

CS Options

Events: Core Strategy Options for Consideration – Chapter 9 Corfe Mullen 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
478235	Ms Jane Brooks		CSO45	9	Object					709
490527	Corfe Mullen Parish Council	Corfe Mullen Parish Council	CSO962	9		General Comment	Paras 9.1-9.20 There may some scope for very limited housing development in Corfe Mullen. Disagree that a centre should be created on the Lockyers site (this site is unlikely to become available anyway). The centre of the village is increasingly being perceived as the Towers Way/Wareham Road where the library, major Co-op store, village hall, council office and parish church is situated. Disagree strongly that a large supermarket would be wanted or needed. It would also be an inappropriate use of land. The figure of 22% living and working in Corfe Mullen is misleading as this must include a large proportion of the self employed.			709
476261	Mr David Aylmore		CSO72	9.1	Object		I object because: 1. There is a v limited public transport system combined with v high car ownership - further houses here will significantly lower the quality of life for existing residents with increased air pollution, noise and congestion. 2. Additional housing will require new retail development drawing in more cars and supply trucks, with increased litter and crime, and the building would be an eyesore visible from a wide area of the Stour valley. 3. Increased population will require more open space and allotments, not just simply relocating what already exists. Relocating these elsewhere in the village will mean that people will continue to use their cars. 4. A village centre will generate more traffic wherever it is located, but ideally should be at the geographic centre, not out here at the edge of the built up area. What will be the extra burden on the council tax payer of the capital cost and on-going running costs of the			710

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							village centre? Further development of any kind will be to the detriment of the existing excellent quality of life in Corfe Mullen.			
480020	Mr Richard Aylmore		CSO1 21	9.1	Object		<p>Heart of the Village: Creating a better heart to the village is a good idea. These plans however propose to situate the heart of the village away from its natural centre by having it on the fringes/outskirts of the village. In paragraph 9.14 it states this as the reason why some recreational facilities need to be relocated to the south of the village given that the current recreational facilities (i.e. the Recreation Ground) are situated where (according to the proposal) in an area which is 'considered inaccessible by foot' for many village residents. If the heart of the village is situated where proposed then the majority of village residents would need to use their cars to reach it, thus increasing the amount of traffic in the Corfe Mullen.</p> <p>If the heart of the village is situated where proposed the current heart of the village (i.e. the Village Hall and the Co-op) could be put at risk as the number of residents visiting this area could be dramatically reduced.</p> <p>Therefore, would it not be better to develop/improve the area around the Village Hall, as this is the current natural heart of the village, instead of relocating the heart and centre of the village to the fringes?</p> <p>Provision of Open Space: The proposed plans reduce the provision of open space - they do not improve it. This is best demonstrated by Core Strategy option CM3 which proposes to build 150 homes on the Eastern part of the Recreation Ground. The reduced provision of open space, coupled with the population increase incurred by these new homes, will increase (instead of reduce) the pressures on local heath lands.</p> <p>In addition, Core Strategy option CM1 proposes to build 80 homes and retail facilities on the school site, which includes its open playing fields. CM2 also reduces the provision of open space by proposing to build houses where several fields are at the moment (including the allotments).</p> <p>In my opinion there is nothing in the plans to</p>			710

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							encourage residents away from the heath lands or increase access to the countryside.			
483385	Mr Clive Fisher		CSO2 86	9.1	Support		I believe they are right for the future of the village			710
478218	Mr Michael Denmark		CSO2 799	9.1	Object		Additional housing is unnecessary. Corfe Mullen is large enough			710
359419	Mrs K. Blee	Clerk Corfe Mullen Parish Council	CSO2 2946	9.1		General Comment	Green belt land is important in the village. The Waterloo Valley must be preserved and enhanced for walkers, cyclists and horse riders possibly by the introduction of a network of new trailways and reduced speed limits on the roads in the vicinity. The village needs an extra 200 or so homes including affordable housing. Affordable housing is extremely important. In Corfe Mullen there is no suitable land left available for housing that is not in the green belt. The Parish Council reluctantly realises that the green belt may need to be revised and suggests revisions be considered in the following locations Land on Wimborne Road between Pine Road and Lambs Green Lane Small area of land between Hillside Road and Waterloo Road near Chapel Lane which is outside the 400m zone. Triangular area bordering Pardys, Sleight Lane and Blandford Road plus an additional piece down Pardys Hill as far as the old pumping station.			710
480020	Mr Richard Aylmore		CSO1 22	9.2	Object		If the proposed homes are built would Corfe Mullen still retain its village status given the resultant (drastic) population increase?			711
497743	Mrs Susan Jefferies		CSO2 427	9.2	Support		Some new housing is needed, but it is very difficult to find an ideal location			711
361276	Mr John Goddard		CSO6 8	9.3	Object		Corfe Mullen, although "attached" to Broadstone and Poole, should be considered as a separate entity with its own semi-rural identity and planning considerations, not as part of the major conurbation,			712

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							which has different, mainly urban, priorities.			
480020	Mr Richard Aylmore		CSO123	9.3	Object		<p>With Corfe Mullen situated on the edge of the District is this the most logical and practical place to build new homes?</p> <p>Very few employment opportunities are available in the village itself (as per paragraph 9.20). The majority of new residents would therefore need to travel to their place of work, e.g. to Poole or Bournemouth. It is acknowledged (in paragraph 9.18) that Corfe Mullen is poorly serviced by public transport. These two factors make it likely that the majority of new residents would need to use a car to travel to work.</p> <p>This, coupled with no proposed improvements to road infrastructure, will lead to increased levels of congestion in and around the village - especially during rush hour (along Wimborne Road to A31, the A31 itself, Higher Blandford Road from Corfe Mullen into Broadstone) - as well as increased air pollution and journey times.</p> <p>In general, I am of the opinion that homes should be built where long-term employment opportunities exist, i.e. in town centre locations - this would reduce the number of cars on our roads as less people would need to travel long distances to their place of work.</p>			712
483385	Mr Clive Fisher		CSO287	9.3	Support		Agree			712
361276	Mr John Goddard		CSO78	9.4	Support					713
483385	Mr Clive Fisher		CSO288	9.4	Support		Agree with statement			713
478218	Mr Michael Denmark		CSO2804	9.4	Support		The policy is correct. There should be no further development outside existing areas			713
361276	Mr John		CSO69	9.5	Support		It is a good idea that in order to maintain the identity, amenity and cohesion of Corfe Mullen, and to inhibit			714

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Goddard						urban sprawl that development be confined to the high ground/plateau area.			
480020	Mr Richard Aylmore		CSO1 28	9.5	Object		<p>Population Figures: The key facts section draws attention to how rapidly the village has grown between 1971 and 2008 (4590 to 10200). In this period therefore the population has grown by 122% (or on average 151 people per year, 3.3% per year, i.e. 122% / 37yrs). Using these figures as a guide, the current population of the village could be as high as 10502 (10200 + 2 years population increase, i.e. 302) The proposal outlines plans to build a total of 310 new homes. If each new home had 2 or 3 people living in them then the population of Corfe Mullen would increase by 775 (310 homes x 2.5 residents) making the total population 11277 (10502 + 775). This constitutes a population increase of 7.4% (775/10502 x 100%) - a massive increase in the population all in one go given that the plans fail to mention the infrastructure improves that would be required to incorporate such an increase in population. 25% least deprived areas: This fact contradicts the need for affordable housing - Does the area require so-called affordable housing if it is one of the least deprived areas in the country? House prices: House prices are high in Corfe Mullen because it is a pleasant and desirable place to live (e.g. in terms of its open spaces, wildlife, pleasant surroundings etc.). Corfe Mullen's desirability could be adversely affected if the proposed plans go ahead. What will happen to house prices in Corfe Mullen if these plans are realised? Conservation Area: If the greenbelt is built upon, as proposed by these plans, a dangerous precedent is set and future developments could encroach on the greenbelt or even the conservation area. Poor Public Transport Provision: As discussed, there are very few employment opportunities available in the village (as per paragraph 9.20) and so the majority of new residents</p>	The document should include projections regarding the anticipated population increase caused by this development and also comment with regard to how the proposed plans would impact upon the other key facts.		714

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

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 need to travel to their place of work. Consequently, it is likely that the majority of new residents would need to use a car to travel to work. Therefore, traffic congestion would increase both in Corfe Mullen and in the surrounding areas.			
483385	Mr Clive Fisher		CSO289	9.5	Support		Agree with statement			714
478218	Mr Michael Denmark		CSO2806	9.5	Support		The statement is correct and indicates why no further development should be contemplated			714
361276	Mr John Goddard		CSO70	9.6	Support		This situation should be maintained to retain the identity and amenity of Corfe Mullen.			716
480020	Mr Richard Aylmore		CSO129	9.6	Object		Corfe Mullen's Green Belt should be preserved, not built upon. One has to question, what is the point in designating an area as Green Belt if, at a later date, its boundaries can be so easily changed and it built upon? The Council should promote more in-filling, i.e. where bungalows/houses are replaced by low-rise flats - examples of this can be seen around the village, the impact of in-filling is certainly less than what the Core Strategy proposes. Building on the Green Belt should be prevented and actively opposed. Amending the Green Belt boundaries to suit these plans is not acceptable. As noted, the proposals are contradictory - it wishes to improve the provision of open space and yet in reality it will reduce the provision of open space if plans to build on the Green Belt are realised.	Corfe Mullen's Green Belt should be preserved, not built upon.		716
483385	Mr Clive Fisher		CSO290	9.6	Support		Agree with statement			716
478218	Mr Michael Denmark		CSO2809	9.6	Support		The statement is correct and this policy should be maintained			716

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
483385	Mr Clive Fisher		CSO2 91	9.7	Support		What can one say about a simple title?			717
361276	Mr John Goddard		CSO7 1	9.8	Support					718
480020	Mr Richard Aylmore		CSO1 30	9.8	Object		<p>It is true that heath land should be protected from housing development. That being said however, this proposal will indirectly (and adversely) affect the heath land that surrounds Corfe Mullen. This is because:</p> <p>a) A higher village population will increase the chances of more people venturing onto the heath land.</p> <p>b) Less open spaces will force more residents to use the heath land for recreational purposes. The local example of Canford Heath illustrates this well - the proximity of the residential development coupled with the high population has put huge pressures on its heath land, such as increased instances of arson: http://www.bournemouthecho.co.uk/news/8458048.Police_hunt_arsonists_after_nature_reserve_in_Canford_Heath_set_alight/</p>	This paragraph mentions 'suitable alternative natural green spaces', this should be elaborated on i.e. where in Corfe Mullen would these green spaces be located? What form would they take?		718
483385	Mr Clive Fisher		CSO2 92	9.8	Support					718
360734	Mr Nick Moulton	Amphibians and Reptiles Conservation Trust	CSO2 337	9.8	Support		ARC supports the proposal to reduce residential impacts on the nearby heaths. The nearby heaths already have high public use and damaging activities like arson. Great care will be needed to ensure that any further housing will not have direct or indirect affects upon these heaths and SANG's should be incorporated in suitable areas to ensure this.			718
478218	Mr Michael Denmark		CSO2 812	9.8	Support		This statement is correct and supports the case for no further development anywhere in the village			718
483385	Mr		CSO2	9.9	Support					719

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Clive Fisher		93							
497743	Mrs Susan Jefferies		CSO2 428	9.9	Object		The heathland must be protected but in some places the rigid 400m rule seems counter productive. there are places in the village 380ms from the heath which could be improved by sensitive development			719
361276	Mr John Goddard		CSO8 1	9.10	Support					720
480020	Mr Richard Aylmore		CSO1 31	9.10	Object		<p>It is true that Corfe Mullen has limited retail facilities; however there is scope for the existing retail facilities to be extended and/or improved.</p> <p>In paragraph 9.5 it has been confirmed that Corfe Mullen has a very high rate of car ownership - this means that retail facilities in nearby Broadstone, Wimborne, Poole and Bournemouth etc. are accessible as and when necessary.</p> <p>The Core Strategy puts forward plans to build additional retail units (on the scale of the new Waitrose store in Wimborne). Such a retail development would place the existing retailers at significant risk (due to the increased competition created) and may result in them moving out of the village.</p> <p>In addition, such a large retail development would completely change the character of Corfe Mullen (as the Waitrose store has done in Wimborne), increase traffic and congestion in and around the village and attract significant anti-social behaviour as seen behind the Co-op in the past.</p> <p>With retail facilities easily accessible both in and around Corfe Mullen it has to be questioned whether additional retail facilities are required in the village.</p> <p>If additional retail facilities are deemed necessary the size of the retail development should definitely be limited in terms of size.</p>	The scale of the retail development should be made clearer so residents can make a more informed decision.		720
483385	Mr Clive Fisher		CSO2 94	9.10	Support		Agree			720

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
478218	Mr Michael Denmark		CSO2 814	9.10	Support		The statement is correct and the so called "limited" facilities are sufficient			720
361276	Mr John Goddard		CSO8 2	9.11	Support					721
480020	Mr Richard Aylmore		CSO1 32	9.11	Object		The existing retail and community facilities in Corfe Mullen are modest but adequate given that significant facilities are readily accessible and available in surrounding areas. As stated in 9.11, the northern group of facilities (i.e. the Co-op and Village Hall) form the main centre of the village - this would appear to be the most logical area in which to create a better heart to the village, and not where the proposal suggests.			721
483385	Mr Clive Fisher		CSO2 95	9.11	Support		Agree			721
478218	Mr Michael Denmark		CSO2 816	9.11	Object		The facilities are not "modest" and are sufficient for the present population			721
361276	Mr John Goddard		CSO8 3	9.12	Support					722
480020	Mr Richard Aylmore		CSO1 33	9.12	Object		Corfe Mullen currently has two food supermarkets (the two Co-op stores) with other food supermarkets and comparison good stores close by. For example, food supermarkets such as Tesco at Fleetsbridge and Towerpark, Asda at Canford Heath and Poole and Waitrose in Wimborne are all close at-hand. Poole and Bournemouth, along with the many retail parks that surround them, provide an abundance of comparison goods floor space. As stated, the level of car ownership is very high in the village which therefore makes these supermarkets/retail stores highly accessible to Corfe Mullen's residents. Furthermore, a large retail development on the scale of the Waitrose store in Wimborne would completely			722

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							change the character of Corfe Mullen, increase traffic and congestion (both in and around the village) and attract significant anti-social behaviour as seen behind the Co-op in the past. With retail facilities easily accessible both in and around Corfe Mullen, it has to be questioned whether additional retail facilities are really required in the village.			
483385	Mr Clive Fisher		CSO2 96	9.12	Support		Agree	Lack of Banking facilities in village		722
478218	Mr Michael Denmark		CSO2 817	9.12	Object		There is no requirement for any further stores and particularly not for any further supermarket type facilities. Any such additional provision would have a seriously detrimental effect on the actual location and surrounding areas as well as the whole village due to increased traffic			722
359419	Mrs K. Blee	Clerk Corfe Mullen Parish Council	CSO2 2948	9.12		General Comment	A large supermarket would not be appropriate for the village. With its linear nature it is important to retain all the shops we currently have, including the larger Co op and the Welcome Parade.			722
483385	Mr Clive Fisher		CSO2 97	9.13	Support					723
497743	Mrs Susan Jefferies		CSO2 429	9.13	Object		Another store might destroy our existing Co-op stores, improve and expand them and we would be amply catered for.			723
361276	Mr John Goddard		CSO8 4	9.14	Support					724
480020	Mr Richard Aylmore		CSO1 38	9.14	Object		It states here that the north of the village around the Recreation Ground and Lockyer's School incorporates the majority of the village's facilities, facilities which 'are considered inaccessible by foot and require car transport'. The same then would be true of the heart of the village if it was located in this area (as the proposal suggests).			724

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

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 addition, the proposal seeks to effectively reduce facility provision in the village by reducing the open space available to local residents - i.e. building houses on the Recreation Ground. Furthermore, the increase in population caused by the proposed housing and retail development will place a strain on these said facilities.			
483385	Mr Clive Fisher		CSO2 98	9.14	Support		Agree with what is said			724
478218	Mr Michael Denmark		CSO2 819	9.14	Object		The text implies that the existing recreational facilities are inadequate because they may be inaccessible for some residents except by car. Whilst additional recreational facilities would be welcomed anywhere in the village, the use of this as a justification to reduce the existing facilities to provide more housing is absurd			724
498552	Mr William Honeyman		CSO3 318	9.14	Object		There is no distinction between sport and recreation in the document and the argument that the recreation ground can only be accessed by car is also false as the bus service runs through most of the village and there is a stop 150 metres from the rec. There are 6 full size football pitches on the current fields but if the CM3 proposal for housing is accepted the village loses 5 football pitches and the last remaining pitch does not drain adequately and is unusable for much of the season. Every Saturday and Sunday morning village children (boys and girls) are coached by village parents who have qualified as coaches and the rec is full and it is not uncommon to see all 6 pitches in use. In addition to the proposed loss of 5 of the 6 football pitches on the rec 3 pitches could also be lost in Lockyers school development. Seasonally athletics clubs (including juniors) use the recreation ground for training and there is an annual 10k race raising funds for local use. The CM3 area drains naturally and is a jewel in the crown for Corfe Mullen sport and recreation	Abandon proposed loss of recreation ground for housing and ensure Lockyers rebuild if it happens is on existing school site		724
483385	Mr Clive		CSO2 99	9.15	Support		Title only			725

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Fisher									
361276	Mr John Goddard		CSO85	9.16	Support					726
480020	Mr Richard Aylmore		CSO142	9.16	Object		<p>The proposed development will have inevitable implications for school provision both in and around Corfe Mullen.</p> <p>It is stated that the two First Schools have some capacity to accommodate some additional pupils - can it be confirmed whether or not these Schools could cope with a large scale increase in pupil numbers which will be caused by this housing development?</p> <p>It is mentioned that Lockyer's School could be re-built elsewhere in the village - where would the re-built school be located? As the proposal stands, it is unclear whether it would be located within the new housing development or in another part of the village. It has already been stated in paragraph 9.14 that there is a lack of space elsewhere in the village.</p> <p>Also, with the original School building not currently listed, can the Council guarantee that it will be preserved if the rest of the school is to be relocated? (As per the wishes of the community outlined in paragraph 9.43).</p> <p>With regard to the Upper schools, the Strategy document has concluded that both Corfe Hills and QE upper schools have 'very little additional capacity to accommodate additional students' and that this situation is not set to change (as there is very little additional capacity for expansion at either school).</p> <p>With a lack of space for additional pupils, where will the additional children go to school when they reach year 9? These are key questions which must be addressed.</p>			726
483385	Mr Clive Fisher		CSO300	9.16	Support		Redevelop Lockyers site is right thing to do, will not take up any other space in village.			726
478218	Mr Michael		CSO2820	9.16	Object		Lockyers School can and should be redeveloped on its existing site. There is no requirement for additional			726

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Denmark						housing to generate additional school population			
483385	Mr Clive Fisher		CSO301	9.17	Support					727
497743	Mrs Susan Jefferies		CSO2430	9.17	Support		Not entirely true. School admission numbers is a complicated procedure. There is provision in Corfe Mullen for school children from additional housing. Admissions perhaps need to be tightened up as many out of catchment children come to our schools which can make it difficult for new residents to find school places.			727
361276	Mr John Goddard		CSO86	9.18	Support					728
480020	Mr Richard Aylmore		CSO143	9.18	Object		The high level of car ownership in Corfe Mullen coupled with the inadequate public transport system has led to an increase in the levels of congestion in areas such as: a) Wimborne Road leading to the A31 b) Higher Blandford Road leading from Corfe Mullen to Corfe Hills and the Broadstone roundabout c) Windgreen roundabout and surrounding roads d) Wareham Road Corfe Mullen's congestion problems will be exacerbated further if these homes are built.			728
483385	Mr Clive Fisher		CSO302	9.18	Support		Agree with statement with no public transport after 5-30pm			728
478218	Mr Michael Denmark		CSO2821	9.18	Support		The statement is correct and indicates why any further development is unwise			728
483385	Mr Clive Fisher		CSO303	9.19	Support		Title of Paragraph			729
497743	Mrs Susan Jefferies		CSO2431	9.19	Support		We need more public transport			729

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
361276	Mr John Goddard		CSO87	9.20	Support					730
483385	Mr Clive Fisher		CSO304	9.20	Support		Agree with paragraph, would suggest a new shop would create limited local employment			730
478218	Mr Michael Denmark		CSO2822	9.20	Support		The statement is correct and indicates why further development is unwise and will lead to further traffic on unsuitable roads			730
359419	Mrs K. Blee	Clerk Corfe Mullen Parish Council	CSO22949	9.20		General Comment	Employment should be encouraged in the village, possibly a small industrial/business site could be created on land not suitable for housing e.g. that within 400m of the heath. This could also bring in exchange much needed informal recreational space for the south of the parish, perhaps along Waterloo Road just past Amber Close. Possible locations for employment could be the land on Wareham Road opposite the tip or around the Candys Lane area near Sims Metal.			730
361276	Mr John Goddard		CSO88	9.21	Support					732
480020	Mr Richard Aylmore		CSO144	9.21	Object		If the greenbelt is built upon, as proposed by these plans, a dangerous precedent is set and future developments could also encroach on the greenbelt. The greenbelt should be protected for the enjoyment of future generations and for environmental reasons, its boundaries should not be so easily amended for the sake of a housing development otherwise what is the point in designating an area as greenbelt? The term affordable housing should be clearly defined, i.e. what is affordable housing? Who will be prioritised, i.e. who will be eligible to apply for it? Who will own the houses - the council, housing developers, private individuals or rental companies? A key justification for this development is the need for affordable housing, however, according to the proposal only 40% of the total number of houses will fall into the 'affordable' category. If the need for	The term 'affordable housing' should be clearly defined so that a common frame of reference can be adopted by all. Instead of building on greenbelt land, the Council should perhaps consider and promote a policy of 'in-filling', building on so-called brownfield sites, or encouraging better use of existing residential land - such as building low rise flats in the place of houses/bungalows (as per the examples on Wareham		732

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>affordable housing is so high then why aren't 100% of these proposed houses going to be 'affordable'? As stated in paragraph 9.5 however Corfe Mullen is one of the 25% least deprived areas in country. With this being the case does the village need any affordable housing?</p> <p>The point made regarding house prices being high compared to wages is now true of most areas of the UK, it is not unique to Corfe Mullen or East Dorset. With regard to house prices being relatively high in the village, this is because Corfe Mullen is a desirable place to live - the proposed housing development could reduce Corfe Mullen's desirability, threaten the value of existing homes in the area and reduce the quality of life for existing residents.</p>	Road in Corfe Mullen).		
483385	Mr Clive Fisher		CSO305	9.21	Support		Agree with paragraph and need to provide affordable housing			732
360112	Mr Kenneth Brooks	St Leonards & St Ives Parish Plan Group	CSO19189	9.21	Object		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.			732
523531	Mr Tim Hoskinson	Savills	CSO18425	9.21	Support		<p>As part of the evidence base to inform the Core Strategy and subsequent documents, Dorset County Council carried out a 'Strategic Housing Market Assessment' (SHMA), published June 2008. The survey provided a detailed picture of the profile of the local housing circumstances in East Dorset, identified gaps in the current market, and provided information on the potential future housing requirements. Overall, the survey found that there are 711 households currently in housing need in East Dorset, of which 89 are located in Corfe Mullen. On top of this, the future need for additional affordable housing is estimated as being in the region of 440 dwellings per annum across the District, with 35 dwellings per</p>			732

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							annum in Corfe Mullen. There is limited capacity for additional development within the urban area of Corfe Mullen, and new housing development adjoining existing urban areas will be needed in order to contribute to meeting identified housing needs.			
361276	Mr John Goddard		CSO89	9.22	Object		Corfe Mullen is already too large for the limited facilities (medical/employment/transport/education etc.) that we have now, let alone if the village increases in size.			733
480020	Mr Richard Aylmore		CSO145	9.22	Object		<p>This paragraph mentions accessibility to services, facilities and employment opportunities as key reasons for why Corfe Mullen has been considered to be an appropriate place to consider housing development.</p> <p>This however contradicts what has been said in previous paragraphs.</p> <p>Accessibility - It has been stated (in paragraph 9.5) that Corfe Mullen has a very limited public transport system. This limits resident's ability to access local services unless they have a car. If the proposal is realised the number of cars will rise and accessibility to services would most likely be reduced due to the subsequent increase in road congestion.</p> <p>Facilities - Corfe Mullen's current facilities have been described as 'modest' for a village of its size (in paragraph 9.11). The proposal posits that additional retail provision should be provided; this however would be on a scale which would completely change the character of the village and place existing retailers (such as the Post Office) at risk. In addition, other facilities such as Doctors and Dentists are not mentioned - a steep population increase would place these and other existing facilities/services under pressure.</p> <p>Employment opportunities - It has been acknowledged in paragraph 9.20 that there are few employment opportunities in Corfe Mullen itself. The reasons for considering Corfe Mullen as an appropriate place to consider building additional housing do not seem to meet with the reality of the situation (as presented by the proposal itself).</p>			733

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
483385	Mr Clive Fisher		CSO306	9.22	Support		Glad Spatial Strategy has gone, this does not however remove the need for housing but we need to respect green belt and not building on land liable to be flooded.			733
490527	Corfe Mullen Parish Council	Corfe Mullen Parish Council	CSO963	9.22	Object		Disagree strongly that Corfe Mullen is a main settlement.			733
478218	Mr Michael Denmark		CSO2824	9.22	Object		The earlier sections of this document do not support the identification of Corfe Mullen as an appropriate place for further development. Indeed they indicate that without expansion of the current adequate facilities it is not suitable.			733
497743	Mrs Susan Jefferies		CSO2432	9.22	Support		We need more affordable housing in Corfe Mullen			733
523531	Mr Tim Hoskinson	Savills	CSO18426	9.22	Support		The Government is committed to increasing housing supply and affordability, and even if Regional Spatial Strategies and associated housing targets are abolished through the Localism Bill, housing needs will still have to be met and Local Authorities will have to demonstrate a justifiable and evidence based approach to housing provision in accordance with PPS3. The sound principles of sustainable development as currently set out in PPS1 will still apply and Corfe Mullen remains highly suitable for new housing development			733
361276	Mr John Goddard		CSO90	9.23	Object		The vitality of the village will be inhibited, not advanced, by further building on the scale proposed. Corfe Mullen is already too large for the facilities (employment/educational/transport/medical/education etc.) that we have now.			734
480020	Mr Richard Aylmore		CSO148	9.23	Object		In its present form I strongly believe that the proposed housing/retail development will detract from what makes Corfe Mullen a great place to live - the wide open spaces. Building on the greenbelt is not a sustainable way to build housing anywhere, such a			734

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

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 will change the character of Corfe Mullen completely. It will increase the village's population radically, cause added road congestion, cause overcrowding in our schools, place existing retailers at risk of closure, put added pressure on existing facilities such as doctor and dentistry services, and reduce the number of open spaces in the village (thus increasing the pressures on local countryside and heathland). All of this will reduce the vitality and viability of the village, reduce its desirability and lower the standard of living for its residents. The Canford Heath residential development, the Poole Quarter housing development and the Waitrose store in Wimborne are examples of how local areas have been completely changed by residential and retail developments.			
478218	Mr Michael Denmark		CSO2 826	9.23	Object		Corfe Mullen can not support any further development in it's existing form . Any such development and the provision of associated facilities will adversely affect the whole village and remove the main reasons for the existing residents to consider it a pleasant place to live.			734
480020	Mr Richard Aylmore		CSO1 46	9.24	Object			Links could be provided so that the documents can be found/read.		735
483385	Mr Clive Fisher		CSO3 07	9.24	Support		Yes it can be provided under Option 2			735
480020	Mr Richard Aylmore		CSO1 47	9.25	Object			Links could be provided so that the documents can be found/read.		736
483385	Mr Clive Fisher		CSO3 08	9.25	Support					736
361276	Mr John Goddard		CSO9 1	9.28	Object		This is pie-in-the-sky thinking. Perhaps in an ideal world this aim might be obtainable but we live in the real world where money and space are limited and			739

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

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 other pressures e.g. environmental, apply.			
483385	Mr Clive Fisher		CSO309	9.28	Support		Agree with paragraph contents			739
361276	Mr John Goddard		CSO92	9.29	Support		I support this aim but other considerations must counterbalance these ideals, such as the environment and overcrowding of existing inhabitants.			740
480020	Mr Richard Aylmore		CSO149	9.29	Object		<p>Placing 310 homes in such a small geographical area will inevitably mean that the housing density will be very high.</p> <p>The term affordable housing should be clearly defined, i.e. what is affordable housing? Who will be prioritised, i.e. who will be eligible to apply for it? Who will own the houses - the council, housing developers, private individuals or rental companies? A key justification for this development is the need for affordable housing, however, according to the proposal only 40% of the total number of houses to be built will fall into the 'affordable' category. If the need for affordable housing is so high then why aren't 100% of these proposed houses going to be 'affordable'? As stated in paragraph 9.5 Corfe Mullen is one of the 25% least deprived areas in country. With this being the case does the village need any affordable housing?</p> <p>The greenbelt location for this development is not suitable - the greenbelt should be preserved, as should Corfe Mullen's open spaces and Recreation Ground. The future of Lockyer's i.e. where it is to be located if it is to be moved from its existing site has not yet been confirmed - this is a key omission.</p> <p>This paragraph mentions accessibility to services, facilities and employment opportunities as key reasons for why Corfe Mullen has been considered to be an appropriate place to consider housing development.</p> <p>This however contradicts what has been said in previous paragraphs.</p> <p>Accessibility - It has been stated (in paragraph 9.5) that Corfe Mullen has a very limited public transport system. This limits resident's ability to access local</p>			740

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>services unless they have a car. If the proposal is realised the number of cars will rise and accessibility to services would most likely be reduced due to the subsequent increase in road congestion.</p> <p>Facilities - Corfe Mullen's current facilities have been described as 'modest' for a village of its size (in paragraph 9.11). The proposal posits that additional retail provision should be provided; this however would be on a scale which would completely change the character of the village and place existing retailers (such as the Post Office) at risk. In addition, other facilities such as Doctors and Dentists are not mentioned - a steep population increase would place these and other existing facilities/services under pressure.</p> <p>Employment opportunities - It has been acknowledged in paragraph 9.20 that there are few employment opportunities in Corfe Mullen itself.</p> <p>Infrastructure - there is little evidence to suggest that the local infrastructure will be improved by this development - will the existing infrastructure be able to cope?</p> <p>The reasons for considering Corfe Mullen as an appropriate place to consider building additional housing do not seem to meet with the reality of the situation.</p>			
483385	Mr Clive Fisher		CSO310	9.29	Support		Agree with paragraph contents			740
497743	Mrs Susan Jefferies		CSO2433	9.29	Support					740
361276	Mr John Goddard		CSO93	9.30	Object		It is not necessarily Corfe Mullen's obligation to provide all this. Other areas may be more suitable.			741
480020	Mr Richard Aylmore		CSO150	9.30	Object		The greenbelt location for this development is not suitable - the greenbelt should be preserved, as should Corfe Mullen's open spaces and Recreation Ground. The future of Lockyer's i.e. where it is to be located if it is to be moved from its existing site has	What the expected needs for housing in Corfe Mullen could be elaborated upon.		741

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact 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 yet been confirmed - this is a key omission.</p> <p>Accessibility - It has been stated (in paragraph 9.5) that Corfe Mullen has a very limited public transport system. This limits resident's ability to access local services unless they have a car. If the proposal is realised the number of cars will rise and accessibility to services would most likely be reduced due to the subsequent increase in road congestion.</p> <p>Facilities - Corfe Mullen's current facilities have been described as 'modest' for a village of its size (in paragraph 9.11). The proposal posits that additional retail provision should be provided; this however would be on a scale which would completely change the character of the village and place existing retailers (such as the Post Office) at risk. In addition, other facilities such as Doctors and Dentists are not mentioned - a steep population increase would place these and other existing facilities/services under pressure.</p> <p>Employment opportunities - It has been acknowledged in paragraph 9.20 that there are few employment opportunities in Corfe Mullen itself.</p> <p>Infrastructure - there is little evidence to suggest that the local infrastructure will be improved by this development - will the existing infrastructure be able to cope?</p>			
483385	Mr Clive Fisher		CSO3 11	9.30	Support		Agree with paragraph contents.			741
478218	Mr Michael Denmark		CSO2 828	9.30	Object		Corfe Mullen is not suitable for this development			741
361276	Mr John Goddard		CSO9 4	9.33	Support					744
480020	Mr Richard Aylmore		CSO1 51	9.33	Object		These plans place housing provision over the needs of the environment. If the plans are realised valuable greenbelt land will be lost and the increase in the village's population will increase the number of cars on its roads (thus increasing congestion and pollution			744

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							- both air and noise). In addition, such a population increase will place added pressures on the local countryside and heath land. It is hard to see how these plans will conserve and enhance the environmental quality of the area.			
483385	Mr Clive Fisher		CSO3 12	9.33	Support		Agree with paragraph			744
361276	Mr John Goddard		CSO9 5	9.34	Object		A chicken and egg argument. Dorset's economy is mainly affected by a lack of employment and transport etc. etc. There are many other factors in the equation and it is simplistic to think that housing is a major contributor.			745
480020	Mr Richard Aylmore		CSO1 52	9.34	Object		Steps have already been taken to increase the provision of affordable homes both in Poole and Bournemouth. Any recruitment and retention problems should be the responsibility of employers to rectify - i.e. they should offer suitable remuneration packages to their employees so that they can afford to live in the local area. Throughout the proposal document it has been constantly reaffirmed that Corfe Mullen has very few employment opportunities and therefore 80% of its residents need to travel to work by car. It is difficult to see how building 'affordable' homes in Corfe Mullen - far from where the majority of residents actually work - will help rectify the situation mentioned, would it not be better to build these houses nearer to where the jobs are? This would cut the need for commuting and the associated congestion and pollution caused by it.			745
483385	Mr Clive Fisher		CSO3 13	9.34	Support		Agree with paragraph			745
497743	Mrs Susan Jefferies		CSO2 434	9.34	Support		Our area is precious, we must both protect and sustain it			745
361276	Mr		CSO9	9.35	Support		As long as the elderly are existing locals and not			746

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

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 Goddard		6				imported so that the area becomes a ghetto of the elderly.			
480020	Mr Richard Aylmore		CSO153	9.35	Object		Are these plans proposing accessible and supported housing? Will this housing really be affordable for older people? Is there not enough sheltered/warden assisted homes and care homes in and around Corfe Mullen already?	It should be made clearer as to whether the proposal plans to contribute to the availability of accessible and supported housing for older people.		746
483385	Mr Clive Fisher		CSO314	9.35	Support		Agree with paragraph.			746
497743	Mrs Susan Jefferies		CSO2435	9.36	Support					747
361276	Mr John Goddard		CSO97	9.37	Support		Sure. These are factors to consider but there are many other factors to be taken into account. Is there actually room for more houses in Corfe Mullen?			748
480020	Mr Richard Aylmore		CSO154	9.37	Object		In their current form these plans do not achieve the outcomes listed in this paragraph as: a) Only 40% of the proposed homes will fall into the 'affordable' category. If 'affordable' homes were really needed shouldn't 100% of the proposed homes be 'affordable'? Also this paragraph states 'Ensure any new homes address in particular the need for affordable housing...' - 60% of the proposed new homes will not live up to this objective. b) It is unclear as to what facilities are to be built (apart from the retail development). The proposed retail development could pose a significant threat to the continued existence of Corfe Mullen's current retailers. Who will pay for these facilities? Will Council tax increase? c) There is little evidence from the plans that additional infrastructure will be built to accommodate this development. This will result in increased pressure being placed on the existing infrastructure. d) These plans place housing provision over the needs of the environment. If the plans are realised valuable greenbelt land will be lost and the increase in the village's population will increase the number of			748

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							cars on its roads (thus increasing congestion and pollution - both air and noise). In addition, such a population increase will place added pressures on the local countryside and heath land. It is hard to see how these plans will conserve and enhance the environmental quality of the area. e) The proposed housing development could reduce Corfe Mullen's desirability and threaten the value of existing homes in the area. It could reduce the quality of life for existing residents.			
483385	Mr Clive Fisher		CSO315	9.37	Support		Agree with paragraph contents			748
361276	Mr John Goddard		CSO98	9.38	Object		There are so few jobs available in Corfe Mullen that this proposal simply does not apply. The implication would be that more houses should be built in the central conurbations of Poole and Bournemouth where people actually work!			749
480020	Mr Richard Aylmore		CSO170	9.38	Object		As previously stated throughout the document, there are little or no job opportunities in Corfe Mullen itself - the majority of residents have to travel (more often than not using their cars) to their place of work. These plans will not provide Corfe Mullen's residents the opportunity to live and work within their own local community.			749
483385	Mr Clive Fisher		CSO316	9.38	Support		Agree Paragraph contents			749
478218	Mr Michael Denmark		CSO2832	9.38	Object		This statement does not apply. There are not and never will be sufficient employment in Corfe Mullen to justify importing additional population for the labour force.			749
497743	Mrs Susan Jefferies		CSO2436	9.38	Support					749
361276	Mr John		CSO99	9.39	Object		The problem is with a shortage of the services. The argument is the wrong way round. Corfe Mullen is			750

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Goddard						short of jobs/transport/ shopping facilities etc. and therefore there appears to little rationale for more housing in that area.			
480020	Mr Richard Aylmore		CSO1 72	9.39	Object		Locating residents near to services is generally a good idea, however the plans do not propose any improvements to the village's services such as public transport, schools, doctors, child care provision, dentists etc. The population increase caused by the proposed housing development will place additional pressure on the Corfe Mullen's services which will lead to a reduction in the quality of life for existing village residents.			750
483385	Mr Clive Fisher		CSO3 17	9.39	Support		Agree paragraph contents			750
478218	Mr Michael Denmark		CSO2 834	9.39	Object		These proposals do not improve/increase services but simply place more pressure upon them.			750
497743	Mrs Susan Jefferies		CSO2 437	9.40	Support					751
361276	Mr John Goddard		CSO1 00	9.41	Support					752
480020	Mr Richard Aylmore		CSO1 75	9.41	Object		The Regional Spatial Strategy was abandoned due to significant local opposition. The plans currently under consideration constitute a slight modification to the plans so virulently objected to by Corfe Mullen's residents in the past.	Why are the responses for the Draft Regional Spatial Strategy still valid?		752
483385	Mr Clive Fisher		CSO3 18	9.41	Support		Agree			752
478218	Mr Michael Denmark		CSO2 837	9.41	Object		The former plans are now completely irrelevant. However previous consultation indicated the overwhelming opposition to any development.			752
361276	Mr		CSO1	9.42	Support		I support this.			753

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

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 Goddard		01							
480020	Mr Richard Aylmore		CSO178	9.42	Object		<p>This paragraph states that 'The vast majority of respondents objected to the principle of urban extensions and developments in the Green Belt and wanted to see no further expansion of Corfe Mullen.' East Dorset District Council should act in accordance with the wishes of Corfe Mullen's residents. The proposed plans not only set out plans to expand Corfe Mullen they also propose to redefine the boundaries of the Green Belt - this directly violates the wishes of the village's residents.</p> <p>The Waterloo Valley should be preserved - as should the surrounding areas in Corfe Mullen, including the recreation ground, Lockyer's School, allotment site and surrounding open spaces.</p> <p>If the Lockyer's site is used for residential and retail development: where would the school be relocated to? How would these developments affect the character of Corfe Mullen? What additional infrastructure, services and/or facilities will be provided in incorporate such a development? How will local house prices be affected? These are some of the many questions which need to be answered.</p>	The Council should recognise and respect the wishes of Corfe Mullen residents.		753
483385	Mr Clive Fisher		CSO319	9.42	Support		The contents of the paragraph are all valid.			753
497743	Mrs Susan Jefferies		CSO2438	9.42	Support		I am glad the RSS has gone, it was too broad brush and ignored the wishes, knowledge and experience of local people.			753
361276	Mr John Goddard		CSO102	9.43	Support		These are reasonable proposals.			754
480020	Mr Richard Aylmore		CSO184	9.43	Object		No, I do not believe Lockyer's School should be considered as part of the urban extension. A redevelopment of the school to bring it into the 21st Century would be of significant benefit to both current and future students, however this should be on the current site and not on the recreation ground.	A fixed site should be proposed as to where Lockyer's would go if it was not to remain on its current site.		754

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact 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 would be several implications if Lockyer's were to be built on the recreation ground: The size of the recreation ground would be significantly reduced. If the sports fields were shared this would place significant pressure on the land. Also several questions have to be answered: Who would maintain the shared area? The school or the council? Would the area be secure for pupils? Would current users be asked to leave the grounds if the school wanted to use them? The original school building is not listed, can the Council guarantee that it would survive (as per the wishes of the local residents) if this development went ahead? Also, how suitable would such a building be for community use? What kind of community use is being considered? Due to continuing funding cuts, can the Council guarantee that the building would be adequately maintained? Two other locations for Lockyer's school are mentioned here: the Corfe Hills Site or the southern end of the Waterloo Valley. It was specified in paragraph 9.16 that, due to the proximity of the heath land, there is little/no room for expansion at Corfe Hills and that the school is already at capacity. This seems to rule out Corfe Hills as a suitable site for Lockyer's straightaway (as well as the fact that it is located in Poole). The Southern end of Waterloo Valley is considered unsuitable for residential development due to the proximity of the heath land (paragraph 9.42), this seems to rule out this site for a new school as well. In addition, it is at the opposite end of the village to where the school is currently located.</p>			
483385	Mr Clive Fisher		CSO3 20	9.43	Support		The school should be redeveloped on its existing site as there is little other land that can be used. To use the recreation ground will deprive the village of leisure and recreational space. The old building should be retained for community use and also to reflect the history and culture of the village.			754
497743	Mrs Susan		CSO2 439	9.43	Support		700 houses in that location was insensitive			754

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Jefferies									
361276	Mr John Goddard		CSO103	9.44	Support		We ALREADY need these improved facilities, let alone with the advent of more housing.			755
480020	Mr Richard Aylmore		CSO188	9.44	Object		<p>The A31 is currently heavily congested, the extra cars in the area caused by this development will only exacerbate the level of congestion. Making it a dual carriageway is a good idea, however, how realistic is it that this will actually happen? In general, these plans propose no additional improvements to the roads or infrastructure in or around Corfe Mullen - this will result in heavier congestion in Corfe Mullen itself and the surrounding areas if this development is built. Who will pay for better public transport links? How long will they last? What will they consist of?</p> <p>The proposed retail development will change the character of Corfe Mullen, cause road congestion, noise pollution, environmental pollution, litter, anti-social behaviour and place existing retailers in the village - such as the Post Office - at risk of closure. No improvements to doctors or dentists are proposed by these plans - a higher population will place undue strain on existing services.</p> <p>No more schools are proposed by these plans. No facilities and/or entertainment for young people are proposed by these plans - indeed, isn't youth centre is set to be lost if this development goes ahead?</p> <p>Allotments and green spaces set to be lost if this development goes ahead.</p> <p>Affordable housing only set to make up 40% of total houses built within this development. Footpaths and cycleways not a substitute for the open land and green belt lost.</p>	Council should outline what other facilities and transport improvements will actually be made if this development goes ahead.		755
483385	Mr Clive Fisher		CSO321	9.44	Support		Agree with contents of paragraph			755
497743	Mrs Susan Jefferies		CSO2440	9.44	Support		This is not a simple question. The future of the school and the future of Education in Dorset and in Corfe Mullen needs to be looked at from the beginning.			755

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
497743	Mrs Susan Jefferies		CSO2441	9.45	Support					756
361276	Mr John Goddard		CSO104	9.46	Support					757
480020	Mr Richard Aylmore		CSO190	9.46	Object		Local objections to past development plans should be noted and acted upon - further housing developments in Corfe Mullen have consistently been opposed by local residents, such plans/developments should not be forced upon the people whether it be 310 homes or 700 homes.			757
483385	Mr Clive Fisher		CSO322	9.46	Support		Agree with contents of plan			757
480020	Mr Richard Aylmore		CSO194	9.47	Object		<p>Environment: The proposed plan proposes not to preserve the Green Belt but instead proposes to build on it.</p> <p>Youth and Education: The proposals do not present a definitive plan for Lockyer's School - is it to be redeveloped on the existing site? Is it to be relocated to the recreation ground development? Or is it to be relocated to the southern end of the village? One thing is certain; it will continue to be needed as long as a 3-tier system is still in operation. Also, local residents want to see the original Lockyer's school building preserved whatever happens - it is however not a listed building - can the council therefore guarantee its continued existence? In addition, both Corfe Hills and QE are nearly at capacity in terms of school numbers - where will the additional school children housed within the proposed housing development go to school when they reach year 9?</p> <p>Infrastructure: The plans say nothing of making the necessary improvements to the local infrastructure. This will result in more traffic congestion and increased pressure on local services and facilities. The proposed retail development would threaten existing retailers in the village - especially Corfe Mullen post office which is situated very close to the</p>	Council should produce and present plans that are reflective of the wishes of the local residents and of Corfe Mullen's Parish Plan.		758

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

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 retail development site. Local people want to see the Post Office preserved (as per paragraph 9.47).			
483385	Mr Clive Fisher		CSO3 23	9.47	Support		Agree with paragraph contents			758
497743	Mrs Susan Jefferies		CSO2 442	9.47	Support		The Parish Plan was well supported. Many residents agreed that some additional housing is required, but not 700 and not in a sensitive area. We cannot stand still and turn Corfe Mullen into a museum			758
497743	Mrs Susan Jefferies		CSO2 443	9.48	Support		We must look forward and adapt.			759
361276	Mr John Goddard		CSO1 05	9.49	Support					760
480020	Mr Richard Aylmore		CSO1 95	9.49	Object		Corfe Mullen's identity should be preserved. This development will completely alter its identity - Corfe Mullen would become like any other residential area and what many people have moved to Corfe Mullen to enjoy would be lost. Proposed housing development appears to favour high-density housing instead of ensuring houses have enough space between them. Would the shortage of specialist housing for the elderly and disabled be addressed by this development? Residents in this area of the village would need to negotiate significant gradients to reach key services such as the Doctor and dental surgeries.			760
483385	Mr Clive Fisher		CSO3 24	9.49	Support		Agree with contents of paragraph			760
361276	Mr John Goddard		CSO1 06	9.50	Support					761
480020	Mr		CSO1	9.50	Object		Creating a better heart to the village is a good idea.			761

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Richard Aylmore		96				<p>These plans however propose to situate the heart of the village away from its natural centre by having it on the fringes/outskirts of the village. In paragraph 9.14 it states this as the reason why some recreational facilities need to be relocated to the south of the village given that the current recreational facilities (i.e. the recreation ground) are situated where (according to the proposal) in an area which is 'considered inaccessible by foot' for many village residents. If the heart of the village is situated where proposed then the majority of village residents would need to use their cars to reach it, thus increasing the amount of traffic in Corfe Mullen. Due to continuing funding cuts, can the Council guarantee that a village centre could be adequately funded and maintained if it was built? What about developing the Village Hall site as this area is the natural heart of the village at the moment. There would be several implications if Lockyer's were to be built on the recreation ground:</p> <p>The size of the recreation ground would be significantly reduced.</p> <p>If the sports fields were shared this would place significant pressure on the land. Also several questions have to be answered: Who would maintain the shared area? The school or the council? Would the area be secure for pupils? Would current users be asked to leave the grounds if the school wanted to use them? What do the school's students think of these plans? Would student education be affected in any way?</p> <p>The original school building is not listed, can the Council guarantee that it would survive (as per the wishes of the local residents) if this development went ahead? Also, how suitable would such a building be for community use? What kind of community use is being considered? Due to continuing funding cuts, can the Council guarantee that the building would be adequately maintained?</p> <p>Two other locations for Lockyer's school are mentioned here: the Corfe Hills Site or the southern end of the Waterloo Valley. It was specified in paragraph 9.16 that, due to the proximity of the heath land, there is little/no room for expansion at Corfe Hills and that the school is already at capacity. 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
							seems to rule out Corfe Hills as a suitable site for Lockyer's straightaway (as well as the fact that it is located in Poole). The Southern end of Waterloo Valley is considered unsuitable for residential development due to the proximity of the heath land (paragraph 9.42), this seems to rule out this site for a new school as well. In addition, it is at the opposite end of the village to where the school is currently located. A fixed site should be proposed as to where Lockyer's would go if it was not to remain on its current site.			
483385	Mr Clive Fisher		CSO3 25	9.50	Support		Agree with keeping school on this site			761
497743	Mrs Susan Jefferies		CSO2 444	9.50	Support		We must have housing that people like to live in. We love our village and we welcome people who love living here.			761
497743	Mrs Susan Jefferies		CSO2 445	9.51	Support		Don't mess with our Recreation Ground, one of the very best in Dorset.			762
483385	Mr Clive Fisher		CSO3 26	9.52	Support		Agree need to review situation.			763
480020	Mr Richard Aylmore		CSO1 97	9.53	Object		If the greenbelt is built upon, as proposed by these plans, a dangerous precedent is set and future developments could encroach on the greenbelt or even the conservation area. Corfe Mullen's Green Belt should be preserved, not built upon. One has to question, what is the point in designating an area as Green Belt if, at a later date, its boundaries can be so easily changed and it built upon? The Council should promote more in-filling, i.e. where bungalows/houses are replaced by low-rise flats - examples of this can be seen around the village, the impact of in-filling is certainly less than what the Core Strategy proposes.			764

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

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 the Green Belt should be prevented and actively opposed. Amending the Green Belt boundaries to suit these plans is not acceptable. As noted, the proposals are contradictory - it wishes to improve the provision of open space and yet in reality it will reduce the provision of open space if plans to build on the Green Belt are realised. Corfe Mullen's Green Belt should be preserved, not built upon.			
497743	Mrs Susan Jefferies		CSO2446	9.53	Support		130 new homes is much more the level we require			764
480020	Mr Richard Aylmore		CSO198	9.54	Object			Can the firm of Consultants be named? Are they local? Do they represent the views of the local people?		765
483385	Mr Clive Fisher		CSO330	9.54	Support		Agree need to reassess			765
490527	Corfe Mullen Parish Council	Corfe Mullen Parish Council	CSO964	9.54	Object		Again disagree that Corfe Mullen should be classed as a main settlement. It is essential that any areas promoted by landowners are vigorously assessed against sustainability criteria. The village has very difficult environmental constraints, inadequate public transport, steep gradients and it is difficult to locate accessible facilities due to the elongated nature of the village.			765
483385	Mr Clive Fisher		CSO331	9.55	Support		Just because a landowner thinks his or her land is suitable for housing development is not a reason to develop that land for housing or other purposes.			766
490527	Corfe Mullen Parish Council	Corfe Mullen Parish Council	CSO965	9.55	Object		Again disagree that Corfe Mullen should be classed as a main settlement. It is essential that any areas promoted by landowners are vigorously assessed against sustainability criteria. The village has very difficult environmental constraints, inadequate public transport, steep gradients and it is difficult to locate accessible facilities due to the elongated nature of the village.			766

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
483385	Mr Clive Fisher		CSO3 32	9.56	Support		All options require consideration.			767
480020	Mr Richard Aylmore		CSO2 02	9.57	Object			Can a link be placed that points to this document?		768
490527	Corfe Mullen Parish Council	Corfe Mullen Parish Council	CSO9 66	9.57		General Comment	It was regrettable that the Broadway Malyan report was so delayed. However it provided detailed additional information which was helpful in understanding the Core Strategy document.			768
483385	Mr Clive Fisher		CSO3 33	9.59	Support		Agree with contents of paragraph			770
361276	Mr John Goddard		CSO1 07	9.63	Object		The area DOES have considerable environmental issues. The area is a habitat for many interesting species of flora and fauna.			775
483385	Mr Clive Fisher		CSO3 34	9.63	Support		Agree with paragraph contents			775
490527	Corfe Mullen Parish Council	Corfe Mullen Parish Council	CSO9 67	9.63		General Comment	Corfe Mullen is one of the longest villages in Europe and it is difficult to locate a centre. However the village centre is widely regarded as around the library/village hall area. It is inaccurate to state that large parts of the northern sub-area are close to the village centre: only those parts at the top of the plateau could be described as such.			775
483385	Mr Clive Fisher		CSO3 35	9.65	Support		Agree with paragraph contents			777
490527	Corfe Mullen Parish Council	Corfe Mullen Parish Council	CSO9 68	9.65		General Comment	The southerly parts of the southern sub-area are also largely remote from the village facilities and the proximity to sensitive environmental sites means that there is little scope for housing.			777
478218	Mr Michael Denmark		CSO2 848	9.65	Support		Agree with conclusion			777

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
497743	Mrs Susan Jefferies		CSO2 447	9.66	Support					778
483385	Mr Clive Fisher		CSO3 36	9.67	Support		Agree that the stated areas are unsuitable for development			779
360302	Mrs Hilary Chittenden	Chairperson Environment TAG (East Dorset)	CSO1 8159	9.67	Support		The earlier (RSS) proposals for the development of the Waterloo Valley are not being considered in the Options put forward. The area is an AGLV and evidence (particularly that provided through the Nature Watch project) has shown it to be an area of high biodiversity, greatly valued by local residents. ETAG fully supports proposals to protect Waterloo Valley (including Pardy's Hill) from development. We strongly recommend that it should also be protected from any adverse impacts on its biodiversity and geological interest through the creation of a SANG, relocation of formal open green space, playing fields, allotments etc. Any proposed land use changes here should be subject to survey over a full 12 month period as we have recommended for all other Core Strategy Options.			779
523319	Mr Ryan Johnson	Turley Associates	CSO1 8323	9.67	Object		In the absence of a strategic housing requirement and an up to date assessment of suitable and deliverable urban sites (incorporating appropriate discounting to reflect the recent revisions to PPS3 and non-implementation), it is difficult to see how the Council came to the conclusion that area 3 was not needed alongside the sites put forward as suitable options. The initially conceived requirement of 700 dwellings has been scaled back to 310 dwellings without first providing evidence to confirm this is no longer needed or can be suitably accommodated elsewhere. It is clear from the current SHLAA (March 2010) that there are very few urban sites available within Corfe Mullen and those that are available may have to be discounted in light of the recent revisions to PPS3. Corfe Mullen therefore has limited opportunities to meet local housing needs, particularly for affordable homes, within its boundaries. This is without taking			779

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>into account the strategic need to sustain the local economy, the need to provide for the housing and employment requirements of the wider plan area, or consider Corfe Mullen's location within the wider Poole urban area.</p> <p>Further, there is also no evidence that the three options suggested by the Council can be delivered within the plan period, as all three rely upon agreements with third parties. There continues to be uncertainty surrounding the availability of the school site, third party land for the relocation of the playing fields and allotments, and also the provision of a SANG to address the developments impact on the SPA.</p> <p>Taylor Wimpey questions the analysis undertaken by the Council and appointed consultants that led to a conclusion to discount area 3 in favour of the Council's current options. This is said with particular reference to the Council's previous assessments that concluded this area was the preferred search area for 700 dwellings (Report to East Dorset DC Policy and Resources Committee (Agenda Item 5) 26th October, 2005). Taylor Wimpey is therefore undertaking their own independent assessment of the constraints and opportunities for development on this site and are willing to work in partnership with the Council to deliver suitable and deliverable options for the sustainable growth of Corfe Mullen. Until the strategic housing requirements of the plan area are determined, urban SHLAA potential established, and the uncertainty surrounding the delivery of the Council's options clarified, Taylor Wimpey maintain area 3 should be included as a suitable and deliverable alternative or addition to the Council's current options for growth in this area.</p> <p>Finally, Taylor Wimpey considers it important for the Council to explain the implications to Corfe Mullen residents of the government's New Homes Bonus. This is envisaged to come into effect from April 2011, and depending on the level of development proposed, would potentially fund significant community infrastructure projects. This would be in addition to the s106/s278 obligations secured in accordance with Circular 05/2005 – Planning Obligations. Those</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
							commenting on this document should be made aware of this, if they are not already, so they can make informed decisions on the level of growth Corfe Mullen should accommodate.			
361276	Mr John Goddard		CSO108	9.68	Support		I agree entirely with this.			781
480020	Mr Richard Aylmore		CSO204	9.68	Support		I strongly agree with the assessments made in this paragraph - developments should be discounted in these areas.			781
483385	Mr Clive Fisher		CSO337	9.68	Support		Agree contents of paragraph			781
490527	Corfe Mullen Parish Council	Corfe Mullen Parish Council	CSO969	9.68		General Comment	The Parish Council struggles to understand the reasoning for rejection of some of these areas. Disagree that the eastern area of the recreation ground is less formal and therefore less valuable: although this area has no buildings it houses the majority of the formal pitches.			781
478218	Mr Michael Denmark		CSO2850	9.68	Support		I agree with the conclusion			781
361276	Mr John Goddard		CSO109	9.69	Support					782
480020	Mr Richard Aylmore		CSO205	9.69	Support		I strongly agree with the assessments made in this paragraph - developments should be discounted in these areas.			782
483385	Mr Clive Fisher		CSO338	9.69	Support		Agree			782
490527	Corfe Mullen Parish Council	Corfe Mullen Parish Council	CSO971	9.69		General Comment	The Parish Council struggles to understand the reasoning for rejection of some of these areas. Disagree that the eastern area of the recreation ground is less formal and therefore less valuable: although this area has no buildings it houses the			782

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							majority of the formal pitches.			
478218	Mr Michael Denmark		CSO2 853	9.69	Support		I agree with the conclusion			782
497743	Mrs Susan Jefferies		CSO2 448	9.69	Object		Most of Corfe Mullen is hilly and present building techniques can overcome this. These areas should not be dismissed.			782
361276	Mr John Goddard		CSO1 10	9.70	Support		Seems reasonable.			783
480020	Mr Richard Aylmore		CSO2 09	9.70	Object		I strongly agree that developments should be discounted in this area. I disagree that the eastern field (where some of the proposed development maybe located) is any less formal than the western fields. Where would recreational facilities be relocated to? Surely this will have implications for maintenance costs? i.e. wouldn't costs rise if there were two recreational sites instead of one?	Keep the recreation ground as it is - don't build houses on it!		783
483385	Mr Clive Fisher		CSO3 39	9.70	Support		Agree western half should be retained, not happy with development of eastern half.			783
490527	Corfe Mullen Parish Council	Corfe Mullen Parish Council	CSO9 70	9.70		General Comment	The Parish Council struggles to understand the reasoning for rejection of some of these areas. Disagree that the eastern area of the recreation ground is less formal and therefore less valuable: although this area has no buildings it houses the majority of the formal pitches.			783
478218	Mr Michael Denmark		CSO2 857	9.70	Object		The whole area should be protected and no part of it used for development			783
497743	Mrs Susan Jefferies		CSO2 449	9.70	Support		Conservation area, development would need to be very sensitive.			783
361276	Mr John Goddard		CSO1 11	9.71	Support					784

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
480020	Mr Richard Aylmore		CSO2 12	9.71	Support		I strongly agree with the assessments made in this paragraph - developments should be discounted in these areas.			784
483385	Mr Clive Fisher		CSO3 40	9.71	Support		Agree			784
490527	Corfe Mullen Parish Council	Corfe Mullen Parish Council	CSO9 72	9.71		General Comment	The Parish Council struggles to understand the reasoning for rejection of some of these areas. Disagree that the eastern area of the recreation ground is less formal and therefore less valuable: although this area has no buildings it houses the majority of the formal pitches.			784
478218	Mr Michael Denmark		CSO2 860	9.71	Support		I agree with the conclusion			784
497743	Mrs Susan Jefferies		CSO2 450	9.71	Support		The Recreation Ground is very important to Corfe Mullen, it is also one of the best in Dorset. All of it must be protected. No building anywhere here please.			784
361276	Mr John Goddard		CSO1 12	9.72	Support					785
483385	Mr Clive Fisher		CSO3 42	9.72	Support		Support 1 & 2 but not 3			785
478218	Mr Michael Denmark		CSO2 864	9.72	Object		None of these sites is suitable. Corfe Mullen does not need more housing.			785
497743	Mrs Susan Jefferies		CSO2 451	9.72	Support		Not ideal.			785
497743	Mrs Susan Jefferies		CSO2 452	9.73	Object		1. A least worst option 2. We need the school and there are no plans or money within the next 10 years to rebuild, relocate or redevelop Lockyers School.			786

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
361276	Mr John Goddard		CSO1 13	9.74	Support			Can we create a village green where the Dorset Soldier Pub is; perhaps relocate that to the rec ground?		787
483385	Mr Clive Fisher		CSO3 43	9.74	Support		Agree with paragraph contents			787
478218	Mr Michael Denmark		CSO2 870	9.74	Object		Any additional shops would be unnecessary and detrimental to the whole village. Green space should be additional and not as an alternative. Lockyers Middle School could be redeveloped on its existing site.			787
497743	Mrs Susan Jefferies		CSO2 453	9.74	Object		3. Do not spoil our Recreation Ground, this area is essential, full of football pitches in the winter.			787
497743	Mrs Susan Jefferies		CSO2 454	9.75	Object		Sounds awful			789
361276	Mr John Goddard		CSO1 15	9.77	Support			Fields adjacent to Haywards Lane could be suitable as alternative green/recreational spaces		791
480020	Mr Richard Aylmore		CSO2 21	9.77	Object		The proposed plans reduce the provision of open space - they do not improve it. This is best demonstrated by Core Strategy option CM3 which proposes to build 150 homes on the Eastern part of the Recreation Ground. The reduced provision of open space, coupled with the population increase incurred by these new homes, will increase (instead of reduce) the pressures on local heath lands. In addition, Core Strategy option CM1 proposes to build 80 homes and retail facilities on the school site, which includes its open playing fields. CM2 also reduces the provision of open space by proposing to build houses where several fields are at the moment (including the allotments). In my opinion there is nothing in the plans to			791

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							encourage residents away from the heath lands or increase access to the countryside.			
483385	Mr Clive Fisher		CSO3 44	9.77	Support		Agree need to protect heathland			791
361276	Mr John Goddard		CSO1 16	9.78	Object		This appears to me as social engineering.			792
480020	Mr Richard Aylmore		CSO2 18	9.78	Object		The plans stress that this development should alleviate the need for affordable housing in the area. If the need for affordable housing is so great, shouldn't more than 40% of the proposed housing be affordable? As Corfe Mullen is one of the least deprived areas in the country does it need affordable housing? Also, the recently built housing developments in Poole and Bournemouth offer significant provision in terms of affordable housing. If the affordable housing is built who will own it? The council? Private landlords? The housing developers? In addition, who would be prioritised for these houses? Would Corfe Mullen residents have the first option to buy one of these affordable homes? How would these affordable homes affect local property prices? Will existing residents find that their homes are devalued?			792
478218	Mr Michael Denmark		CSO2 873	9.78	Object		"Affordable" housing will not enhance the existing village.			792
497743	Mrs Susan Jefferies		CSO2 455	9.78	Support		Very important indeed, we do not have enough recreation space for the existing residents, let alone more.			792
480020	Mr Richard Aylmore		CSO2 19	9.79	Object		If the Green Belt is built upon, as proposed by these plans, a dangerous precedent is set and future developments could encroach on the Green Belt or even the conservation area. Green Belt boundaries should not be revised to meet the requirements of a building plan – what is the point in having a Green Belt if it can be so easily by-passed?			793

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
483385	Mr Clive Fisher		CSO3 45	9.79	Support		Agree need for mixed value and affordable housing.			793
478218	Mr Michael Denmark		CSO2 875	9.79	Object		The Green belt should not be reduced.			793
361276	Mr John Goddard		CSO1 17	9.81	Support					795
480020	Mr Richard Aylmore		CSO2 42	9.81	Object		<p>Creating a better heart to the village is a good idea. These plans however propose to situate the heart of the village away from its natural centre by having it on the fringes/outskirts of the village. In paragraph 9.14 it states this as the reason why some recreational facilities need to be relocated to the south of the village given that the current recreational facilities (i.e. the recreation ground) are situated where (according to the proposal) in an area which is 'considered inaccessible by foot' for many village residents. If the heart of the village is situated where proposed then the majority of village residents would need to use their cars to reach it, thus increasing the amount of traffic in the Corfe Mullen.</p> <p>If the heart of the village is situated where proposed, the current heart of the village (i.e. the Village Hall and the Co-op) could be put at risk as the number of residents visiting this area could be dramatically reduced.</p> <p>Therefore, would it not be better to develop/improve the area around the Village Hall, as this is the current natural centre of the village, instead of relocating the heart and centre of the village to the fringes?</p> <p>It is true that Corfe Mullen has limited retail facilities; however there is scope for the existing retail facilities to perhaps be extended and/or improved.</p> <p>In paragraph 9.5 it has been confirmed that Corfe Mullen has a very high rate of car ownership - this means that retail facilities in nearby Broadstone, Wimborne, Poole and Bournemouth etc. are accessible as and when necessary.</p> <p>The Core Strategy puts forward plans to build</p>			795

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>additional retail units (on the scale of the new Waitrose store in Wimborne). Such a retail development would place the existing retailers at significant risk (due to the increased competition created) and may result in them moving out of the village. It may especially threaten the Corfe Mullen Post Office which is located near to the proposed site of the new retail development - local residents have however expressed the desire to keep the Post Office.</p> <p>In addition, such a large retail development would completely change the character of Corfe Mullen (as the Waitrose store has done in Wimborne), increase traffic and congestion in and around the village and attract significant anti-social behaviour as seen behind the Co-op in the past.</p> <p>With retail facilities easily accessible both in and around Corfe Mullen it has to be questioned whether additional retail facilities are required in the village. The existing retail and community facilities in Corfe Mullen are modest but adequate given that significant facilities are readily accessible and available in surrounding areas.</p> <p>As stated in 9.11, the northern group of facilities (i.e. the Co-op and Village Hall) form the main centre of the village - this would appear to be the most logical area in which to create a better heart to the village, and not where the proposal suggests.</p> <p>Corfe Mullen currently has two food supermarkets (the two Co-op stores) with other food supermarkets and comparison good stores close by. For example, food supermarkets such as Tesco at Fleetsbridge and Towerpark, Asda at Canford Heath and Poole and Waitrose in Wimborne are all close at-hand. Poole and Bournemouth, along with the many retail parks that surround them, provide an abundance of comparison goods floor space. With retail facilities easily accessible both in and around Corfe Mullen, it has to be questioned whether additional retail facilities are really required in the village.</p> <p>It has been stated that the north of the village around the Recreation Ground and Lockyer's School incorporates the majority of the village's facilities, facilities which 'are considered inaccessible by foot</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 require car transport'. The same then would be true of the heart of the village if it was located in this area (as the proposal suggests). In addition, the proposal seeks to effectively reduce facility provision in the village by reducing the open space available to local residents - i.e. building houses on the Recreation Ground. Furthermore, the increase in population caused by the proposed housing development will place a strain on these said facilities. Also, with the original School building not currently listed, can the Council guarantee that it will be preserved if the rest of the school is relocated? (As per the wishes of the community outlined in paragraph 9.43). In addition, it states here that 'this option does not involve Green Belt land unless the school would need to be relocated'. According to the map, the Lockyer's site is set to become the Village Centre which suggests that the school would need to be relocated. Therefore, Green Belt land would indeed need to be involved. Green Belt land should be preserved and not built upon. Corfe Mullen residents have already voiced objections to the building of more houses in the village (as per the Regional Spatial Strategy). The Council should respect these wishes and abandon the Core Strategy plans for Corfe Mullen.</p>			
478218	Mr Michael Denmark		CSO2 876	9.81	Object		<p>These proposals are not necessary if no additional housing is built. Additional retail facilities would be a disaster for the existing village due to increased traffic and noise. Lockyers school site is not the "natural centre" of the existing village and to make it so would have a detrimental effect on the facilities existing very effectively elsewhere on the village.</p>			795
497743	Mrs Susan Jefferies		CSO2 456	9.81	Support		<p>We need a mix of housing and residents.</p>			795
361276	Mr John Goddard		CSO1 18	Option CM 1	Support		<p>Support but I would query the need for 80 homes.</p>			796

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
480020	Mr Richard Aylmore		CSO2 41	Option CM 1	Object		<p>Creating a better heart to the village is a good idea. These plans however propose to situate the heart of the village away from its natural centre by having it on the fringes/outskirts of the village. In paragraph 9.14 it states this as the reason why some recreational facilities need to be relocated to the south of the village given that the current recreational facilities (i.e. the recreation ground) are situated where (according to the proposal) in an area which is 'considered inaccessible by foot' for many village residents. If the heart of the village is situated where proposed then the majority of village residents would need to use their cars to reach it, thus increasing the amount of traffic in the Corfe Mullen.</p> <p>If the heart of the village is situated where proposed, the current heart of the village (i.e. the Village Hall and the Co-op) could be put at risk as the number of residents visiting this area could be dramatically reduced.</p> <p>Therefore, would it not be better to develop/improve the area around the Village Hall, as this is the current natural centre of the village, instead of relocating the heart and centre of the village to the fringes? It is true that Corfe Mullen has limited retail facilities; however there is scope for the existing retail facilities to perhaps be extended and/or improved.</p> <p>In paragraph 9.5 it has been confirmed that Corfe Mullen has a very high rate of car ownership - this means that retail facilities in nearby Broadstone, Wimborne, Poole and Bournemouth etc. are accessible as and when necessary.</p> <p>The Core Strategy puts forward plans to build additional retail units (on the scale of the new Waitrose store in Wimborne). Such a retail development would place the existing retailers at significant risk (due to the increased competition created) and may result in them moving out of the village. It may especially threaten the Corfe Mullen Post Office which is located near to the proposed site of the new retail development - local residents have however expressed the desire to keep the Post Office.</p> <p>In addition, such a large retail development would completely change the character of Corfe Mullen (as</p>			796

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact 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 Waitrose store has done in Wimborne), increase traffic and congestion in and around the village and attract significant anti-social behaviour as seen behind the Co-op in the past.</p> <p>With retail facilities easily accessible both in and around Corfe Mullen it has to be questioned whether additional retail facilities are required in the village. The existing retail and community facilities in Corfe Mullen are modest but adequate given that significant facilities are readily accessible and available in surrounding areas.</p> <p>As stated in 9.11, the northern group of facilities (i.e. the Co-op and Village Hall) form the main centre of the village - this would appear to be the most logical area in which to create a better heart to the village, and not where the proposal suggests.</p> <p>Corfe Mullen currently has two food supermarkets (the two Co-op stores) with other food supermarkets and comparison good stores close by. For example, food supermarkets such as Tesco at Fleetsbridge and Towerpark, Asda at Canford Heath and Poole and Waitrose in Wimborne are all close at-hand. Poole and Bournemouth, along with the many retail parks that surround them, provide an abundance of comparison goods floor space. With retail facilities easily accessible both in and around Corfe Mullen, it has to be questioned whether additional retail facilities are really required in the village.</p> <p>It has been stated that the north of the village around the Recreation Ground and Lockyer's School incorporates the majority of the village's facilities, facilities which 'are considered inaccessible by foot and require car transport'. The same then would be true of the heart of the village if it was located in this area (as the proposal suggests).</p> <p>In addition, the proposal seeks to effectively reduce facility provision in the village by reducing the open space available to local residents - i.e. building houses on the Recreation Ground. Furthermore, the increase in population caused by the proposed housing development will place a strain on these said facilities.</p> <p>Also, with the original School building not currently listed, can the Council guarantee that it will be</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>preserved if the rest of the school is relocated? (As per the wishes of the community outlined in paragraph 9.43). In addition, it states here that 'this option does not involve Green Belt land unless the school would need to be relocated'. According to the map, the Lockyer's site is set to become the Village Centre which suggests that the school would need to be relocated. Therefore, Green Belt land would indeed need to be involved. Green Belt land should be preserved and not built upon.</p> <p>Corfe Mullen residents have already voiced objections to the building of more houses in the village (as per the Regional Spatial Strategy). The Council should respect these wishes and abandon the Core Strategy plans for Corfe Mullen.</p>			
483385	Mr Clive Fisher		CSO3 46	Option CM 1	Object		Have put object as I feel school should stay where it is and land opposite can be used for housing.			796
490527	Corfe Mullen Parish Council	Corfe Mullen Parish Council	CSO9 73	Option CM 1		General Comment	<p>This land is not in the green belt, is at the top of the plateau, and therefore accessible to facilities. Theoretically it may therefore be suitable for development. However, the Parish Council has met with the DCC Director for Children's Services and the DCC Cabinet Member for Children's Services who have both confirmed that there will be no change in the organisation of the Corfe Mullen pyramid or a rebuild of Lockyers School for at least ten years. Some of the reasons given for this include:</p> <p>a) Forthcoming legislation is likely to mean that the education authority will lose the right both to reorganise and close schools;</p> <p>b) The normal reasons for reorganisation are not present in the Corfe Mullen pyramid (No pressure of falling numbers, no question mark over standards);</p> <p>c) Prohibitive cost of reorganisation;</p> <p>d) Logistical problems in moving to 2-tier and its knock on effect on surrounding areas;</p> <p>e) No funding for replacement building.</p> <p>In the unlikely event of the site becoming available, it would be essential to relocate the Youth Centre, or provide for this on the site. The Director of Children's Services confirmed that the current Youth Centre</p>			796

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

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 is of poor quality and bigger and better facilities would be a high priority. It is agreed that the Victorian school building should be retained as a village landmark. Disagree strongly that a supermarket would be appropriate here. The other facilities such as the council offices, library, car park, recycling facility and village hall should remain where they are.			
360714	Mrs Carol Morgan		CSO2 012	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
361055	Mr David Oakley		CSO1 005	Option CM 1	Support					796
361099	Mrs Lynette Payne		CSO1 251	Option CM 1	Support		A good number of these options, especially in Wimborne and Parley, are on the edges of the urban areas. Building in these locations changes the whole ethos of the area. When you leave Wimborne you see fields, trees and rivers dotted with thatched cottages. Even along Leigh Road, there is a definite rural feel, with true separation between Wimborne and Colehill. Developing along here, or Cranborne Road will dramatically change the area, for the worst. This in turn reduces people's quality of life, as we see our area creep closer to urbanisation, field by field. Why can't some of the brownfield sites be used instead?			796
361111	Mr Raymond Brown		CSO2 069	Option CM 1	Object		CM1 Lockyers School Site - I would support homes but not new retail and community facilities. Already have village halls / library / supermarket on existing site - why duplicate and split the village facilities?			796
361170	Mr T Harvey		CSO2 840	Option CM 1	Support					796
478218	Mr Michael Denmark		CSO2 881	Option CM 1	Object		Additional housing is unnecessary and detrimental			796
484088	Mr		CSO2	Option		No Opinion				796

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

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 Price		504	CM 1						
490852	Mr C J TIMMS		CSO1 063	Option CM 1	Object		Building 310 (approx.) homes in this area will completely change the character of this old part of the village, changing forever the relative tranquillity enjoyed by the residents. In my opinion housing on this scale should be carried out to the west of the village in the Naked Cross area, where there will be much less impact.			796
491311	Mr Kevin Gilling		CSO2 706	Option CM 1	Support					796
491317	M S WALKER		CSO1 207	Option CM 1	Object		To lose the recreational facilities which are well placed and extremely well used would impact significantly on the community 'quality of life' and 'well being'. Putting buildings in the area CM3 would have a negative impact on the Stour Valley. These facilities and sports fields are easily accessible to all locals through the public footpaths and roads. As Corfe Mullen has been extensively developed already to one to the largest villages in the UK, I feel that it has had more than its fair share of development over the past years.			796
491401	Mr S Ost		CSO1 269	Option CM 1	Object		The local roads, schools, hospitals would be unable to cope with extra movements of traffic and people coming into the area.			796
495562	Mr MJ Banting		CSO1 508	Option CM 1	Object					796
495625	Mr Michael McMath		CSO1 535	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
495971	Mr T A Reith		CSO2 191	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
496188	Mr RE		CSO1 614	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Vogel									
496479	Charlotte Dixon		CSO1 701	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
496564	Mr JH Lockwood		CSO1 748	Option CM 1	Support		How are you going to ensure these so called affordable homes aren't snapped up by outsiders buying second homes.			796
496612	Mr and Mrs JP Lovell		CSO1 798	Option CM 1	Support					796
496958	Mrs J Beech		CSO1 928	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
497026	Doreen Smith		CSO1 984	Option CM 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.			796
497060	Mrs Mary Tuffrey		CSO2 055	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
497089	Mr Frank A Soan		CSO2 101	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
497184	Mr Hilling		CSO2 189	Option CM 1	Support					796
497343	Sharon Sutcliffe		CSO2 272	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
497743	Mrs Susan Jefferies		CSO2 457	Option CM 1	Object		There are no plans or funds to redevelop the school building or relocate the school, or make it redundant in the next 10 years. This is not an option. We also need to remember that our Youth Club shares this site and the Youth Club is very important, what ever happens to the school the Young people will still be here.			796

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
497773	Mr R Johnstone		CSO2 475	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
498044	Mrs Carolyne Banks		CSO2 654	Option CM 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.			796
498047	Mr CD Bradford		CSO2 647	Option CM 1	Support					796
498062	Mr Nick Crawford		CSO2 712	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
498084	Mr P Hartley		CSO2 747	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
498125	Mr and Mrs P Dashwood		CSO2 788	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
498169	Mrs D WEAVER		CSO2 894	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
498184	Mrs Angela Barker		CSO2 921	Option CM 1	Object		Not every area needs affordable housing - if a lot of people are retired and/or own their own homes, does it matter?			796
359908	Mr F.D.A Revill		CSO6 236	Option CM 1	Support		Relocate school to west end of CM2. Should be able to provide public use of school sport facilities and school could use recreation ground pitches.			796
359927	Mrs Ann Bissex		CSO6 354	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
360037	Mr Dave Barnes		CSO4 044	Option CM 1	Object	General Comment	What alternative locations, if any, have been considered? There is mention of heathland development.....where would this be?			796
360685	Mr M.P Hose		CSO4 630	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
361041	Mr & Mrs C Hampton		CSO4 016	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
361089	Mr David Nash	Director Urban DNA	CSO3 238	Option CM 1	Support		<p>This is an opportunity to improve the education facilities within the village through building a much needed new school on what is currently Green Belt (GB) land at the 'Area 2' site and meet other needs including housing, small scale business units and community facilities on the 'Area 3' site. This is an option that has much less environmental impact and has the chance of being far better integrated into the village (physically and socially) than the earlier search options (Pardy's Hill / Waterloo Valley). The 'Area 1' land should not be used for additional housing as that would be an unreasonable extension of development into the GB, would detract from the setting of the village viewed from the Stour Valley and would reduce the informal recreational and leisure facilities of the village. Area 1 should only be used as part of comprehensive proposals associated with the built development of Areas 2-3 to ensure the new school has sufficient playing fields and/or as a site for the relocation/enhancement of the existing allotments.</p>	<p>Any such development proposals should: Be subject to a comprehensive masterplan with design parameters, economics and phasing clarified Involve the community at every stage building on the Parish Plan 2006 Provide high quality mixed use development (including a new junior/middle school (form of entries to be clarified by Dorset CC), general housing (mixed by type and tenure to meet local requirements, sheltered housing, live-work, starter/nursery business units and re-use of the historic school building for community purposes Adopt an integrated low carbon design approach (proposals to achieve appropriate Code for Sustainable Homes/BREEAM accreditation) using form and orientation, then building fabric efficiency and finally renewable technology</p>		796

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
								<p>measures (alternatively funding communal energy measures for the school and community buildings as local 'allowable solutions')</p> <p>Provide a suitable quantum and quality of open spaces within the development</p> <p>Optimise biodiversity through retention and enhancement of the existing school nature area, retain the hedgerow and 'country lane' character of the Violet Farm section of Wimborne Road and provision of native tree and landscaping proposals</p> <p>Provide east-west and north-south pedestrian and cycle routes through Area 3 to integrate the site with adjoining routes</p> <p>Manage risk of flooding through Sustainable Urban Drainage measures</p> <p>Secure a proportion of the new houses to be built by local developers / housebuilders (qualifying terms to be defined) to reduce infill pressure elsewhere within the village</p>		
361106	Mr and Mrs Robin and Janet WALL		CSO3 670	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
361210	Mr John East		CSO5 112	Option CM 1	Support		This is fine providing facilities and access are properly catered for. This must include improved access to the A31 which is already a nightmare for local residents			796

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
361222	Ms Sarah WASTEL		CSO6 324	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
361246	Mr Andy Edwards		CSO4 133	Option CM 1	Support	General Comment	I strongly believe that the Waterloo Valley in Corfe Mullen (including Broadmoor Road and Pardy's Hill) should be protected from new housing due to the fact that is beautiful, gives much pleasure to cyclists, drivers, runners, horses. This is why it is an important part of high quality Green Belt land to protect. Any building towards the top of Pardy's Hill (Sleigh Lane / Haywards Lane) will lead to further future encroachment down the beautiful Waterloo Valley. The Rec is a wonderful community asset and the space is fully utilised at the weekend with so many sports matches all over the land. It seems sensible to build on CM 2 and CM 1 if schooling needs can be met in another way (again without infringing on the Waterloo Valley).			796
361278	Mrs Nicola Hoar		CSO3 743	Option CM 1	Object		A31 should be increased to dual carriageway as far west as Merley before any of this can happen. Even at non-rush hour times, this road cannot cope. I hope the transport improvements include subsidised bus fares and regular services. Otherwise people will persist in using cars even if there is gridlock.			796
361295	Mr & Mrs Arnold		CSO6 718	Option CM 1	Object		Lockyers School is a picturesque building and if closed would need a replacement to be built on another site. Probably an ugly modern unit that would also need to accommodate the many additional children that would arise from the additional housing proposed for any or all the sites.			796
361303	Lt.Col R.A Peake		CSO3 321	Option CM 1	Support		Central to the village, with good transport links, would make an improved 'village centre'. If a two tier system of education for the county (as agreed by Poole) becomes effective, then Rushcombe 1st School is the most viable area for extension to cover extra capacity needed. If only the school playing fields were used then a road bridge and dedicated footpath along CM 2 proposal would give safe, direct access to Rec.			796

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
361318	Mr F.L Marsh		CSO6 232	Option CM 1	Support		The bus service would need to be improved e.g. by restoration of a direct bus to the Bournemouth area from Corfe Mullen.			796
477822	Ms Susan Rayment		CSO6 766	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
491232	Mr Keith Barnett		CSO6 971	Option CM 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.			796
498268	Mr and Mrs R Cullen		CSO3 002	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
498271	Ms Mandy Cheeseman		CSO3 045	Option CM 1	Object		Corfe Mullen is a large enough village at present. Traffic in the mornings is horrendously busy without adding to it. I walk up to the Rec often and it's always being used and would be a real shame to lose it to houses in such a picturesque spot. Also, the main reason I moved to Stour View Gardens!			796
498280	Mr and Mrs G Norris		CSO3 041	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
498335	Mr and Mrs Lester		CSO3 201	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
498336	Mr & Mrs A Basterfield		CSO3 072	Option CM 1	Object		We believe it is important to keep Green Belt areas and retain all of the recreation land.			796
498421	Mr Jeremy Hett		CSO3 179	Option CM 1	Support		The future of the school is obviously a key issue.			796
498485	Mrs E Seward		CSO3 251	Option CM 1	Support		My preferred option. Build new school on existing school playing field. New houses on current school site from school car park to corner of Blandford/Wimborne road. Move allotments to other side on corner Lockyers/Wimborne road-edge of new school, all topsoil to make good allotment ground. New houses off Violet Farm Close- allotment current site, as per CM2. Leave playing field in recreation ground CM3.			796
498495	Mr John Williams		CSO3 270	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
498711	Mr Tam Chant		CSO3 382	Option CM 1	Object					796
498996	Mrs M E Clarke		CSO3 449	Option CM 1	Support					796
499231	Mrs A Lathbury		CSO3 519	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
499236	Mr J Pipe		CSO3 534	Option CM 1	Object					796
499245	Mr and Mrs N Butler		CSO3 574	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
499261	Mrs		CSO3	Option	Support		I have no objection to the limited use of green belt			796

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Norma Jackson		607	CM 1			land for development, as long as there are no water/flooding issues, and there are enough green spaces in any development for children's play areas. There does not seem to be a village centre in Corfe Mullen anyway, so a new development should be welcomed as an opportunity to provide this. Can't see any detriment to the Co-op or Library - there are still enough people living around them.			
499290	Mrs Lisa TURNBULL		CSO3 641	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
499384	Mr A I ROSE		CSO3 714	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
499858	Mr & Mrs M Palmer		CSO3 969	Option CM 1	Object					796
499873	Mr Graham Holt		CSO3 983	Option CM 1	Support					796
500060	Mr Stuart Piddock		CSO4 072	Option CM 1	Object					796
500070	Mr J W ELCOCK		CSO4 104	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
500113	Mr and Mrs T J Gurr		CSO5 732	Option CM 1	Object		Retail and community facilities are already well catered for. The prospect of yet another Tesco really doesn't bear thinking about.			796
500147	Mrs R Edwards		CSO4 155	Option CM 1	Support		The Waterloo Valley, including the fields around Pardy's Hill, Broadmoor Road and Hayward's Lane, is a beautiful area, giving Corfe Mullen its unique 'rural' feel. It is constantly in use by walkers, cyclists and horse riders. Any building on the fields surrounding this area would completely destroy the natural			796

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							beauty, enjoyed by so many. If any new houses have to be built, keep them close to the areas that are already built up - as this will not change the character of the village. Also any building on the hills adjacent to Pardy's Hill will greatly increase the risk of flooding to houses below.			
500222	Mr S Hartley		CSO4 183	Option CM 1	Object					796
500350	Mr P H Bartlett		CSO4 216	Option CM 1	Support					796
500361	Mr and Miss N and A Middleton and Turner		CSO4 254	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
500427	Mrs D J LYONS		CSO4 307	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
500558	Mr A Baker		CSO4 348	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
500697	Mr Thomas SMITH		CSO4 476	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
500706	Mr and Mrs R Jeans		CSO4 499	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
500720	Mrs VALLIER		CSO4 519	Option CM 1	Support					796
500748	Mrs Lauren Matthews		CSO4 583	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

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	Mr J Hayward		CSO4 673	Option CM 1	Support					796
500814	B Fagan		CSO4 705	Option CM 1	Support					796
500836	Mrs Sylvia Hines		CSO4 715	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
500903	Mr and Mrs S and R Harris		CSO4 765	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
501012	Mrs Louise Arnold		CSO4 834	Option CM 1	Support					796
501015	Mr & Mrs W McMillan		CSO4 857	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
501018	Mr Robert P Hand		CSO4 833	Option CM 1	Support		<p>Re: Corfe Mullen Options. Development of Recreation Ground / Lockyers School Site. Could the reason for any possible development on the eastern side of Corfe Mullen Recreation Ground be more to do with its prestigious location, rather than the need for housing and / or a new school? (i.e. the view). No doubt the more expensive properties would be designed and built with the view in mind! Why should this area / view be taken away from the many and given to the few. No part of Corfe Mullen Recreation Ground should be built upon EVER! It was provided as an open space to be used and enjoyed by local people, and should remain as such. Indeed, it has already been used for this purpose by generations, and as such would quite rightly meet all the required criteria for any future application for 'Town Green' status! Surely the most logical solution to building any new properties in the Lockyers School area of Corfe Mullen, would be to allow building on the area</p>			796

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>between 'Violet Close Farm' and the 'Allotments'. Development could also be permitted on the existing school playing field! Lockyers School could be redeveloped on its existing site, with the facilities at the Recreation Ground being used for school sporting / games activities. The recreation ground could be accessed from the school via a purpose built crossing and walkway!</p> <p>This option would have the benefits of:</p> <p>1: Not having to relocate Lockyers School or the Allotments to elsewhere in the village.</p> <p>2: The recreation ground would not need to be built on.</p> <p>3: That any new housing would be adjacent to already residential areas.</p>			
501056	Dr and Mrs M S Taylor		CSO4 899	Option CM 1	Object		We feel with so much Government emphasis on well being, that the unique recreation ground, which gives enormous pleasure to the residents of Corfe Mullen could be broken up, and even though there is suggestion of re siting, the recreation ground is irreplaceable, and we feel it would be an unwise decision to build on this wonderful site.			796
501079	Mrs Linda M O'Connell		CSO4 927	Option CM 1	Support		Previously expressed concerns are still relevant and will this small area be enough to satisfy quota. The road (Wimborne Road) is too narrow to accommodate a huge amount of traffic. Once one option has been used do you then intend to go for the other two and will it eventually end up by developing past the disused railway line?!			796
501107	Mr & Mrs E C Lacey		CSO4 973	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
501118	Mr Ron Cook		CSO4 997	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
501331	Mr Michael Henry		CSO5 182	Option CM 1	Support					796

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

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		CSO5 219	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
501364	Mr M Devetta		CSO5 844	Option CM 1	Support					796
501485	Mrs J Jackson		CSO5 287	Option CM 1	Object		You need to take into account impact or roads, transport, shops, doctor's surgery, schools, when building new homes, not just roads alone.			796
501488	Mr Chris Lamb		CSO5 318	Option CM 1	Support					796
501502	Mr Michael WAREHAM		CSO5 362	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
501503	Mr N F Stripp		CSO5 355	Option CM 1	Object					796
501508	Mr Martin Davies		CSO5 392	Option CM 1	Object		We totally object to any buildings in CM1, CM2 and CM3. We moved to Corfe Mullen in 1979 to live in this lovely rural area with views of the fields behind our property.			796
501513	Mr O E Beverley		CSO5 399	Option CM 1	Support					796
501520	Mrs Z Merrifield		CSO5 424	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
501523	Rita Gilbert		CSO5 439	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
359598	Mr A Ketchley		CSO7 993	Option CM 1	Support	General Comment	Unfortunately whatever is finally decided on the following well known saying will occur: 'You can please some of the people all the time,			796

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							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			
359873	Mrs M Hughes		CSO8 610	Option CM 1	Support		A31 Canford Bottom needs to be bridged if increased traffic from new housing takes place; it just can't take any further loading (or a dual carriage way up to A350 from Ferndown).			796
359889	Mr and Mrs P Clark		CSO8 476	Option CM 1	Support		With any developments we would need to be assured that infrastructure improvements are in place BEFORE any development is consented to. This is particularly important with regard to public transport provisions. It is also important that feedback is forthcoming as an acknowledgement of our response to this survey.			796
359977	Miss M.G. Earp		CSO8 044	Option CM 1	Object					796
360145	Mr Nigel WARREN		CSO8 200	Option CM 1	Support					796
361015	Mr and Mrs M.S and C.E Hack		CSO8 477	Option CM 1	Support					796
361113	Mr Alan Meade		CSO7 180	Option CM 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.			796
361123	Mr Iain STEVEN		CSO8 219	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	SON									
361178	Mr and Mrs Norman and Sarah Wall		CSO8 755	Option CM 1	Object		CM1 depends on the LEA and the Diocese of Salisbury, and we cannot see the education system being changed in the near future. Also we don't need another supermarket or "village centre".			796
361206	Mr Iain Robinson		CSO9 028	Option CM 1	Object		As housing has become unaffordable for many young people, making developers contribute to transport improvements will just mean the costs passed on and make the new homes even more out of their price bracket. Public transport fails at the moment to connect where people live to where they work, after all people tend to go to work more often than they go shopping and thus cars are needed for employment and having their own transport makes buses irrelevant and less in touch with the 24/7 and shift work employment patterns.			796
501542	Mr and Mrs STRACHAN		CSO5 516	Option CM 1		No Opinion	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; Len ham, Kent; Ditton, Nr Maidstone, Kent. My ref: 10 years as a Parish Councillor in Ditton, Kent.			796
501547	Mrs Helen Lessnoff		CSO5 569	Option CM 1	Object					796
501560	Mr Christopher Clarke		CSO5 571	Option CM 1	Support					796
501589	Mrs P Parkes		CSO5 651	Option CM 1	Object		I object to the homes on Lockyers school site if the new school is built on a Green Field site. Future generations will not thank us for losing these open spaces.			796

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
501596	Mr and Mrs B & K O'Loughlin		CSO5 704	Option CM 1	Object					796
501616	Mr R J Joyce		CSO5 753	Option CM 1	Support		No building in Waterloo Valley.			796
501626	Mrs J A Russell		CSO5 747	Option CM 1	Object		I strongly object to building houses or a school on east of Corfe Mullen recreation ground. This is a necessary amenity which is used greatly by a large majority of the village. Sports activities, dog walking, children's leisure time, is a necessity for the wellbeing of all, mentally and physically. The recreation space is a place to go to escape the hustle and bustle of everyday life and to even consider building on this beautiful landscape is complete madness! We do not have enough green space at the moment and to destroy the recreation ground would be insane !! Corfe Mullen could not cope with building 150 new homes. The infrastructure - more traffic, not enough doctors, dentists or schools would be impossible for every day life to run smoothly. Although I do not agree with any building of new housing in Corfe Mullen, Option CM2 (Violet Farm) is the lesser of 3 evils !! We do not need another supermarket in the village, it is already one of the largest villages in Europe. We do not want it turned into a town ! The Co-op is adequate for all our needs - Thank You !!			796
501694	Mr R Bryan		CSO5 788	Option CM 1	Support					796
501699	B THOMAS		CSO5 815	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
501720	Dr and Mrs D Harlow		CSO5 904	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
501761	Mr D Curtis		CSO6 004	Option CM 1	Support		CM 1 - Relocation and development of school - a great benefit			796
501788	Mr Evan Waterman		CSO6 054	Option CM 1	Support		As you will see from my comments overleaf, I favour 2 options for Corfe Mullen, and am against one. However, I need to further clarify: Option CM 1 - This would depend on the education system adopted, and as yet no decision has been made. Option CM 2 - Care would need to be taken to ensure the density of dwellings was not too great. Option CM 3 - Corfe Mullen needs its green space.			796
501794	Mr and Mrs G Hattemore		CSO6 062	Option CM 1	Object					796
501813	Peter Holdaway		CSO6 103	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
501830	Mrs Yvonne Legg		CSO6 151	Option CM 1	Support		If we must have more homes, then a new school is the 1st priority. The children must come first before big fat profit making developments. The site of the old school could then be used. Not much point in 80 more homes if the school can not cope with 80 more pupils anyway.			796
501867	Mrs I M Marks		CSO6 165	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
501873	Mr and Mrs H Lilley		CSO6 215	Option CM 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			796

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

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 problems and cannot be supported.			
501876	Mr J Long		CSO6 191	Option CM 1	Support					796
501880	Mr and Mrs Anderson		CSO6 185	Option CM 1	Object		I can't see how you imagine people will be able to buy all these properties that are proposed when they are unable to get mortgages, losing their jobs, all the cutbacks that if not at the present time, will be felt in the near future. Also there is not the infrastructure to accommodate hundreds more families and the cars that go with them. The roads around and through the centre of Corfe Mullen are already some of the busiest and dangerous at certain times of the day. I could go on, but these are a few points to seriously think of, as it seems you are set on keeping already very greedy builders in work!			796
501881	B W Deverill		CSO6 218	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
501900	Miss Theresa Gale		CSO6 243	Option CM 1	Object					796
501940	Mr M J Godfrey		CSO6 338	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
502022	Mr HWR Stevens		CSO6 377	Option CM 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.			796
502029	Mr J MacArthur		CSO6 417	Option CM 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			796

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							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.			
502032	Mr and Mrs Pitt		CSO6 434	Option CM 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 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.			796
502059	Mr R Sedona		CSO6 491	Option CM 1	Object		Development should be restricted to brownfield sites. Greenbelt must be preserved. Any development impacting on environmentally important areas such as Wimborne water meadows and River Allen must be avoided at all costs. Affordable homes should not be built on greenfield sites which have high environmental value to the community. These heritage sites must be preserved.			796
502076	Kay Stead		CSO6 541	Option CM 1	Object					796
502099	Mrs Carolyn Lourens		CSO6 577	Option CM 1	Object		Increased housing means increased population. The current infrastructure is already stretched to its limits, traffic and facilities will only suffer. There is insufficient parking already for the co-op store and nearby church. How will this help our fragile environment.			796
502114	Mr P Foster		CSO6 629	Option CM 1	Support					796
502136	Mr and Mrs WA Forster		CSO6 670	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

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		CSO6 679	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
502312	Mrs Sally Brierley		CSO6 794	Option CM 1	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 first place?			796
502317	Cllr Peter Lucas		CSO6 821	Option CM 1	Object					796
502326	Mr and Mrs T Bennett		CSO6 863	Option CM 1	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.			796
502333	Mr B M Andrews		CSO6 866	Option CM 1	Object		Make parents walk their children to school. Stop parents 4x4s, etc. Spend more money on our area. Council tax far too high and what benefits do we receive from the Parish Council?			796
502345	Mr and Mrs Ray and Irene Coulson		CSO6 938	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
502347	Mrs Sarah Cobb		CSO7 031	Option CM 1	Object					796
502381	Mr Cyril Josey		CSO7 043	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
502387	Mr George Kilpatrick		CSO7 025	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
502441	Mrs Ingrid Wells		CSO7 157	Option CM 1	Support					796
502468	Mr Robert Lambert		CSO7 377	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
502568	Mrs Sarah Morgan		CSO7 272	Option CM 1	Object					796
502569	Mr & Ms M & L Skinner & Jeffries		CSO7 300	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
502570	Mr Samways		CSO7 328	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
502579	Mr & Mrs R L Thorne		CSO7 357	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
502595	Mr Colin House		CSO7 413	Option CM 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.			796
502596	Mr A C Hayter		CSO7 399	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
502610	Mr John Jackson		CSO7 454	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
502612	Hugh and Joy Dickson		CSO7 443	Option CM 1	Support					796

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
502673	Mrs A Powell		CSO7 551	Option CM 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 the building works that are already going on.			796
502701	Mrs M Williams		CSO7 587	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
502708	Ms Julia Owen		CSO7 632	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
502745	Mrs J.M Kenny		CSO7 678	Option CM 1	Support					796
502913	Mr & Mrs D Whitmarsh		CSO7 884	Option CM 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			796
502935	Mr Roger Parker		CSO7 805	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
503024	Ms Valerie Measey		CSO8 867	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
503085	Mr P.A. Scott		CSO7 966	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
503156	Mr and Mrs R Blunderfield		CSO8 021	Option CM 1	Object					796
503171	Sally Cooke		CSO8 069	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
503183	Ms		CSO8	Option		No Opinion				796

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

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 Chissell		141	CM 1						
359920	Mr S Parker		CSO9 535	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
359954	Mr Alan FLINT		CSO1 0005	Option CM 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. 			796
360029	Mr David Lanigan		CSO1 0278	Option CM 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.</p> <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>			796

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact 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 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 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</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
							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		CSO9 818	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
360111	Mr K VIVIAN		CSO9 594	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
361037	Mr P STRATFORD		CSO1 1257	Option CM 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.			796
361105	Mr John Gooch	Colehill Parish Council	CSO9 906	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
498775	Mrs		CSO1	Option	Support					796

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	P L Buckler		0748	CM 1						
499748	Ms Soozie Cooper		CSO9 735	Option CM 1	Support					796
503233	Mrs F Parkes		CSO8 223	Option CM 1	Object		<p>1. Further housing should only be considered where a proven need is indicated for affordable housing for Corfe Mullen residents (not incomers). Affordable housing should be provided in small local communities where needed by the local inhabitants.</p> <p>2. Restrictions should be placed on private developers so that they provide equal numbers of affordable and other housing.</p> <p>3. The Parish and District Councils should finance council housing, but not for resale, and for fixed terms reviewed at set intervals.</p> <p>4. Any proposals regarding Lockyers School cannot be made until the whole question of schools strategy has been worked out for the whole county; these proposals should not be included in the current Core Strategy.</p> <p>5. Moving the allotments is not a viable concept; its present location is reasonably accessible, there is a considerable waiting list, it has taken many years to bring the ground to a good state and there is not another suitable area within the village.</p> <p>6. Corfe Mullen already has adequate retail and community facilities and there is no demand for a distinctive centre to the village.</p> <p>7. "Could provide valuable green infrastructure" – only at the expense of destroying existing green infrastructure.</p> <p>8. Nothing can replace the unique location of the recreation ground (which by usage now includes the DCC area); the views are among the best in the county and it overlooks an area of outstanding natural beauty. Any other area would be too remote to be practical, be difficult to access and certainly would not have the visual appeal of the existing recreation ground.</p> <p>9. Development land is available on the north-west side of the Wareham Road which does not have an</p>			796

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>impact on the green belt; brown field sites are at present occupied by the old abattoir, the scrap yard and Naked Cross Nursery. Providing substantial fencing is erected on the south-east side of the Wareham Road, there would not be any impingement on the heathland.</p> <p>10. Finally it is quite wrong to “nibble” away at our green belt when the need is not proven; find out by a referendum in the county what the inhabitants want in detail, and then look at what is needed.</p>			
503250	Mrs Helen Poole		CSO8 242	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
503303	Mr Anthony Roberts		CSO8 304	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
503315	Mr Kenneth Wood		CSO8 332	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
503347	Ms Hardwick		CSO8 359	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
503355	Mr Robert Griffiths		CSO8 387	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
503358	Mrs H C Hoare		CSO8 418	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
503444	Mr R Hobbs		CSO8 557	Option CM 1	Object					796
503482	Mr Ron Hopkins		CSO8 660	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
503554	Mr D Verguson		CSO8 741	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
503598	Mr John Turner		CSO8 763	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
503603	Mrs DJ Morley		CSO8 783	Option CM 1	Object					796
503621	A G Haines		CSO8 825	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
503624	Mr RT Jackson		CSO8 836	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
503635	Mr J Gough		CSO8 889	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
503639	Mrs and Mr M Stevens		CSO8 932	Option CM 1	Support					796
503640	N J and S A White		CSO9 025	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
503644	Mr J Riley		CSO8 964	Option CM 1	Object					796
503687	Mr Nick Smith		CSO9 052	Option CM 1	Object					796
503690	Ms Clare Parvin		CSO9 102	Option CM 1	Support					796
503704	Mr RJ Legge		CSO9 103	Option CM 1	Object					796
503725	Mr		CSO9	Option	Object					796

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	G A Hughes		185	CM 1						
503759	Mr D.J. Middleton		CSO9 224	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
503787	Mrs P A Dent		CSO9 280	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
503846	Mr Anthony Hose		CSO9 301	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
503861	Mr E Hawkins		CSO9 333	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
503878	Mr Peter Smith		CSO9 392	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
503879	Mr S Smithson		CSO9 414	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
503943	Mr & Mrs Rumball		CSO9 443	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
504093	Mr & Mrs Vivian		CSO9 475	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
504101	Mrs Mary Trevis-Bell		CSO9 502	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
504216	Mr Mark Rich		CSO9 572	Option CM 1	Object					796
504285	Mr P Miller		CSO9 647	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
505273	Mrs Lorraine Hubbard		CSO9 844	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
505288	Mrs S Cramer		CSO9 880	Option CM 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.			796
505315	Mr Frank W Myerscough		CSO9 932	Option CM 1	Support					796
505354	Mr Tim Edwards		CSO9 952	Option CM 1	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!!!			796
505369	J Young		CSO9 979	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
505506	Mr Peter Hendra		CSO1 0055	Option CM 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.			796
505561	Mr D. Calvert		CSO1 0106	Option CM 1	Object					796
505590	M Spalding		CSO1 0135	Option CM 1	Support					796
505656	Mr Dave		CSO1 0155	Option CM 1	Object		I'm pleased the regional spatial strategy died a death. The percentage of affordable housing will be			796

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

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						achieved I hope. The road system is already congested in this area, how will it improve? It appears a decision needs to be made as to the continuance of Lockyers school. Who owns the land that figures in the proposed development?			
505681	Mr Nick Lewis		CSO1 0172	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
505742	Mr L. J. Ashplant		CSO1 0197	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
505760	J Evans		CSO1 0213	Option CM 1	Object		Corfe Mullen does not have the infrastructure to support further development. Already crowded roads, health services stretched - more building adds pressure. Very suspicious of so called "social housing". Great danger of spoiling rural nature of area. Democratically we should have been given the right to reject all options. It's our village. Development will turn Corfe Mullen into dirty, noisy, overcrowded place.			796
505802	Mr RGH Chapman		CSO1 0247	Option CM 1	Support					796
506161	Mr RD Holyoake		CSO1 0322	Option CM 1	Object		Any more development within Dorset's existing built up areas will end with a complete gridlock of traffic.			796
506196	Mr & Mrs P Stout		CSO1 0351	Option CM 1	Support					796
506754	Mr Derek E Marsh		CSO1 0379	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
507026	Mr David Craig		CSO1 0431	Option CM 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			796

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

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 social/community facilities should be considered.			
507032	Mr David Oliver		CSO1 0457	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
507789	Mr CJ Barrett		CSO1 1439	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
507800	Mrs K M Platt		CSO1 1468	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
507980	Mrs Sylvia Allen		CSO1 1584	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
508383	Ms Emma Hayter		CSO1 1699	Option CM 1	Object					796
508413	Mrs S Best		CSO1 1759	Option CM 1	Support					796
359854	Mr T Graham		CSO1 2695	Option CM 1	Object		I was elected by vote to Corfe Mullen Parish Council on an agenda of opposing further proposed housing development in this parish. These core strategy proposals are not in accordance with the Corfe Mullen Parish plan which both CMPC and EDDC approved. Most of the proposals will mean the revision of Green Belt boundaries not in accordance with the plan. The core strategy was right to exclude all other parts of Corfe Mullen for more development. So this parish is not a suitable place for development.			796
360097	Mr John DOWLING		CSO1 4490	Option CM 1	Object					796
360131	Mr Martin Hanham		CSO1 3025	Option CM 1	Object		I consider that, now that it has been accepted that the Corfe Mullen Meadows SSSI has incorrectly shown as a constraint on residential development, your			796

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

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 should look once again at the Waterloo Valley, i.e. the land between Waterloo Road and Hillside Road to accommodate further housing. Furthermore, that land constrained by the Upton Heath SSSI, in this area, should be considered for the re-location of Lockyers school.			
361227	Miss Angela Davis		CSO1 2990	Option CM 1	Object		I find it hard to support without knowing the location of Lockyers School e.g. CM1 used for housing, CM3 used for school.			796
361277	Mrs Judith Deadman		CSO1 2978	Option CM 1		No Opinion	Having attended the stand in the village hall on 06-12 -10 I do not feel able to make an informed decision as no-one seems to have enough information and probably won't until the decision has actually been made. I appreciate the attempt to involve the public, but when all my (very pertinent in my opinion) questions were answered 'we don't know at this stage' or similar it all seems a bit pointless.			796
361300	Mr & Mrs Searley		CSO1 2970	Option CM 1	Support		We are of the opinion that you should stick to the policy of making use of brownfield sites and also make use of infill between properties when they become available. Infrastructure have to be properly sorted out before any new development takes place. If a new school site is required, the relocation to the recreation ground would be ideal as it have a lot of facilities. The old school could be adapted for use as a care home or doctors-dentist etc. The allotments could also be moved onto another part of the recreation ground. This could make way for another access in and out relieving some of the congestion at the other entrance. If the above was to take place, it would also reduce transport. The children from the new housing would be on the school/recreation ground door step.			796
361313	Ms Sarah Bowley		CSO1 2643	Option CM 1	Support					796
478235	Ms Jane Brooks		CSO1 3010	Option CM 1	Object		1) Potential for increases in population of 300 - 600 people - too many for amenities and change in character of area.			796

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>2) Current residents have chosen to live in area of low population - this would not suit everyone, but should not be changed.</p> <p>3) Argument for is 'only flat land left in Corfe Mullen so build on'. Surely this is an argument against. We should not build on last bit of flat land.</p> <p>4) If we change Green Belt boundaries, what is the point in having them, where would it stop.</p> <p>5) Light pollution from homes and street lights in rural area.</p> <p>6) Straightening of Wimborne Road brings road too close to residential properties and spoils the character of the road and area.</p> <p>7) Whatever modifications to the road system, there will be too many vehicles at peak times for it to cope.</p> <p>8) Just because wildlife is currently unthreatened - buzzards, badgers, deer, does not mean it will not be in future.</p>			
496659	Mr & Mrs Tony & Hilary Hendy		CSO1 1731	Option CM 1	Support					796
507033	A R Twaits		CSO1 0483	Option CM 1	Support	General Comment	<p>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.</p> <p>In particular problems on the Ferndown and Wimborne bypasses need to be resolved, and the A31 to Poole link built.</p>			796
507170	Miss A K Jukes		CSO1 0575	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
507286	Mr N P Butler		CSO1 0691	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
507336	Mr		CSO1	Option		No Opinion				796

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

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 Page		0750	CM 1						
507356	Mr and Mrs M Moody		CSO1 0818	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
507363	Mr Kevin Sayer		CSO1 0845	Option CM 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 eyesore 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.			796
507388	Mr David Huggins		CSO1 0897	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
507474	Mark and Jean Cording		CSO1 1033	Option CM 1	Object		1) We are still due a correction in housing prices, housing benefits have artificially underpinned the bubble. The so called shortage of housing is also caused by breaking up of the family unit (teenagers and young people do not need their own homes) 2) The Green Belt must be protected, a temporary supposed need would and could not be reversed. There are hundreds of brown sites which could be utilised, without the need for more disruptive and expensive infrastructures. 3) Green Belt land was created to protect open land between and around developments. We anticipated development and councils saying they need more land, it was and is vital so please do not change the policy. Times change, needs change, populations (immigration and emigration) demands disappear but green land cannot be replaced.			796
507524	Mr C G		CSO1 1077	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Richards on									
507555	Mr and Mrs C Lamond		CSO1 1104	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
507659	Ms Victoria Johnstone		CSO1 1215	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
507693	Mrs P Carter		CSO1 1262	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
508835	Mrs E.L. Stratford		CSO1 2182	Option CM 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.			796
508852	Mrs L.A. Chesshire		CSO1 2229	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
508887	Mr J.S. Kidd		CSO1 2302	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
509065	Mrs B Burge		CSO1 2490	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
509100	Mrs Judy Waite		CSO1 2510	Option CM 1	Object					796
509106	Dawn Clark		CSO1 2526	Option CM 1	Object					796
509111	B K		CSO1	Option	Support		The school should be moved across the road			796

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

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		2531	CM 1			(Wimborne Road) also part of the Recreation Ground as school playing field. Corfe Mullen urgently need a school. EDDC could then develop the Lockyers School area instead of other developers. Thank you.			
509119	Mr A Reachill		CSO1 2533	Option CM 1	Object		Suggest reconsider land on western slopes where building has already successfully taken place i.e. Orchard Lane, Haywards Lane etc. Leave the remaining flat land i.e. school sports field, recreation ground allotments green.			796
509129	Mr Simon Briscoe		CSO1 2541	Option CM 1	Object		The search area is too limiting, confining the options. They are unacceptable. The housing proposals put forward will not satisfy the perceived affordable housing. These houses will be taken up by people to commute to other areas, as has happened previously. Building on recreational space and infill development has to stop; it is changing the village character. I understand the consultation has revealed an impasse between SSSI, nature conservation, Green Belt and our lineally developed village set on a plateau. The geography cannot change but our use of the surrounding land can - if it is deemed necessary which I doubt. This document and the Local Plan have therefore to look further.			796
509164	Mr Courtney		CSO1 2552	Option CM 1	Object					796
509168	Mr and Mrs P Lawton		CSO1 2556	Option CM 1	Support		Both recreation grounds and the allotments should be preserved as they are both an extremely valuable community resource. Lockyers school can use the recreation ground for sporting activities. Both CM 2 and CM3 provide much needed green space for the village.			796
509171	Mr and Mrs J Newman		CSO1 2560	Option CM 1	Object		We dispute the alleged requirement for more houses in this area. There are plenty of houses on the market - some would be regarded by definition as 'affordable'. Poole and Bournemouth have some of the highest unemployment in the south so why attract more people into the area to worsen the situation. The only acceptable housing would be housing association rented only to local people.			796

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
509181	Mrs A Jones		CSO1 2564	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
509182	Mr K A Jones		CSO1 2568	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
509272	Greg Dollerson		CSO1 2600	Option CM 1	Object		<p>Objections for CM1:</p> <p>1) economic reality - wrong time for re-development.</p> <p>2) Uncertainty of middle schools - may be total waste of money.</p> <p>3) maintain historic building - unique interest for CM.</p> <p>4) protects Green Belt.</p> <p>If CM1 must be used, please relocate to incorporate into part of recreation ground, to maximise use of recreational facilities for school and locals. Vital we use the money and facilities wisely.</p>			796
509295	Miss G Burden		CSO1 2611	Option CM 1	Object		<p>* creating more houses will not help those who can't afford a house as they will attract more people into the area. There are enough already if so many were not second homes, and those that have been built recently are far from affordable</p> <p>* The schools/doctors etc. are already full, we don't need to attract more people here. The roads are already inadequate for the level of traffic that uses them.</p> <p>* We do not need any more supermarkets around here, you don't have to travel far to get to one, and we already have the Co-op in the village.</p> <p>* Building on the recreation ground would limit the space available for playing sports and dog walking. Dog walkers would be forced onto the heathlands, which is both unsafe at times of the year (adders), and detrimental to the environment.</p> <p>* Why can we not have some green areas in the village? It will be a far less attractive place to live if every available space is built on.</p> <p>* I fail to see how building on so many fields would be creating a 'green infrastructure'.</p> <p>* How many of the people proposing this actually live in the village?</p> <p>* If only up to half of the houses being built would be</p>			796

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

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', its not exactly going to help many people buy a house, only those with money.			
509428	Mrs Vanessa Burden		CSO1 2653	Option CM 1	Object		Roads can't cope with population now. Schools overcrowded. Doctors always fully boked now. Affordable housing should have been thought of years ago instead of allowing so may expensive houses to be built, which only outsiders could afford. Too many housing estates already. Rec is used and is central. Lockyers needs updating, not moving. Allotments have been well looked after and hard work put in. Corfe Mullen is too big now why make it bigger. It's a village not a town. There are plenty of shop in Broadstone if you can't get what you need in CM so no more supermarkets are needed or a new centre. If affordable housing is built it should only be for people who can prove they have lived in Corfe Mullen for a considerable time.			796
509438	Mr Nigel Burden		CSO1 2664	Option CM 1	Object		These proposals will only exacerbate the problems that already exist in the area. The infrastructure is inadequate to cope with the existing population, with doctors surgeries full to capacity, school full to capacity, woefully inadequate main road (A31 A350) to take the volumes of traffic that pass through the area. Public transport is not the answer due to the fact that residents are travelling to many differing areas for work, something that has been woefully neglected in Dorset for many years. As for social or affordable housing, these problems will not address the problem. This issue has been obvious for many years, yet precedence has been given to the building of more expensive type of residence. This is an attempt to shut the gate after the horse has bolted.			796
509454	Mr David Burden		CSO1 2671	Option CM 1	Object		Corfe Mullen is already full - the village does not have the facilities to support any more people. The roads are already used to capacity whilst public transport to the village is almost non-existent. Public services such as the doctors surgery are already full. There is also already a lack of suitable playing areas for kids. Getting rid of most of the recreation will just heighten that and this in an age when we are worried about levels of childhood obesity. People have also put a lot			796

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

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 time and hard work into the allotments so destroying them for some unneeded houses is selfish. If you approve these plans it will just go to show that you don't care about servicing the village but just making a quick buck off rich city folk who will buy these.			
509466	Mr Andy Cobb		CSO1 2681	Option CM 1	Object					796
509470	Mrs S Joyce		CSO1 2685	Option CM 1	Support		Please do no build in Waterloo Valley.			796
509513	Mr K Moore		CSO1 2706	Option CM 1	Object		This plan is not definitive enough. Too many if's and maybe's.			796
509526	Mr E Cornick		CSO1 2713	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
509540	Chris Finlay		CSO1 2723	Option CM 1	Support		Lockyers school has been needing re-building for many, many years.			796
509549	Mr D Russell		CSO1 2729	Option CM 1	Object					796
509577	Mrs Elizabeth Ann Short		CSO1 2742	Option CM 1	Object					796
509632	Mr and Mrs L and D Jackson		CSO1 2764	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
509759	Mrs V Kitson		CSO1 2781	Option CM 1	Support		CM1 may not become available for some years, but should be included as the school will fall down if not rebuilt.			796
509782	Mr and		CSO1	Option	Support		Corfe Mullen badly needs a centre. It is a very large			796

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

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 Harrison		2800	CM 1			village with no identity/centre at the moment. The Lockyers school site would be ideal for this purpose and would also result in the school being improved. Whilst the Green Belt is important, the school is even more important.			
509790	Ian Sparks		CSO1 2809	Option CM 1	Object					796
509796	B Sparks		CSO1 2814	Option CM 1	Object		Corfe Mullen is a village with village facilities and would not cope with large amounts of new housing within its conurbations. Our wildlife would also suffer from building on the scales proposed.			796
509804	Mrs J Best		CSO1 2826	Option CM 1	Support					796
509814	Mr T M Trickett		CSO1 2837	Option CM 1	Object		To allow housing school would need to be moved to another Green Belt site.			796
509826	Mrs P Walker		CSO1 2843	Option CM 1	Support		No attempt to reintroduce building in the valley should be allowed. Green Belt must be preserved. Housing only, not shops and certainly not a supermarket, on Lockyers site only if Corfe Mullen goes 2-tier and the site is redundant for education. It should not be replaced by a new school site on Green Belt land. Any housing should be 40% social and 60% starter homes. No other house building after that.			796
509848	Mr & Mrs I Robertson		CSO1 2864	Option CM 1	Object					796
509888	Dr A Craven		CSO1 2884	Option CM 1	Object		All three proposals for housing will cause heartache and drive a stake through the heart of the village: CM1 - builds on Lockyers site which is a beautiful school in the heart of the village. CM2 - this will destroy all the hours of hard work by the allotment holders and add lots of traffic onto an already dangerous and narrow stretch of road. CM3 - a great community space for activities by			796

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

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 and families. Where will the desecration of our village stop. Another set of badly thought out options for our village.			
509906	Mr P Woodward		CSO1 2901	Option CM 1	Object		CM 1 to 3 are all council/public land areas, more likely to have been acquired for the use of its citizens for recreation and local sports. The use of these areas is not welcome, there are plenty of brown sites and other options available - bunch all together in one area. Your transport dreams are ideal but there is no reality, we already have traffic issues - Lockyers Road and Wimborne Road (around the Windgreen). You have not proposed any road changes or improved access points. Its bad enough that you queue and cannot get onto the A31. This area and 3 proposals on top of each other is madness!!!			796
509923	G Woodward		CSO1 2916	Option CM 1	Object		There is not enough infrastructure to cope with that many houses in Corfe Mullen and surrounding area. Also there is a public footpath that runs through the recreation ground. Where would you relocate the allotments? Does this also mean you are getting rid of Lockyers school? The other schools are not big enough to cope with extra children. The site is of natural beauty and it would be a shame to lose it for future generations.			796
509944	J Sparks		CSO1 2935	Option CM 1	Object					796
509975	Mr and Mrs J M Price		CSO1 2956	Option CM 1	Support		1) There appear to be plenty of private dwellings for sale in Corfe Mullen so emphasis should be on affordable properties. 2) Does not government realise that with no motorway in Dorset, the A31 and other major roads can hardly take more traffic. Has central government considered building a new small town in mid/north Dorset. 3) If Lockyers school (1897) is demolished where would a replacement school (bigger?) be built.			796
510009	Mr		CSO1	Option	Object		I moved to the Broadstone/Corfe Mullen area in 1971.			796

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

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 M Langley		2961	CM 1			Since that time there has been a huge increase in housing leading to overload of traffic during peak hours - this will not be reduced/improved by public transport due to the spread out complex - making extensive journeys uneconomical for bus operators. Infill and demolish/rebuild should be the first consideration. Corfe Mullen is a spread out village and to keep referring to the village centre ignores the obvious facts - there isn't one. Housing expansion is not entirely necessary on this scale and should be considered nearby in more suitable locations.			
510048	Mrs Dorothy Scobey		CSO1 2983	Option CM 1	Support					796
510111	Mr Brian Lane		CSO1 3021	Option CM 1		General Comment	I am informed that no replacement school before 10 years or more. Sources: Dorchester (DCC) Planning. When relevant information available, will form opinion.			796
510235	Mrs Deborah Hanham		CSO1 3029	Option CM 1	Object		I consider that, now that it has been accepted that the Corfe Mullen Meadows SSSI has incorrectly shown as a constraint on residential development, your Council should look once again at the Waterloo Valley, i.e. the land between Waterloo Road and Hillside Road to accommodate further housing. Furthermore, that land constrained by the Upton Heath SSSI, in this area, should be considered for the re-location of Lockyers school.			796
510241	Miss Danielle Hanham		CSO1 3033	Option CM 1	Object		I consider that, now that it has been accepted that the Corfe Mullen Meadows SSSI has incorrectly shown as a constraint on residential development, your Council should look once again at the Waterloo Valley, i.e. the land between Waterloo Road and Hillside Road to accommodate further housing. Furthermore, that land constrained by the Upton Heath SSSI, in this area, should be considered for the re-location of Lockyers School.			796
510252	Mrs		CSO1	Option		General	I do not live in Corfe Mullen as you will see. It is no			796

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

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 Wright		3037	CM 1		Comment	good to build extra housing without something being done re roads. Broadstone can be gridlocked at school collection and delivery times. Bus services need much improving and to be more reliable. Please - no more pressure on us who live down in Broadstone.			
510420	Mr Peter Stevens		CSO1 3150	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
510490	Ms Helen Banfield		CSO1 3230	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
510532	Mr W.W. Chant		CSO1 3278	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
510623	Mr Douglas Priest		CSO1 3383	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
361121	Mrs Elizabeth Jones		CSO1 4009	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
361124	Mrs M.E Brown		CSO1 6355	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
361138	Mr Rod WHITHAM		CSO1 6882	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
361161	Mr Douglas FORWARD		CSO1 3603	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
361196	Mr J.M Bullivant		CSO1 6273	Option CM 1	Support		It is important to have affordable housing in this area but not to encroach on existing green belt land.			796

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
361279	Mrs Brenda Tye		CSO1 5714	Option CM 1	Support					796
361298	Mr S.J Damon		CSO1 6773	Option CM 1		General Comment	<p>I note that all three options are baited with the suggestion that up to 50% could be "affordable housing". The current system of allocation has ensured that virtually no suitable affordable housing has been built in Corfe Mullen over the past years, yet the list of housing is prominently used to justify more houses. Since those needing local housing will predominately require affordable homes here is an issue which should be addressed now. The rule, originally intended to assist the homeless, has been worded with a bias totally in favour of the small developer and presented as though graven on tablets of stone. The rule should be changed now, not when the Strategy Consultation is summarized, maybe in some years time. To assist in readdressing the unbalance I propose that ALL new housing in the three options should be affordable.</p> <p>Lockyers School has been a subject of continuous controversy for many years and the issue needs to be dealt with. My view is that the school should be renewed on the existing site. Some remnants of the original structure could then be retained in context. Reconstruction and upgrading could be done sympathetically in stages and could defer some costs until later. Rebuilding on an existing site is more difficult but the existing location is very much worthwhile.</p> <p>A case could be made to site the school within land in Option 2 but this is less attractive.</p> <p>There is no need for a new social centre in option 1. Corfe Mullen is essentially rural and widespread so no site would be ideal but the facilities grouped near the village hall are increasingly regarded and used as a centre by villagers. The concept and location is being improved.</p> <p>The green issue would not change significantly.</p>			796
476264	Mr David Reddawa		CSO1 5665	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	y									
491252	Margaret Wareham		CSO1 6583	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
510798	Mr F Sullivan		CSO1 3526	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
510844	Mr Michael Guilmany -Cush		CSO1 3572	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
510873	Mr & Mrs B.R. Mayes		CSO1 3620	Option CM 1	Object					796
510974	Mr Jim Cullumbine		CSO1 3648	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
510993	Mr R.A. Cherrett		CSO1 3681	Option CM 1		General Comment	<p>I have filled in the strategy consultation, another of an endless stream of costly strategies and plans, realising at the end of the day I am wasting my time. The decisions will be made by a few politically motivated, inexperienced amateurs with personal agendas and egos.</p> <p>Regarding comments on fly-tipping, in your expensive leaflet, perhaps the Council's negative policy at Brook Road has added to the problem?</p>		<p>These are general comments. The consultee has ticked "No Opinion" to Option CM 1. I have put these comments here in the absence of any "general comments" consultation point to assign them to.</p>	796

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
511015	Mr Christopher White		CSO1 3729	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
511076	Mr Ian Burden		CSO1 3814	Option CM 1	Object		I do not understand East Dorset's obsession with building on sports and recreation grounds. I have lived in Corfe Mullen and Merley for 60 years and I am very upset that you are proposing to build on Lockyers School, the recreation ground and the playgrounds plus Wimborne Football Club, which I have associated with for 45 years. All of these areas have lovely views over the valley towards Sturminster Marshall and Ashleywood. Please do not repeat the mistake by making more irreversible decisions like the building on Wimborne Cricket Ground.			796
511399	Mr & Mrs Michael and Diana Froud		CSO1 4055	Option CM 1	Support					796
511430	Mr A.D. May		CSO1 4115	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
511489	Mr H G Holden		CSO1 4171	Option CM 1	Support					796
511571	Mr Colin Alborough		CSO1 4226	Option CM 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.			796
511618	Mrs V Blunden		CSO1 4261	Option CM 1	Support					796
511621	Ms		CSO1	Option		No Opinion				796

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Mary A Combe		4272	CM 1						
511639	Mr Paul Hockey		CSO1 6071	Option CM 1	Object					796
511692	Ms Ruth Blaug		CSO1 4407	Option CM 1	Support		I			796
511711	Mr Coombes		CSO1 4429	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
512281	Mr Graham Roberts		CSO1 4974	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
512326	Mr Ian Willis		CSO1 5052	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
513639	Mr and Mrs D J A Kirby		CSO1 5434	Option CM 1	Object					796
513881	Mrs S Bagg		CSO1 5530	Option CM 1	Object					796
513900	Mr P Wall		CSO1 5568	Option CM 1	Object		Unfortunately more development more movement. A comprehensive transport policy should be developed e.g.. road improvement (A31), bus and trams, rail links (restored).			796
513911	Mr Ian Burton		CSO1 5566	Option CM 1	Object		Corfe Mullen does not have the infrastructure to support additional housing.			796
513924	Mrs A F Langford		CSO1 5575	Option CM 1	Support		I support some building in Corfe Mullen but over 300 new homes will mean 400 - 600 more cars trying to get to work and home again at peak times which will create even more traffic congestion. It will be difficult to improve on this, it's bad enough now.			796

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
513937	Mrs A Boxshall		CSO1 5592	Option CM 1	Object		Corfe Mullen , the village is full. The roads, shops, nursery, schools, etc. are busy. It is a village, not a town! Please respect that.			796
513949	Fay Gardner		CSO1 5608	Option CM 1	Object					796
513954	Mr RW Heseltine		CSO1 5612	Option CM 1	Object					796
359461	Mrs Nicola Brunt	Conservation Officer Dorset Wildlife Trust	CSO1 7491	Option CM 1	Support		Options CM 1 Lockyers Middle School, CM 2 Violet Farm Close, CM 3 Recreation Ground These developments provide opportunity to develop green infrastructure that would benefit residents and divert pressures away from heathlands. They also provide opportunity to protect and enhance local wildlife habitats and this should be taken into account in the development of SANGs. We consider that all sites should be subject to biological survey to inform the options. The green linkages indicated could provide corridors of green infrastructure, beneficial to people and wildlife, maintaining interconnecting open land from the east to the north of Corfe Mullen through areas 1-3. We suggest both these points are included in the general requirements 9.77. Allotments could continue to form part of the green corridor but if these are to be relocated, care must be taken to conduct biological surveys of potential sites to avoid loss of any sites of high wildlife interest in the locality. We have concern that the loss of recreation ground (CM3) could lead to more people accessing the heaths for recreation and therefore this proposal must be supported by robust provision of a SANG. We support the protection of the Waterloo Valley and Pardys Hill from development.			796
359478	Mr Rohan TORKILD SEN	West Territory Planner English Heritage	CSO1 8554	Option CM 1	Object		The evidence associated with the initial assessment fails to demonstrate an understanding of the relative significance of the areas historic environment which now, as result of PPS5, should also include consideration of non designated heritage assets and the broader historic landscape and its setting.			796

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

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 intention to safeguard Lockyers School (founded 1706 and enlarged c.1824) is welcomed.			
359482	Ms Helen Powell	Conservation Officer Natural England, Dorset and Somerset Team	CSO1 8706	Option CM 1		No Opinion	CM1, 2, 3 These options offer opportunities for significant green infrastructure that could remove potential adverse effects (from recreational pressures) on the Dorset heaths and increase the value of the locality for biodiversity. Our opinion on this option will therefore be shaped by the strength and detail of policy on delivery of the green infrastructure as an integral part of the development.			796
359571	Mr Renny Henderson	Conservation Officer Royal Society for the Protection of Birds	CSO1 8697	Option CM 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:			796
359891	Mrs Susanne Parkin		CSO1 8376	Option CM 1	Object		The plan for Corfe Mullen is flawed from its conception with the exception of the land off Violet Farm Close. It is a 'what if' situation, hardly fair on the village - the school is a non - starter, the allotments are in the only place possible (regarding soil condition) in fact they should be enlarged. Corfe Mullen has few amenities and to propose taking these with no creditable plan of replacement is very unfair and in my view unprofessional. The village can only comment with speculation in mind and to expect a supportive consultation is impossible. A very bad plan ill thought out. I would now like to address Corfe Mullen. We have been told that the consultants were advised by the officers. Why is Corfe Mullen treated differently than the rest of the district. Why do we have for most part a wish list of improbables. Corfe Mullen has always been the Cinderella part of the district in the way it is being treated it seems yet again it has drawn the short straw. One can't help wondering why is 11,000 inhabitants are treated in this way. We have so few amenities compared to the other areas in the district and to propose to diminish these with no idea of how			796

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

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 redress this shortfall is very unprofessional and says little of the care that should have been taken on is there a hidden agenda!!! The aim of the district is to be able to build affordable homes. What is proposed in CM will deliver so few - and do we have to have those homes at the cost of our amenities.			
360302	Mrs Hilary Chittenden	Chairperson Environment TAG (East Dorset)	CSO1 8163	Option CM 1	Support		There are native hedgerows and mature trees throughout the area some of which are protected by TPOs. Evidence of significant badger activity was observed on 13.11.10. The whole area would require protected species survey. ETAG supports retention of the historic school building, although it is understood that DCC's current advice is that the school will not be relocated.			796
361026	Mr Steve Hellier	Network Planning Manager Highways Agency	CSO1 7742	Option CM 1	Support		The removal of the RSS requirements to provide substantial new housing in the Corfe Mullen area suggests that there is an opportunity for a considered approach involving the use of SEDMMS, among other evidence. This would enable the suitability of the Corfe Mullen area for new housing to be reviewed, alongside other options There is evidence of a high level of car dependency in this area, which implies that further growth (Options CM1, CM2 and CM3) could exacerbate the existing high level of demand for movements via the A31. The village has poor public transport provision, therefore any future growth needs to be linked with improvements to sustainable transport provisions			796
513958	Mr A Bough		CSO1 5617	Option CM 1	Object		Regarding Lockyers School site this school should remain as a school this school was given to the village and should not be turn into some super-market and if all these homes to be built in and around the village I doubt it will be people from the village who will live in them. There should be no more building in or around Corfe Mullen.			796
513966	Mr and Mrs Howard		CSO1 5639	Option CM 1	Support					796

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
513973	Mr and Mrs RM Bowles		CSO1 5642	Option CM 1	Object		Our concern re the land at the rear of Violet Farm Close is the amount of water that collects after heavy rain and doesn't drain away. The presence of reeds indicates how wet the soil remains all the time. We also have badgers/foxes, deer and rabbits in a pleasant environmental setting.			796
513974	Mr A Moore		CSO1 5802	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
514009	L Stock		CSO1 5700	Option CM 1	Object					796
514023	Mr WR Cox		CSO1 5710	Option CM 1	Object		Lockyers school should be rebuilt on its existing site and stay in the community it serves, rather than being pushed to the outskirts.			796
514039	Mrs R Doman		CSO1 5730	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
514043	E Fookes		CSO1 5719	Option CM 1	Object					796
514049	Mrs E Hellier		CSO1 5739	Option CM 1	Object		Where would you put a new school in Corfe Mullen? Wherever you build it, it will be a long distance from the main housing estates, therefore children will not walk to school, therefore more traffic. Also local doctors surgery busy now; how will it cope with more people?			796
514078	Mr G D Hart		CSO1 5764	Option CM 1	Object					796
514083	Mr R Munt		CSO1 5769	Option CM 1	Object		Of the three options, CM2, but I must object to all three.			796
514087	Joan Smithies		CSO1 5791	Option CM 1	Support					796
514091	Mr RJ		CSO1 5803	Option CM 1	Object		All the changes in Corfe Mullen are in one area-need to look at alternative areas.			796

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Potts						Must preserve existing wild areas and allotments. Development on flood plains are not a good idea.			
514099	Mr and Mrs T C Blakeley		CSO1 5845	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
514107	The Payne Family		CSO1 5860	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
514111	Penelope Webiery		CSO1 5890	Option CM 1	Object		We don't have the facilities for any more people in Corfe Mullen. We don't have a proper supermarket, only a small doctors surgery and a library which is closed more than its open. For God's sake we still have to put black plastic bags out for the dustmen, because we are the only place in Dorset without bins. The Rec is important to us for exercising our dogs and for our children to play. LEAVE CORFE MULLEN ALONE.			796
514114	Ms Karen Maund		CSO1 5891	Option CM 1	Object		I object to the proposed development in Corfe Mullen, because I feel it is to many houses in a confined area. Also the road structure will not cope with additional volume of traffic. 310 houses amounts to an additional 600+ cars on the road at peak times. No thoughts have been given to further amenities regarding schools, shops, doctors.			796
514136	Mrs J Crumb		CSO1 5940	Option CM 1	Object					796
514225	Mr Simon Dixon	Secretary West Moors Traders Association	CSO1 5958	Option CM 1	Support					796
514246	Theresa Monahan & Jonathon		CSO1 5990	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Chaffey									
514274	Mr Showell		CSO1 6045	Option CM 1	Object		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.			796
514467	Mrs Lesley Cripps		CSO1 6190	Option CM 1	Support		It must be stressed that a new school to replace the existing Lockyers School must be of paramount importance for Corfe Mullen before any new homes would be built. Recreation facilities also need to be developed in the southern end of the village including allotments and play park for Waterloo Road area. Can the village infrastructure support more people and motorcars? Moreover could the roads in and out of Corfe Mullen cope with the extra traffic especially through Broadstone.			796
514482	C E T Gilbert		CSO1 6223	Option CM 1		No Opinion	Corfe Mullen (CM 1), further commercial/retail premises are not a priority. Any new school can be built on the playing fields to incorporate a community centre, existing buildings to be cleared for new play area.			796
514504	Mr and Mrs B Gibbs		CSO1 6237	Option CM 1	Object		The options in the survey do not allow a considered and unbiased answer as they include vague terms such as ' school may be relocated' and 'allotments would need to be relocated elsewhere' but do not offer a solution. Thus it is almost impossible to make a proper judgement. We feel the only sensible solution is to utilise some green belt land but not the recreation ground, as this is used by many people in the village. Also, if the school is to be built elsewhere, it should not be on the present recreation ground, as previously suggested. The other option might be CM2 which does not appear to encroach the recreation space. If houses are to be built on the school site, then 80 families will cause unacceptable congestion traffic-wise to new and existing residents. Why do we need			796

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							so many houses? If this scheme goes ahead it will cause much anger and frustration, particularly if no adequate facilities are provided.			
514507	Mr and Mrs C Macy		CSO1 6259	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
514649	Mrs June Sawyer		CSO1 6310	Option CM 1	Object					796
514674	Mrs J Williams		CSO1 6338	Option CM 1	Object					796
514752	Claire Richards on & Jamie Shirley		CSO1 6385	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
514812	Mr C Sawyer		CSO1 6422	Option CM 1	Object					796
514912	Mrs Mary Carsbury		CSO1 6471	Option CM 1	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.			796
514913	Mr and Mrs M		CSO1 6458	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Clark									
514939	Mr D Porter		CSO1 6499	Option CM 1	Object		The more land you concrete over the more you have to because you just increase demand. Infill best option.			796
514959	Mr and Mrs R Fisher		CSO1 6531	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
514993	Dr Peter J Hardwick		CSO1 6563	Option CM 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 while second homes and investment properties continue to exist.			796
515033	Mr T Crump		CSO1 6602	Option CM 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.			796

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
515287	Mr L Jackson		CSO1 6673	Option CM 1	Support		The A31 trunk road from Ferndown by-pass should be widened to form a dual carriageway all the way through to Bere Regis.			796
515367	Mr & Mrs J Pottinger		CSO1 6786	Option CM 1	Object					796
518491	Mr and Mrs Bargewel I		CSO1 7368	Option CM 1	Object		<p>Following the issue of the latest Core Strategy Options by yourselves, please accept this letter, and the points contained with-in, as formal objection to the Options being considered for Corfe Mullen. Although from our address that we would be immensely affected by the option concerning land off Violet Farm Close, please be assured our objections are not purely on a personal nature and hope that our objections will be considered by yourselves and not be discounted simply due to our location. Having been residents of the village for many years, we feel the village is now at full capacity and see no reason why the village should be forced to accommodate large scale housing developments which are simply not needed. Having attended the Core Strategy meeting at the Council Offices in November, one of your representatives clearly stated that the Regional Spatial Strategy has now been abolished and that you no longer have any housing targets which need to be met. This point is by far the strongest reason for objecting to any housing development plans on the scale of which you are now proposing.</p> <p>Large Scale Housing Development - Not Needed A development of this nature, on any of the 3 sites, is simply not needed on a scale such as this, nor is it wanted by the residents of Corfe Mullen. Current housing needs should be accommodated by in-fill, not a major new housing estate. We are a village – not a town.</p> <p>A new housing estate would have an environmental impact on the village - more pollution / power usage / carbon footprint/ car emissions / noise pollution / light pollution / waste etc. etc. Development would add to already strained power supplies. This are of Corfe Mullen already experiences regular 'power cuts'</p>			796

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>especially at the Pavilion / Rec area. Adding 150 dwellings will put additional strain on local power stations. What provision is in place to accommodate this?</p> <p>The supermarkets / shops / Post Offices / Banks etc. are sufficient for the current population of the village. More services are only required due to development plans – no development = no need for more services. Green Belt / Open Space / Wildlife haven</p> <p>Although not all the resident wildlife species are protected, habitats will be lost. Resident buzzards, rabbits, deer, foxes, badgers, field mice, many species of birds etc. use the areas under consideration as feeding grounds / habitat – particularly the land off Violet Farm Close. We feel it is essential that these 'pockets' of open space be retained as wildlife havens for many species, as such spaces are now being reduced at an alarming rate, not just locally but nationally.</p> <p>Local Residents - in the immediate area What, if any, compensation will be provided for those who will see a dramatic fall in the value of their homes caused by this development? House prices in the immediate area reflect the current rural setting which will be lost if this development goes ahead. The saying goes that you 'cannot put a price tag on a view' – meaning house prices do not reflect location. On this I would disagree. The market value of my property reflected its' location, and the privacy given by backing onto 'open space' and not dwellings. A new development here would reduce the value of my property immensely – what provision has been made for residents who would be affected like ourselves? Are there any plans to compensate those in the immediate vicinity of such a development - as your proposals would lose those residents many thousands of pounds on property value should they choose to move. A loss I would expect the Council, as proposer of said development, to rectify.</p> <p>Traffic Windgreen roundabout (Esso garage) already heavily congested at rush hour. Long queues already occur down towards Corfe Hills (heading towards Windgreen), Blandford Road (from Lockyers 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>Windgreen) and Wareham Road, both sides of the roundabout, at peak times.</p> <p>Any development at Lockyers / Rec / Violet Farm would add significant numbers of vehicles, possibly in excess of another 150 cars, to the already busy highways at that end of the village, most of which would join the rush hour traffic and all of which would need to access their destined routes via the Windgreen area.</p> <p>Education / Schools.</p> <p>All 4 of the first schools which 'feed in to' Lockyers (Henbury, Rushcombe, Springdale, Sturminster Marshall) are already full and have been for the last few years. Where would the primary school aged children, from the proposed development, be expected to go? Although the argument for a 2 tier education system is on-going, the existing first schools could not at this time accommodate Years 5 and 6 should we go 2 tier, and Corfe Hills are unable to extend either pupil capacity nor site size, so to add 150 dwellings – (each of which could have the average 2.4 children - which could number 300 additional school children!) to this already 'strained' education provision is unacceptable.</p> <p>Health Provision.</p> <p>Local doctors surgeries were full in 1992 when I became a Corfe Mullen resident thus my family had to register with a practice in Broadstone. What provision is being made for the residents of the proposed development regarding Health Care / Doctors Surgeries? 150 dwellings could add in the region of 600 new residents to Corfe Mullen. In the current economical climate is the NHS likely to provide and fund new surgeries / GPs just for one development? It is highly unlikely that the existing Health provisions in the village would cope with an influx of these numbers.</p> <p>Allotments –</p> <p>The allotments are well established with a small knit, community feel. The Corfe Mullen Allotment Association is volunteer run group. Many allotment holders, including ourselves, are with-in walking distance of current site but would need to drive to any proposed new site. Would the allotments even be</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>relocated and, if so, would the land be of the same quality of the current site, which many plot holders have spent years improving? Would new site be as 'fertile' / productive for growing as current site? Some plot holders have rented their plots for many, many years. Yet again, development would damage the ethos / feel of village 'community.' Perhaps the best suggestion for the land off Violet Farm Close would be to extend the current allotment site which has been in situ for in excess of a 100 years but has seen its' size dramatically reduced over that time.</p> <p>Service Providers / Current Economic Climate – Additional strain on already struggling financial budgets of all major service providers who would be required to maintain new developments – Wessex Water / Electric and Gas Companies/ Highways Agencies / Rubbish collection / Parish Council / Telephone Service Providers / Transport - bus companies etc. etc. As the proposer of said developments, what contribution will EDDC make to all these companies who are expected to bear the maintenance costs of a new housing development? Lastly – Site Suitability?</p> <p>Building on the land off Violet Farm Close would rule out any future access to the land at the Recreation Ground, should that area ever be developed. Also, is the land off Violet Farm Close actually suitable for development? The area is known to be an old 'landfill' site and is always heavily waterlogged over the winter with poor drainage and excess surface water in situ for months. There is also a Tree Protection Order in force – the large trees situated on the land 'off Violet Farm Close' are protected by a Preservation Order, issued by your own Council, indicating a desire to protect not to develop this area!</p>			
518513	Mr Christian Westwood		CSO1 7378	Option CM 1	Object		<p>I would like to log an objection to the use of the Lockyers School site to provide land for housing development. In my own opinion this proposal is not a valid option as my family's home is directly adjacent to the proposed site. We purchased our house approximately 18 months ago and the reasons for so doing was the rural environment in which it is located,</p>	<p>Consider redevelopment of an area to which the addition of further housing and commercial activity would damage less than that proposed. The development of the Lockyers School</p>		796

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact 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 fact that it is not overlooked by a myriad of other properties and the close proximity of recreational facilities for both us and our son. At the time of purchasing our property, we were only aware of the possible redevelopment of Lockyers school that would maintain the positions of the main buildings, which is a much more favourable option to developing the site for residential and commercial purposes.</p> <p>The proposed housing development, together with the planned community facilities and associated infrastructure, in particular the road network, would result in the area becoming a much more urban setting, absolutely destroying the reason why we, and many other families, elect to live in this area. It would also result in our home being overlooked by a significantly greater quantity of properties than is currently the case.</p> <p>The appeal of the village is its rural surroundings, combined with the convenience of the Core Strategy Options for Consideration Response Form</p> <p>commercial areas found in the neighbouring towns of Wimborne and Broadstone. The shops available in these already built up communities surely mean that there is no reason to tarnish the landscape surrounding Corfe Mullen with similar facilities.</p> <p>Not only does the option of using the Lockyers School site for a residential and commercial development remove the wildlife area adjacent to the school playing field, the relocation of the school to Site 1 would also result in the loss of the local recreation area. Having previously lived in the Wareham area, we have prior experience of facilities shared between local residents and education establishments and found that the limited times that they were available to the residents was particularly restrictive. Furthermore, the price charged for such facilities as astro turf pitches meant that, on the occasions I played there, two thirds of the pitch was not utilised. I appreciate that such</p>	<p>site removes access to fantastic views of our beautiful countryside and living in a rural environment whilst providing commercial facilities within a 5-10 mile radius.</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>facilities have an inherent construction cost that must be recovered, however I do not consider them a fair replacement for playing fields for which there is no charge for use.</p> <p>The relocation of the Lockyers School to Site 1 would also result in the loss of a valuable dog walking area. Also, some residents would avoid this area entirely simply due to the fact that it is adjacent to a school.</p> <p>The option of relocating Lockyers School to Site 1 would result in the current views from our property that extend as far as Badbury Rings being replaced by one of contemporary school buildings.</p> <p>This proposal would also produce a huge increase in traffic utilising the part of Wimborne Road on which we live, resulting in a much noisier, polluted and more dangerous environment in which to raise our son.</p> <p>In conclusion, I consider that not only would this proposal adversely affect the value of our property, it would also have a large detrimental effect on the community as a whole. The appeal of this part of the village is that it is not excessively developed and therefore this proposal would have a dramatic effect on both the area and the lifestyle of its inhabitants</p>			
519991	Ms Claire Aldridge	Planning Liaison Officer Environment Agency	CSO17574	Option CM 1		General Comment	<p>Options CM1,2 and 3 are all located within a SPZ 2 so similar to Wimborne and Colehill there may be a restriction on what can be built and suitable assessment will need to be undertaken to show that the development will not have a detrimental impact on groundwater.</p> <p>Overall issues for consideration are: SUDS; foul drainage; water supply / water efficiency; groundwater and contaminated Land; sustainable construction (recommend at least Code for Sustainable Homes Level 3); waste management facilities; green infrastructure/ biodiversity issues; pollution prevention. Further information on these topics can be seen in the general section of our letter.</p>			796
359875	Dr		CSO1	Option	Object		The urban fringe of south-east Dorset supports a			796

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Lesley Haskins		9290	CM 1			<p>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>SUPPORT The stated intent to retain the old school building within any development of this site is strongly supported. Corfe Mullen probably always was a rather dispersed village, with its church near the river and school on the hilltop this redevelopment could offer the opportunity to establish a new 'heart' for the village, centred upon the retention of the old school building. Shops and community facilities should take priority over residential.</p> <p>The decision not to propose development on land southward from Pardys' Hill is strongly supported. Use as a SANG will need to take account of intrinsic</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
							wildlife interest. The area will not be suitable for any relocation of sports facilities or allotments and so forth, as clearly these would be damaging to wildlife interests.			
360768	Cllr. Mr David Packer	Colehill West Ward East Dorset District Council	CSO2 0647	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
360977	Mr Nick Solomon		CSO2 0696	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
489765	Mr Derek Kearey		CSO1 9491	Option CM 1	Support					796
490854	Mr D Mutton		CSO2 0133	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
507361	Mr Kenneth Archer		CSO2 0329	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
507546	Mr Nigel Pugsley	Senior Planner BNP Paribas Real Estate	CSO1 7988	Option CM 1		General Comment	The abovementioned policies options relate to potential Greenfield housing allocations on the fringes of Corfe Mullen. Whichever of the options the Council is minded to progress with (following further consultation and examination), it would be essential that the infrastructure needed to support the planned growth is provided for in a timely manner.			796
507737	Mrs S Philpot		CSO2 0201	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
511383	Mrs Jean Archer		CSO2 0381	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
521315	Janet & Kevin		CSO1 7916	Option CM 1	Support		SUMMARY: CM1 RELOCATION OF MIDDLE SCHOOL (80)			796

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Healy Paul Timberlake						<p>We will NOT OBJECT to this proposed site but it is rather a poor option as the school will have to be re-located. It is possible that the school is no longer adequate as it is, but where does it re-locate to? Our approval would be dependant on achieving 40% affordable housing.</p> <p>Adding another potential 120 cars to the commuting/school run in Corfe Mullen is not good. It is such an unsustainable settlement when accessing employment and services. This location and Verwood are two locations that should not be developed any further.</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 is not a Green Belt site, however the purposes of the Green Belt are still well suited to this proposed site. Corfe Mullen has doubled in size over the last 40 years. It is basically a residential area with no real centralised town/village centre. This new proposed development will add to the spread of an already unsustainable settlement.</p> <p>To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.</p> <p>Technically this development would be contained within the school grounds, but as the school will have to be relocated, it would be encroaching on the countryside elsewhere, doubtless on Green Belt.</p> <p>VISUAL IMPACT ON BOTH THE NATURAL AND HISTORIC LANDSCAPE</p> <p>The potential development on this site would not have a great visual impact on the natural landscape, it is a flat self contained area bound by some trees, a mature beech hedge and other mixed native hedgerow. A great deal of planting of mature deciduous trees would be required, the planting to be done before the development commences and the developers contracted to look after the planting to make sure it survives the first couple of years. The old school building should be preserved, it was built in 1897 and has become a part of the historic landscape of north Corfe Mullen.</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 Lockyers School 1.4km* Middle? 1.5km Corfe Hills 0.6km 2km 2km to the south *This is approximate and to both schools. To Henbury View the distance has been measured using the existing paths to the school, avoiding the main road. If Lockyers school was relocated and no longer within walking distance for many Corfe Mullen children, not only would this site be unsustainable, so too would much of the existing areas in Corfe Mullen.</p> <p>EMPLOYMENT There are few employment opportunities within the settlement. Only 22% live and work in Corfe Mullen, 86% of all commuters were car drivers or passengers. (Taken from the Core Strategy which uses the 2001 census figures). There are a number of employment centres in Wimborne, otherwise the main centres are Ferndown Industrial Estate, Bournemouth Airport, Bournemouth and Poole. Commuting for Corfe Mullen : 2001 census Internal commuters - 1151 In commuters - 606 Out commuters - 3986 Total commuters (in and out) - 4592 86% of all commuters were car drivers or passengers. (Core Strategy 2001 ONS census) This is not a sustainable location.</p> <p>PUBLIC TRANSPORT This is very poor. Number 3 to Poole is a ½ hourly service. It does not stop at the Creekmoor out of town shopping centre so it is no good for any one working there. Time to Poole is 24 minutes.</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>Number 3 to Wimborne is a ½ hourly service. Time is 7 minutes.</p> <p>Number 13 to Ferndown Industrial Estate and Bournemouth. A 1/2 hourly service from Wimborne, so potential passengers must catch the number 3 and change buses. Time to Bournemouth is 1hr from Wimborne.</p> <p>NEAREST CENTRE WITH FULL RANGE OF SERVICES</p> <p>There is a reasonable supermarket in north Corfe Mullen, but for a full range of services a car trip to Wimborne, Broadstone or Poole.</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>GI to take the residents to the open spaces in the north would be most important as there are conservation areas to the south and east. The Roman road will also provide a good track for walkers with pushchairs and also cyclists so a link to that must be provided.</p> <p>Is there any possibility of recovering and using more of the disused railway track that ran from Wimborne to West Moors? If the disjointed parts of this track were linked it may help to get cyclists to Ferndown Industrial estate. A track through WMC5 south of Leigh Road may help.</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: See ETAG Response</p> <p>TRANQUILLITY: sense of place Only the restfulness of a large green open space, but as a school playing field it is not a great loss. There are quite busy roads around it.</p> <p>LIGHT POLLUTION See the ETAG Response for a report by Bob Mizon.</p> <p>DRAINAGE PPS25 (causing increase in river flooding or surface water problems) It is a high flat area so SUDS and permeable surfaces</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>should be adequate.</p> <p>PROXIMITY TO HEATHLAND AND AVAILABILITY OF SANGS FOR MITIGATION</p> <p>Corfe Mullen is surrounded by sensitive areas. This northern edge of the village sweeps down from the ridge, across the A31, to the flood plain of the Stour Valley. It is highly commendable that a great swathe to the north and west of this plateau should be set aside as SANGS. It should be protected as such for the foreseeable future to prevent more intrusive development encroaching on the wider landscape.</p> <p>PROVISION OF ADDITIONAL INFRASTRUCTURE (schools etc.)</p> <p>The real problem is where would the new school go? One suggestion from the 2008 issues and options was that the school playing fields were built on, and the school shared the current recreation ground. We do not think this a good suggestion, particularly as the current recreation ground appeared to be well used by dog walkers. We do not think dog walking and children's playing fields are a good mixed use.</p> <p>IMPACT ON TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE</p> <p>Have you ever considered providing an information sheet advising residents on how much of their income they can save if partners/households car share? In order to facilitate one car families, safe cycle tracks must be provided. It is not much good if cars park over cycle tracks or if the tracks suddenly stop before a difficult junction. They need to be a continuous safe system that bypasses the very bad roundabouts and junctions. Cycling and cheaper more efficient public transport are the only means of stabilising the traffic situation.</p> <p>It is unlikely that the modifications to existing congested junctions and roundabouts will make any difference, especially with the scale of development planned up to 2027. The only way forward is to make settlements more self-contained. If the school run can be eliminated, the in and out commuting by car moderated, then just maybe the traffic will not grind to a halt. Punishing the shoppers, who help to keep the retail areas profitable, by restricting shoppers parking is not the answer. If shopping gets too difficult the internet will take over. Heavier charging on all 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
							parking may help keep workers out of the car parks, but this is no good if there is no reasonable alternate means of travel. It is important that residents are not made to feel as if they are being punished for past and future development not of their choosing.			
521337	Mrs Christine Charlesworth		CSO17858	Option CM 1		General Comment	There are too many ifs, buts and maybes in this consultation. No site is specified for the new Cuthbury allotments, for instance, despite the fact that no increase in their number is used as a justification for proposal WMC1. Likewise, in proposals CM1 Lockyers School is proposed for relocation, but no site is specified and it is admitted that 'if a site cannot be found in the built up area of the village, Green Belt land would need to be used for the school'.			796
359264	Mr Peter Afield	Director Goads by Ltd	CSO18172	Option CM 1	Support		J. Havelock and A. Lloyd are the owners of approximately 1 hectare of land to the south west of Blandford Road at Corfe Mullen. This is identified on the plan (Appendix 1) attached to this form of representation. The site is just to the north of a petrol filling station (Windgreen Garage) with an ancillary shop. Beyond this are sports facilities, including a hall, and a library. Some of these areas are already the subject of Policy CM3 of the adopted East Dorset Local Plan. This policy states that: "Developments falling within Use Classes A1, A2, A3, B1 and community uses will be permitted in accordance with Policy SHDEV1 Para 6.236 along Wareham Road at Hill View Post Office, around the junction with Albert Road, the library and Windgreen garage in areas shown on the Proposals Map. Any such development or redevelopment will be subject to the provision of off-street car parking and/or rear service areas and must not prejudice the amenities of residential properties. Residential development at first floor level will also be permitted in association with such development." The intention of this policy was to consolidate and strengthen the two principal centres at Corfe Mullen, including the area around the Windgreen Garage site. Given that the Core Strategy may allocate more than additional 300 new dwellings to the northern part of the settlement, there is an even greater need to	Add new Option CM4: "Development could take place on land west of Blandford Road to create an enhanced village centre to this part of Corfe Mullen. Appropriate future uses for the site could include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retail • Medical surgery / health care facility, with pharmacy • Care Home • Residential (where in excess of 400 metres from Dorset heath land) As a consequence, the green belt should be amended in accordance with the plan attached as Appendix 2 to this form of representation.		796

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>strengthen the commercial and community centre around the Windgreen Garage site. The land south west of Blandford Road is ideal to accommodate these additional uses.</p> <p>A Parish Plan for Corfe Mullen was prepared in 2006. Questionnaires were sent to residents. The responses were analysed and the views were summarised in the plan. Key points relevant to these representations are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a need for a new dental practice in the settlement. • There may be a further need for a doctor's surgery if more housing is constructed at Corfe Mullen – some respondents stated that they currently travel outside of the area to get to a doctor or dentist. • A cyber café is required. • A focal point will help bring the village together. <p>A Corfe Mullen Focus Group meeting, held in May 2008, confirmed some of the identified needs; in particular the lack of shops and doctors facilities. The Core Strategy Issues and Options develops some of these matters. It acknowledges that the village has limited facilities, but that there is capacity to accommodate another retail store in the settlement. Paragraph 9.44 summarises the facilities required to support further development at Corfe Mullen:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More shops of all kinds, including banks and retain the existing Post Offices. • More health facilities, especially dentists and doctors. • Employment opportunities. • Facilities and entertainment for young people. <p>The plan reproduced on Page 169 of the Core Strategy identifies various sites within the northern 'Area of Search'. The accompanying text, in Paragraphs 9.68 – 9.71, describes landscape, environment / conservation, land use and other constraints to the development of six sites. Land west of Blandford Road is not one of these. Together with the three sites that have been identified as potential allocations, it is free from any impediment to development.</p> <p>It is therefore submitted that the site is suitable 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>accommodate a range of uses to compliment the residential development of 300+ dwellings at Lockyer's School, east of Violet Farm Close and at the eastern end of the recreation ground. The range of uses could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retail • Medical surgery / health care facility, with pharmacy • Care Home • Residential (where in excess of 400 metres from Dorset heath land) <p>Options CM1 – CM3 will require an amendment to the boundary of the green belt around Corfe Mullen. It is submitted that a new boundary can also exclude land west of Blandford Road from the green belt so as to permit the development of the site with the range of uses set out above.</p>			
522396	Mr Keith Stannard		CSO1 8134	Option CM 1	Object					796
522410	Susan Spiller		CSO1 8141	Option CM 1	Object		<p>As an allotment holder I do object until further detail on where it is considered that the allotments would be relocated to. The site is established and the land fertile and pleasant to work being adjacent to the Recreational ground. If there is space for them within the village??? Can this space then not be used for housing? If resisting to an acceptable location is inevitable then an advantage would be if the site was secure/lockable and sheds or storage was allowed. (Like the allotments in Blandford). Traffic flow is also of concern as the roundabout junction at that end of the village is already very congested at peak flow times. Whilst I appreciate the need for affordable housing, the definition of affordable at this time, and in this financial climate is difficult in itself. What is deemed affordable?? In our area?</p>			796
522444	Adrian Barker	Terence O'Rourke Ltd	CSO1 8147	Option CM 1	Object		<p>This representation has been prepared by Terence O'Rourke Ltd, on behalf of the Perry Family Trust, in response to the current consultation on the Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy. Specifically we refer to the options presented for the</p>			796

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>delivery of housing at Corfe Mullen. The Perry Family Trust is the owner of 4.4 hectares of land between Pardy's Hill and the B3074, Blandford Road in Corfe Mullen.</p> <p>Having reviewed the consultation document and the suggested housing sites for Corfe Mullen, we do not consider that they represent the most acceptable strategy for the community.</p> <p>Background and need for housing</p> <p>The draft regional strategy for the south west was subject to public examination in 2007 and consequential additional studies were being carried out when, in July 2010 the Coalition Government revoked all Regional Strategies, effectively halting the production of the strategy. The draft strategy has however informed work on the current Core Strategy, including the level of housing, which stands at 6,500 new houses across East Dorset. Furthermore, following a high court judgement in November 2010 Regional Strategies have been reinstated, for the time being and it is therefore appropriate to treat the emergent policies as a material consideration.</p> <p>The need to deliver housing in Corfe Mullen is also recognised at a local level. At the recent meeting of Corfe Mullen Parish Council, on 6 December 2010, 10 out of 14 voting councillors agreed that 200 or more new dwellings would be required to adequately serve the community over the plan period, with only a single councillor arguing that no new housing should be delivered. Enclosed is a copy of the minutes of that meeting, for your information.</p> <p>The recently published Localism Bill will remove Regional Spatial Strategies from the development plan, whilst at the same time removing the need for local planning authorities to address regional housing targets. However there is likely to remain a local need for housing land even it at a lower level than previously identified. The need for local planning policies to be tested for soundness will also remain. With the publication of the Localism Bill it is clear that local views have growing significance in shaping planning policies. In this context the views of local groups and parish councils will have increased significance. In the context of the current consultation</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 parish council's position of recognising the need for new housing, but opposing the currently suggested strategy for delivery of that growth is significant.</p> <p>The need for soundness</p> <p>Planning Policy Statement 12: Creating strong safe and prosperous communities through Local Spatial Planning (PPS12) sets out the steps that Local Planning Authorities must take when preparing Local Development Frameworks. It also sets out the standards against which Development Plan Documents are judged, in order to be considered sound. Namely, the policies must be justified, effective and consistent with national policy. In order to fulfil these criteria, development plan documents and, by extension, strategic land allocations emerging through them must be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Justified <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Founded on a robust and credible evidence base – Represent the most appropriate strategy when considered against the reasonable alternatives • Effective <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Deliverable – Flexible – Able to be monitored • Consistent with national policy <p>Paragraph 4.44 of PPS12 establishes that the deliverability of a strategy is predicated on there being no regulatory or national policy barriers to the delivery of the strategy, such as the presence of protected wildlife sites and landscapes or sites of historic or cultural importance. Paragraph 4.45 goes on to highlight that deliverability also requires those partners essential to the delivery of the plan such as landowners and developers to be signed up to it.</p> <p>Planning Policy Statement 3: Housing (PPS3) stipulates that in order for housing sites to be considered deliverable, they must be Available, Suitable and Achievable</p> <p>The Draft Core Strategy</p> <p>The approach to the delivery of housing, which has emerged through the draft Core Strategy, is to provide housing through a series of modest extensions to existing settlements. In this context,</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>three contiguous sites have been identified as options for housing growth within Corfe Mullen, at Lockyers School, land off Violet Farm Close and the eastern part of the recreation ground.</p> <p>Overall, we consider it important that all potential sites for housing delivery are considered so that the most appropriate strategy for the village can be developed. The individual sites should therefore be considered in the context of the PPS3 and PPS12 tests set out above. In the first instance, we would highlight that significantly no alternatives have been presented with regard to providing replacement sites for the facilities which would be lost as a result of the suggested strategic allocations. This casts doubt over the effectiveness of the strategy as a whole, in terms of its deliverability, its flexibility and its suitability. We consider that in its current form, there is a risk of the strategy being found unsound, when the above tests are applied.</p> <p>Corfe Mullen Parish Council has objected to the identification of the sports pitches (CM3) and allotments (CM2). The Corfe Mullen Sports Association, which operates the recreation ground has echoed the objection to site CM3, both sets of comments are enclosed. While the principle of development of the Lockyers School site (CM1) is not considered unacceptable, the availability of the site is uncertain. The suitability of each of the suggested sites is discussed below. There cannot be certainty about them until all uses have been found an appropriate location. The current strategy relies on a chain of events which cannot, at this time, be guaranteed.</p> <p>Lockyers School (CM1) – 80 dwellings While the site is outside of the green belt and in an accessible location, its availability for development is uncertain and the site cannot be said to be deliverable. The parish council's response to the consultation for this site, based on comments from Dorset County Council, confirms that there are no plans to change the organisation of the Corfe Mullen schools pyramid, or to rebuild Lockyers School for at least 10 years. The existing school is functional and there is currently no reason for it to be replaced. 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>any case, there is not sufficient funding for a replacement school to be constructed and it is doubtful whether the level of housing proposed for the site could viably support the construction of a replacement.</p> <p>The school and its playing fields are a vital local facility, both in their primary function and also in providing facilities for the use of local sports and other clubs, outside of school hours. If the site were to be developed for housing it would be necessary to provide at least equivalent facilities elsewhere, and these would need to be provided in advance of the closure of the school. From a basic review of Corfe Mullen it is difficult so see an alternative site to accommodate such a facility and it is apparent that consideration has not yet been given to possible alternatives by the local authority.</p> <p>In light of the above this site cannot be considered deliverable, according to the tests set out in PPS3. Being an operating school, it is clearly not available and given the County Council's current position and the need to re-provide the school elsewhere, it is not realistically achievable and therefore fails the tests of appropriateness.</p>			
523300	Mr Trevor Abbott		CSO1 8284	Option CM 1	Support					796
523319	Mr Ryan Johnson	Turley Associates	CSO1 8328	Option CM 1	Object		<p>As stated above, the uncertainty surrounding the delivery of such options calls into question their eligibility as either deliverable or developable sites within the terms of PPS3. In the absence of robust housing land supply evidence to the contrary, Taylor Wimpey also considers the reduction of housing requirements at Corfe Mullen from 700 to 310 homes is unsound. Taylor Wimpey maintains that discounted area 3 should therefore be retained as a deliverable alternative or addition to the Council's options to meet the strategic housing requirements directed to Corfe Mullen. Taylor Wimpey is willing to work in partnership with the Council, landowners and the local community to deliver the most suitable and deliverable options for growth north/north west of</p>			796

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							Corfe Mullen within this context. Further evidence will be provided to elaborate on these representations through subsequent consultation stages of this DPD. See attachment			
527750	Mr Colin MacNee		CSO1 8910	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
527818	Mr Nigel Lester	Synergy Housing Association	CSO1 8961	Option CM 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.			796
527849	Miss Kate Tunks	Transport Planning Officer Dorset County Council	CSO1 9035	Option CM 1	Support		Option CM 1 Any development should aim to provide local facilities to increase the level of self containment and reduce the level of car trips across Corfe Mullen as a whole. Sustainable transport in Corfe Mullen would benefit from the provision of defined local centre. A significant increase in the number of properties could also be an opportunity to improve the public transport provision for Corfe Mullen.			796
533834	Mr Tim Harris		CSO1 9201	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
534820	Mr Paul Batten		CSO1 9427	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
534837	Mrs P Martin		CSO1 9489	Option CM 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.			796
534875	Mr Brian Lane		CSO1 9533	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
534914	Mrs		CSO1	Option		No Opinion				796

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	P Froud		9649	CM 1						
535070	Mr Alan Reade		CSO1 9623	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
535112	Mr Jack Tindall		CSO1 9697	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
535167	Mrs Lynda Lake		CSO1 9749	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
535209	Mr P Webster		CSO1 9789	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
535349	P Thomas		CSO1 9817	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
535368	Mr Andrew Evans		CSO1 9868	Option CM 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.			796
535387	Mr Brian Cox		CSO1 9942	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
535393	Mr Jeremy Berg		CSO1 9895	Option CM 1	Support		ROADS, ROADS, ROADS, BEFORE YOU BUILD ANYWHERE & DESTROY EVERYONES WAY OF LIFE FOREVER, BUILD ROADS & BY PASSES.			796
535421	Mr Roland Andrews		CSO2 0609	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
535457	Mr Matthew Newman		CSO1 9952	Option CM 1	Object					796
535500	David Veevers		CSO2 0005	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
361024	Mr & Mrs Kenny Pearce		CSO2 2091	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
361288	Mrs Ruth DOLLERSON		CSO2 1498	Option CM 1	Object		Objections to CM1: 1. economic reality - wrong time for expensive re-development. 2. Uncertainty of middle schools. These are phasing out elsewhere, so re-development could be a total waste of money 3. Maintain historic building - unique and of interest to CM 4. Protect Green belt [IF CM1 must be used, please relocate to side of recreation ground to maximize use of recreational facilities for school & locals. VITAL we use money & facilities wisely!]			796
482494	Mrs Yvette Jones		CSO2 1873	Option CM 1	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 appropriate. They do not have to cause illness through acute distress of residents just to line the developers' pockets and gratify councillors.			796
498211	Mrs J		CSO2 1724	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Auckland									
498402	Mrs T Hughes		CSO2 2231	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
508735	Mr Peter Barham		CSO2 2264	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
535504	Mr Michael Beer		CSO2 0055	Option CM 1	Object					796
535509	Mrs S Durant		CSO2 0071	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
535517	Mr Roy Rich		CSO2 0087	Option CM 1	Object					796
535550	Mrs D Mogg		CSO2 0165	Option CM 1	Support					796
535566	Mrs L Cook		CSO2 0213	Option CM 1	Object					796
535567	Ms Judy McMath		CSO2 0222	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
535574	Mr and Mrs Ralph Williams		CSO2 0237	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
535591	A Walker		CSO2 0285	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
535610	Mr Stewart Bullen		CSO2 0345	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
535662	Dianne Trevett		CSO2 0394	Option CM 1	Support		a) Support CM1 Lockyers as long as avoids relocating the school onto green belt land. Subject to Dorset County Council approval could look to sell off school playing fields for housing before the education structure & schools requirement is resolved. Consider closing to through traffic the middle section of Wimborne Road between Lockyers School & land by Violet Farm Close so that pupils have a traffic free access to the recreation ground for their sports facilities thus increasing midweek use of the recreation ground			796
535670	Mr Dave Allen		CSO2 0405	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
535678	Mr Andrew Bryant		CSO2 0433	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
535688	Mrs Susan Hobbs		CSO2 0523	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
535698	Mr John Stone		CSO2 0471	Option CM 1	Object					796
535701	Mr Andy Skeats		CSO2 0480	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
535815	Mrs C M Davies		CSO2 0550	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
535836	Mr Peter Parsons		CSO2 0577	Option CM 1	Support					796
535865	Mr D.C Bryson		CSO2 0640	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
535875	Mr		CSO2	Option		No Opinion				796

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

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 Kitchenside		0670	CM 1						
535907	Mr Christopher Baxendale		CSO20707	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
535935	Mr Peter J Medler		CSO20825	Option CM 1	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.			796
535940	Mrs Linda Medler		CSO20772	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
536014	Mrs Dawn Tindall		CSO20866	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
536046	Mr L Appleton		CSO20886	Option CM 1	Support					796

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
536129	Mr Peter Houghton		CSO2 0961	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
536169	Mr Tony Trevis-Bell		CSO2 1009	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
536267	Trish Wheeler		CSO2 1148	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
536282	Mrs Doreen Kingaby		CSO2 1181	Option CM 1	Object					796
536324	Paul Sumner		CSO2 1263	Option CM 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 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 sites and they will all destroy habitat for local wildlife, VWM4 will also see ssi sites reed beds ancient hedge rows etc. severely disrupted. Did you know that there is a flood plain? What about the scientific report on the River Crane and fishing lakes down there? Common-sense please.			796
536330	A Aylmore		CSO2 1252	Option CM 1	Object					796

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
536335	S Aylmore		CSO2 1273	Option CM 1	Object					796
536341	Mr Adrian Bowyer		CSO2 1300	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
536346	Mr Ben Richards		CSO2 1343	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
536349	Mrs C Bowyer		CSO2 1367	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
536449	Mr Dave Isaacs		CSO2 1442	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
536543	Mrs Samantha Fysh		CSO2 1513	Option CM 1	Support		NO MORE HOUSES IN VERWOOD.. ENOUGH IS ENOUGH!!!!			796
536572	Mr Roger Fysh		CSO2 1573	Option CM 1	Support		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			796
536576	Mrs Valerie Green		CSO2 1578	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
536628	Mr C.A Wills		CSO2 1640	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
536699	Ms Kathryn D'Arcy		CSO2 1769	Option CM 1	Support		Ensure that all existing unoccupied homes are utilised. Look at infill in a positive way- Ensure that all infrastructure REALLY supports proposed development Do not build homes if the occupants are unable to find work locally. This leads to juvenile problems and a group of unemployed within the community. There is not enough employment in Wimborne for the number of homes proposed.			796
536771	Mr B Lusher		CSO2 1840	Option CM 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 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.			796
536790	David Steadman		CSO2 1892	Option CM 1	Support					796

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
536802	Mrs Anida Griffiths		CSO2 1946	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
536808	Ms Yvette Allen		CSO2 1983	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
536812	Mr R H Barker		CSO2 1980	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
536830	Mrs Janet Sutcliffe		CSO2 2048	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
536838	Ms Anita Pearman		CSO2 2051	Option CM 1	Object		We consider that Corfe Mullen cannot cope with this amount of rapid housing increase, it will have a detrimental effect on the lives of all the current residents of Corfe Mullen, and will create overdevelopment to what is currently a semi rural location. For example 150 new family homes could create another 300 plus cars all trying to make the morning commute which is already at breaking point.			796
536848	Ola Steadman		CSO2 2130	Option CM 1	Object					796
536850	Mr Michael Hird		CSO2 2121	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
536860	Mrs Sparks		CSO2 2181	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
536866	Ms Emma Huns		CSO2 2206	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
536932	Mr Paul Bason		CSO2 2296	Option CM 1	Support					796
537050	Diane		CSO2	Option		No Opinion				796

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Fletcher		2405	CM 1						
361342	Mr Graham Clarke	Spatial Planning Officer Dorset County Council	CSO2 2830	Option CM 1		General Comment	Notwithstanding the difficulties of finding housing sites in a highly constrained area, housing sites CM1 (Lockyers School) and CM3 (the Recreation Ground) in Corfe Mullen are undeliverable. The sites in question are currently in use for school and recreational purposes, and there are no current proposals to discontinue these uses, or relocate them elsewhere. There are no proposals to close Lockyers School. The Recreation Ground is a popular and well used local facility, the proposed discontinuance of which would be likely to provoke strong opposition from local residents and users of the sports pitches. It would also be difficult to replace the playing fields locally.			796
537075	Mrs Elaine Holt		CSO2 2439	Option CM 1	Support					796
537106	Mrs C Hebditch		CSO2 2470	Option CM 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			796

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

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			
537362	Mr Peter Constable		CSO2 2528	Option CM 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, Stone Lane.			796
537435	Ms Pauline Burton		CSO2 2556	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
537529	Mrs C White		CSO2 2583	Option CM 1	Object		I am particularly concerned about the proposals for Lockyers School, Corfe Mullen and the relocation of allotments. I hope the old school building can be retained for some form of community use. I do not object to the school being redeveloped on the existing site, provided the old building is retained, and the wild area. My son attended this school, and he shares my concerns. Since most children walk to school there, placing a new school at the other side of the recreation ground increases their journey, especially as it is away from the main bulk of existing housing, and majority of the school population. I hope the rural nature and existing wildlife can be retained and even enhanced. Decades of soil improvement and cultivation are lost when allotments are moved, the tenants do not always acquire land of equivalent quality in return. This view applies to Cuthbert allotments as well. More land needs to be made available for community growing of food, including a community orchard, as local food production will become more important in the future. We should not use farmland for housing. Our green belts need to be protected without question. Architectural style and environmental good practice are crucial if new houses or industrial units have to be sited close to existing countryside. It would be appropriate to incorporate some form of green energy generation into any industrial sites and to encourage developers to find ways of making each new area of housing self sufficient in terms of energy. Land may need to be incorporated into their plans to accommodate this.			796

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
537571	Mr and Mrs N Leatherdale		CSO2 2635	Option CM 1		No Opinion				796
538210	Mr and Mrs Peter Griffiths		CSO2 2713	Option CM 1	Object					796
361276	Mr John Goddard		CSO1 19	9.82	Support					799
480020	Mr Richard Aylmore		CSO2 40	9.82	Object		<p>Many residents have been working hard on their allotments for many years, they will be angry and upset if plans to build on their allotments are realised. Also, there is a significant number of residents waiting to be allocated an allotment. Can it be confirmed where in the Village the allotments would be relocated to? A location in or near to the Waterloo Valley would be very close to Corfe Mullen's sensitive heath land, thus increasing the pressures upon this land which is something that these plans wish to avoid.</p> <p>It should be confirmed where Lockyer's school would be relocated to (if it is indeed to move from its current site).</p> <p>Corfe Mullen's Green Belt should be preserved, not built upon.</p> <p>One has to question, what is the point in designating an area as Green Belt if, at a later date, its boundaries can be so easily changed and it built upon?</p> <p>The Council should promote more in-filling, i.e. where bungalows/houses are replaced by low-rise flats - examples of this can be seen around the village, the impact of in-filling is certainly less than what the Core Strategy proposes.</p> <p>Building on the Green Belt should be prevented and actively opposed. Amending the Green Belt boundaries to suit these plans is not acceptable.</p> <p>As noted, the proposals are contradictory - it wishes</p>	Corfe Mullen's Green Belt should be preserved, not built upon.		799

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact 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 improve the provision of open space and yet in reality it will reduce the provision of open space if plans to build on the Green Belt are realised.</p> <p>A development of this size would require significant infrastructure improvements - no such improvements have been proposed. Therefore, traffic congestion would increase exponentially both in and around Corfe Mullen.</p> <p>A development of this size would completely change the character of Corfe Mullen - such a population increase could bring into question Corfe Mullen's status as a village. It would place significant pressure on local facilities and services and thus lower the standard of living for existing residents.</p>			
478218	Mr Michael Denmark		CSO2 883	9.82	Object		The allotments are suitably sited at present and should not be moved. They represent a lot of work on the part of their users.			799
480020	Mr Richard Aylmore		CSO2 43	Option CM 2	Object		<p>Many residents have been working hard on their allotments for many years, they will be angry and upset if plans to build on their allotments are realised. Also, there is a significant number of residents waiting to be allocated an allotment. Can it be confirmed where in the Village the allotments would be relocated to? A location in or near to the Waterloo Valley would be very close to Corfe Mullen's sensitive heath land, thus increasing the pressures upon this land which is something that these plans wish to avoid.</p> <p>It should be confirmed where Lockyer's school would be relocated to (if it is indeed to move from its current site).</p> <p>Corfe Mullen's Green Belt should be preserved, not built upon.</p> <p>One has to question, what is the point in designating an area as Green Belt if, at a later date, its boundaries can be so easily changed and it built upon?</p> <p>The Council should promote more in-filling, i.e. where bungalows/houses are replaced by low-rise flats - examples of this can be seen around the village, the impact of in-filling is certainly less than what the Core Strategy proposes.</p>			800

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

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 the Green Belt should be prevented and actively opposed. Amending the Green Belt boundaries to suit these plans is not acceptable. As noted, the proposals are contradictory - it wishes to improve the provision of open space and yet in reality it will reduce the provision of open space if plans to build on the Green Belt are realised.			
483385	Mr Clive Fisher		CSO347	Option CM 2	Support		Preferred option but with school remaining on present site.			800
490527	Corfe Mullen Parish Council	Corfe Mullen Parish Council	CSO974	Option CM 2		General Comment	The existing allotment site has been cultivated as such since 1895. The soil is therefore of very high quality and it would be extremely difficult, if not impossible, to find an alternative suitable site within the parish. The Parish Council estimates that an additional allotment site of at least double the size of the current one is required to accommodate the growing demand for allotments, and better parking and facilities are also required. As the adjacent field was also cultivated as allotments until the late 1960s, this would be an ideal site for this much needed extension to current facilities, rather than being used for housing.			800
360714	Mrs Carol Morgan		CSO2016	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
361055	Mr David Oakley		CSO1006	Option CM 2	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.			800
361099	Mrs Lynette Payne		CSO1252	Option CM 2	Object		A good number of these options, especially in Wimborne and Parley, are on the edges of the urban areas. Building in these locations changes the whole ethos of the area. When you leave Wimborne you see fields, trees and rivers dotted with thatched cottages. Even along Leigh Road, there is a definite rural feel, with true separation between Wimborne and Colehill. Developing along here, or Cranborne Road will dramatically change the area, for the worst. This in turn reduces people's quality of life, as we see our			800

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

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 creep closer to urbanisation, field by field. Why can't some of the brownfield sites be used instead?			
361111	Mr Raymond Brown		CSO2 070	Option CM 2	Support		Affordable Homes - What would be the process on the allocation / purchase / rental of affordable homes? Would they be available only to local East Dorset residents, (say minimum of 10 years residency in the East Dorset District)? I would be concerned if they ended up being allocated to EU or non EU immigrants with little connection to the area.			800
361170	Mr T Harvey		CSO2 841	Option CM 2	Support					800
484088	Mr David Price		CSO2 505	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
490852	Mr C J TIMMS		CSO1 064	Option CM 2	Object		Building 310 (approx.) homes in this area will completely change the character of this old part of the village, changing forever the relative tranquillity enjoyed by the residents. In my opinion housing on this scale should be carried out to the west of the village in the Naked Cross area, where there will be much less impact.			800
491311	Mr Kevin Gilling		CSO2 707	Option CM 2	Support					800
491317	M S WALKER		CSO1 209	Option CM 2	Object		To lose the recreational facilities which are well placed and extremely well used would impact significantly on the community 'quality of life' and 'well being'. Putting buildings in the area CM3 would have a negative impact on the Stour Valley. These facilities and sports fields are easily accessible to all locals through the public footpaths and roads. As Corfe Mullen has been extensively developed already to one to the largest villages in the UK, I feel that it has had more than its fair share of development over the past years.			800
491401	Mr		CSO1	Option	Support		The local roads, schools, hospitals would be unable			800

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

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 Ost		270	CM 2			to cope with extra movements of traffic and people coming into the area.			
495562	Mr MJ Banting		CSO1 509	Option CM 2	Object					800
495625	Mr Michael McMath		CSO1 536	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
495971	Mr T A Reith		CSO2 193	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
496188	Mr RE Vogel		CSO1 615	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
496479	Charlotte Dixon		CSO1 702	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
496564	Mr JH Lockwood		CSO1 749	Option CM 2	Support		How are you going to ensure these so called affordable homes aren't snapped up by outsiders buying second homes.			800
496612	Mr and Mrs JP Lovell		CSO1 799	Option CM 2	Object					800
496958	Mrs J Beech		CSO1 929	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
497026	Doreen Smith		CSO1 986	Option CM 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.			800
497060	Mrs Mary Tuffrey		CSO2 057	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
497089	Mr Frank A Soan		CSO2 102	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
497184	Mr Hilling		CSO2 190	Option CM 2	Support					800
497343	Sharon Sutcliffe		CSO2 273	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
497743	Mrs Susan Jefferies		CSO2 458	Option CM 2	Support		Least worst option, but we must either save the allotments or find a new, better and bigger site for the existing allotments. We must remember that there is a good reason why they were located there in the first place. This is the best land in the village (ex Violet Farm) both fertile and sunny. Fertile soil and a good location is essential for allotment but not for housing.			800
497773	Mr R Johnstone		CSO2 476	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
498044	Mrs Carolyne Banks		CSO2 659	Option CM 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.			800
498047	Mr CD Bradford		CSO2 648	Option CM 2	Support					800
498062	Mr Nick Crawford		CSO2 715	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
498084	Mr P Hartley		CSO2 748	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
498125	Mr and Mrs P Dashwo		CSO2 790	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

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									
498169	Mrs D WEAVER		CSO2 895	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
498184	Mrs Angela Barker		CSO2 922	Option CM 2	Object		Not every area needs affordable housing - if a lot of people are retired and/or own their own homes, does it matter?			800
359908	Mr F.D.A Revill		CSO6 238	Option CM 2	Object					800
359927	Mrs Ann Bissex		CSO6 355	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
360037	Mr Dave Barnes		CSO4 046	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
360685	Mr M.P Hose		CSO4 631	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
361041	Mr & Mrs C Hampton		CSO4 017	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
361089	Mr David Nash	Director Urban DNA	CSO3 351	Option CM 2	Object		Loss of green belt. This site should be used for the replacement for Lockyer's School/Playing fields to facilitate mixed use and housing development on 'Site 3' only. Allotments to be relocated to 'Site 1'. See respondents comments on CM1.	Land at Violet Farm is to be used for a replacement junior/middle school with associated play space Shared use of the recreation ground for school sports purposes will also be permitted Existing allotments are to be relocated to Site 3 and enhanced to meet local needs		800
361106	Mr and Mrs		CSO3 671	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Robin and Janet WALL									
361210	Mr John East		CSO5 113	Option CM 2	Support		This is fine providing facilities and access are properly catered for. This must include improved access to the A31 which is already a nightmare for local residents			800
361222	Ms Sarah WASTEL		CSO6 325	Option CM 2	Support					800
361246	Mr Andy Edwards		CSO4 135	Option CM 2	Support	General Comment	I strongly believe that the Waterloo Valley in Corfe Mullen (including Broadmoor Road and Pardy's Hill) should be protected from new housing due to the fact that is beautiful, gives much pleasure to cyclists, drivers, runners, horses. This is why it is an important part of high quality Green Belt land to protect. Any building towards the top of Pardy's Hill (Sleigh Lane / Haywards Lane) will lead to further future encroachment down the beautiful Waterloo Valley. The Rec is a wonderful community asset and the space is fully utilised at the weekend with so many sports matches all over the land. It seems sensible to build on CM 2 and CM 1 if schooling needs can be met in another way (again without infringing on the Waterloo Valley).			800
361278	Mrs Nicola Hoar		CSO3 747	Option CM 2	Support		A31 should be increased to dual carriageway as far west as Merley before any of this can happen. Even at non-rush hour times, this road cannot cope. I hope the transport improvements include subsidised bus fares and regular services. Otherwise people will persist in using cars even if there is gridlock.			800
361295	Mr & Mrs Arnold		CSO6 719	Option CM 2	Object					800
361303	Lt.Col R.A Peake		CSO3 328	Option CM 2	Support		A "tidy link" to both CM1 and CM3 and a much needed access to recreation ground that Lockyers School children could use if their playing fields were	The late Charles Weldon's "scrap yard" to be purchased, cleared and established as		800

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

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 for CM1	allotments. It would clear the lower Wareham Road of an illegal establishment, smarten that end of the village and the allotments would link in well with the Naked Cross Nursery.		
361318	Mr F.L Marsh		CSO6 239	Option CM 2	Support		The bus service would need to be improved e.g. by restoration of a direct bus to the Bournemouth area from Corfe Mullen.			800
477822	Ms Susan Rayment		CSO6 767	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
491232	Mr Keith Barnett		CSO6 972	Option CM 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.			800
498268	Mr and Mrs R Cullen		CSO3 003	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
498271	Ms Mandy Cheeseman		CSO3 048	Option CM 2	Object		Corfe Mullen is a large enough village at present. Traffic in the mornings is horrendously busy without adding to it. I walk up to the Rec often and it's always being used and would be a real shame to lose it to houses in such a picturesque spot. Also, the main reason I moved to Stour View Gardens!			800
498280	Mr and		CSO3	Option	Support					800

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

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 G Norris		042	CM 2						
498335	Mr and Mrs Lester		CSO3 202	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
498336	Mr & Mrs A Basterfield		CSO3 073	Option CM 2	Support					800
498421	Mr Jeremy Hett		CSO3 180	Option CM 2	Object					800
498485	Mrs E Seward		CSO3 252	Option CM 2	Support		My preferred option. Build new school on existing school playing field. New houses on current school site from school car park to corner of Blandford/Wimborne road. Move allotments to other side on corner Lockyers/Wimborne road-edge of new school, all topsoil to make good allotment ground. New houses off Violet Farm Close- allotment current site, as per CM2. Leave playing field in recreation ground CM3.			800
498495	Mr John Williams		CSO3 271	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
498711	Mr Tam Chant		CSO3 383	Option CM 2	Support					800
498996	Mrs M E Clarke		CSO3 450	Option CM 2	Support					800
499231	Mrs A Lathbury		CSO3 520	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
499236	Mr J		CSO3 536	Option CM 2	Object					800

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Pipe									
499245	Mr and Mrs N Butler		CSO3 575	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
499261	Mrs Norma Jackson		CSO3 609	Option CM 2	Support		I have no objection to the limited use of green belt land for development, as long as there are no water/flooding issues, and there are enough green spaces in any development for children's play areas. There does not seem to be a village centre in Corfe Mullen anyway, so a new development should be welcomed as an opportunity to provide this. Can't see any detriment to the Co-op or Library - there are still enough people living around them.			800
499290	Mrs Lisa TURNBULL		CSO3 642	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
499384	Mr A I ROSE		CSO3 715	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
499858	Mr & Mrs M Palmer		CSO3 970	Option CM 2	Object					800
499873	Mr Graham Holt		CSO3 985	Option CM 2	Support					800
499888	Mr & Mrs Johnson		CSO3 975	Option CM 2	Support		This is unused waste land. The recreation ground is far more valuable for community use and the school area is too small for what is prepared.	Allotments can easily be relocated.		800
500060	Mr Stuart Piddock		CSO4 073	Option CM 2	Support					800
500070	Mr J W ELCOCK		CSO4 105	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
500113	Mr and Mrs T J Gurr		CSO4 134	Option CM 2	Support		This seems the obvious location for limited development within the village. The two fields are unused apart from occasional grazing and are fenced off prohibiting any access.	We feel the allotments could be re-located off Pardy's Hill, indeed perhaps the whole area (now safe from development) could become a public open space.		800
500147	Mrs R Edwards		CSO4 159	Option CM 2	Support		The Waterloo Valley, including the fields around Pardy's Hill, Broadmoor Road and Hayward's Lane, is a beautiful area, giving Corfe Mullen its unique 'rural' feel. It is constantly in use by walkers, cyclists and horse riders. Any building on the fields surrounding this area would completely destroy the natural beauty, enjoyed by so many. If any new houses have to be built, keep them close to the areas that are already built up - as this will not change the character of the village. Also any building on the hills adjacent to Pardy's Hill will greatly increase the risk of flooding to houses below.			800
500222	Mr S Hartley		CSO4 184	Option CM 2	Support					800
500350	Mr P H Bartlett		CSO4 217	Option CM 2	Support					800
500361	Mr and Miss N and A Middleton and Turner		CSO4 256	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
500427	Mrs D J LYONS		CSO4 308	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
500558	Mr A Baker		CSO4 349	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
500697	Mr		CSO4	Option		No Opinion				800

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Thomas SMITH		477	CM 2						
500706	Mr and Mrs R Jeans		CSO4 503	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
500720	Mrs VALLIER		CSO4 521	Option CM 2	Object					800
500748	Mrs Lauren Matthews		CSO4 584	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
500749	Mrs Joyce House	Corfe Mullen Allotments	CSO4 572	Option CM 2	Support		This option is the most suitable of the three offered. The existing road structure would be unaltered (new roads around an estate) buses pass it. Close to shopping facilities and school. The allotments could be relocated to the Waterloo Valley (green belt). This would not affect the Waterloo Road. These allotments are over 100 years old. They need updating with toilets etc.			800
500759	Mr R House	Corfe Mullen Allotment Association	CSO4 597	Option CM 2	Support		It is a parcel of land that is the most practical to develop. Also we the allotment holders could perhaps get a much better site, with some modern facilities. Waterloo Valley would be ideal.			800
500802	Mr J Hayward		CSO4 674	Option CM 2	Support					800
500814	B Fagan		CSO4 706	Option CM 2	Object					800
500836	Mrs Sylvia Hines		CSO4 717	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
500903	Mr and Mrs S and R Harris		CSO4 772	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

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	Mrs Louise Arnold		CSO4 840	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
501015	Mr & Mrs W McMillan		CSO4 859	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
501018	Mr Robert P Hand		CSO4 845	Option CM 2	Support		<p>Re: Corfe Mullen Options. Development of Recreation Ground / Lockyers School Site. Could the reason for any possible development on the eastern side of Corfe Mullen Recreation Ground be more to do with its prestigious location, rather than the need for housing and / or a new school? (i.e. the view). No doubt the more expensive properties would be designed and built with the view in mind! Why should this area / view be taken away from the many and given to the few.</p> <p>No part of Corfe Mullen Recreation Ground should be built upon EVER! It was provided as an open space to be used and enjoyed by local people, and should remain as such. Indeed, it has already been used for this purpose by generations, and as such would quite rightly meet all the required criteria for any future application for 'Town Green' status!</p> <p>Surely the most logical solution to building any new properties in the Lockyers School area of Corfe Mullen, would be to allow building on the area between 'Violet Close Farm' and the 'Allotments'. Development could also be permitted on the existing school playing field! Lockyers School could be redeveloped on its existing site, with the facilities at the Recreation Ground being used for school sporting / games activities. The recreation ground could be accessed from the school via a purpose built crossing and walkway!</p> <p>This option would have the benefits of:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1: Not having to relocate Lockyers School or the Allotments to elsewhere in the village. 2: The recreation ground would not need to be built on. 3: That any new housing would be adjacent to already residential areas. 			800

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
501056	Dr and Mrs M S Taylor		CSO4 906	Option CM 2	Object		We feel with so much Government emphasis on well being, that the unique recreation ground, which gives enormous pleasure to the residents of Corfe Mullen could be broken up, and even though there is suggestion of re siting, the recreation ground is irreplaceable, and we feel it would be an unwise decision to build on this wonderful site.			800
501079	Mrs Linda M O'Connell		CSO4 959	Option CM 2	Object		It will be essential that the allotments will need to be relocated to equivalent grade soil.			800
501107	Mr & Mrs E C Lacey		CSO4 975	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
501118	Mr Ron Cook		CSO4 999	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
501331	Mr Michael Henry		CSO5 184	Option CM 2	Support					800
501351	Mr and Mrs R D'Cruze		CSO5 220	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
501364	Mr M Devetta		CSO5 848	Option CM 2	Support					800
501485	Mrs J Jackson		CSO5 288	Option CM 2	Support		You need to take into account impact or roads, transport, shops, doctor's surgery, schools, when building new homes, not just roads alone.			800
501488	Mr Chris Lamb		CSO5 319	Option CM 2	Support					800
501502	Mr Michael WAREH AM		CSO5 365	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
501503	Mr N F Stripp		CSO5 359	Option CM 2	Object					800
501508	Mr Martin Davies		CSO5 407	Option CM 2	Object		We totally object to any buildings in CM1, CM2 and CM3. We moved to Corfe Mullen in 1979 to live in this lovely rural area with views of the fields behind our property.			800
501513	Mr O E Beverley		CSO5 400	Option CM 2	Support					800
501520	Mrs Z Merrifield		CSO5 425	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
501523	Rita Gilbert		CSO5 454	Option CM 2	Support					800
359598	Mr A Ketchley		CSO7 994	Option CM 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			800
359873	Mrs M Hughes		CSO8 611	Option CM 2	Support		A31 Canford Bottom needs to be bridged if increased traffic from new housing takes place; it just can't take any further loading (or a dual carriage way up to A350 from Ferndown).			800
359889	Mr and Mrs P Clark		CSO8 481	Option CM 2	Support		With any developments we would need to be assured that infrastructure improvements are in place BEFORE any development is consented to. This is particularly important with regard to public transport provisions. It is also important that feedback is forthcoming as an acknowledgement of our response to this survey.			800
359977	Miss		CSO8	Option	Support					800

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

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.G. Earp		049	CM 2						
360145	Mr Nigel WARREN		CSO8 201	Option CM 2	Support					800
361015	Mr and Mrs M.S and C.E Hack		CSO8 480	Option CM 2	Support					800
361113	Mr Alan Meade		CSO7 181	Option CM 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.			800
361123	Mr Iain STEVENSON		CSO8 220	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
361178	Mr and Mrs Norman and Sarah Wall		CSO8 757	Option CM 2	Support		We feel CM2 could be feasible-land as indicated at the exhibition between Broadmoor Road and Brook Road could be used as allotments, but additional plots would be needed as there is a waiting list. We do think the Green Belt needs to be protected as Corfe Mullen is basically "full" with very little additional available space.			800
361206	Mr Iain Robinson		CSO9 031	Option CM 2	Support		As housing has become unaffordable for many young people, making developers contribute to transport improvements will just mean the costs passed on and make the new homes even more out of their price bracket. Public transport fails at the moment to connect where people live to where they work, after all people tend to go to work more often than they go shopping and thus cars are needed for employment and having their own transport makes buses irrelevant and less in touch with the 24/7 and shift work employment patterns.			800

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
501542	Mr and Mrs STRACHAN		CSO5 518	Option CM 2		No Opinion	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. i.e.. Verwood Hub; Lenham, Kent; Ditton, Nr Maidstone, Kent. My ref: 10 years as a Parish Councillor in Ditton, Kent.			800
501547	Mrs Helen Lessnoff		CSO5 572	Option CM 2	Object					800
501560	Mr Christopher Clarke		CSO5 573	Option CM 2	Support					800
501589	Mrs P Parkes		CSO5 654	Option CM 2	Support		I object to the homes on Lockyers school site if the new school is built on a Green Field site. Future generations will not thank us for losing these open spaces.			800
501596	Mr and Mrs B & K O'Loughlin		CSO5 706	Option CM 2	Support		Is on unused land, the other sites are used by local people. The school does need updating but not at the expense of the park.			800
501616	Mr R J Joyce		CSO5 759	Option CM 2	Support		No building in Waterloo Valley.			800
501626	Mrs J A Russell		CSO5 748	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
501694	Mr R Bryan		CSO5 789	Option CM 2	Support					800
501699	B THOMAS		CSO5 816	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
501720	Dr and		CSO5	Option		No Opinion				800

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

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 D Harlow		907	CM 2						
501761	Mr D Curtis		CSO6 007	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
501788	Mr Evan Waterman		CSO6 057	Option CM 2	Support		As you will see from my comments overleaf, I favour 2 options for Corfe Mullen, and am against one. However, I need to further clarify: Option CM 1 - This would depend on the education system adopted, and as yet no decision has been made. Option CM 2 - Care would need to be taken to ensure the density of dwellings was not too great. Option CM 3 - Corfe Mullen needs its green space.			800
501794	Mr and Mrs G Hattamore		CSO6 084	Option CM 2	Object					800
501813	Peter Holdaway		CSO6 107	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
501830	Mrs Yvonne Legg		CSO6 162	Option CM 2	Object					800
501867	Mrs I M Marks		CSO6 169	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
501873	Mr and Mrs H Lilley		CSO6 220	Option CM 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			800

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							network all these proposals will only add to our present problems and cannot be supported.			
501876	Mr J Long		CSO6 193	Option CM 2	Support					800
501880	Mr and Mrs Anderson		CSO6 205	Option CM 2	Object		I can't see how you imagine people will be able to buy all these properties that are proposed when they are unable to get mortgages, losing their jobs, all the cutbacks that if not at the present time, will be felt in the near future. Also there is not the infrastructure to accommodate hundreds more families and the cars that go with them. The roads around and through the centre of Corfe Mullen are already some of the busiest and dangerous at certain times of the day. I could go on, but these are a few points to seriously think of, as it seems you are set on keeping already very greedy builders in work!			800
501881	B W Deverill		CSO6 221	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
501900	Miss Theresa Gale		CSO6 248	Option CM 2	Object					800
501940	Mr M J Godfrey		CSO6 340	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
502022	Mr HWR Stevens		CSO6 379	Option CM 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.			800
502029	Mr J MacArthur		CSO6 418	Option CM 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.			800

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							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.			
502032	Mr and Mrs Pitt		CSO6 436	Option CM 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.			800
502059	Mr R Seddon		CSO6 492	Option CM 2	Object		Development should be restricted to brownfield sites. Greenbelt must be preserved. Any development impacting on environmentally important areas such as Wimborne water meadows and River Allen must be avoided at all costs. Affordable homes should not be built on greenfield sites which have high environmental value to the community. These heritage sites must be preserved.			800
502076	Kay Stead		CSO6 544	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
502099	Mrs Carolyn Lourens		CSO6 583	Option CM 2	Object		Increased housing means increased population. The current infrastructure is already stretched to its limits, traffic and facilities will only suffer. There is insufficient parking already for the co-op store and nearby church. How will this help our fragile environment.			800
502114	Mr P Foster		CSO6 631	Option CM 2	Support					800
502136	Mr and Mrs WA Forster		CSO6 671	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

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		CSO6 682	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
502312	Mrs Sally Brierley		CSO6 795	Option CM 2	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 first place?			800
502317	Cllr Peter Lucas		CSO6 823	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
502326	Mr and Mrs T Bennett		CSO6 865	Option CM 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.			800
502333	Mr B M Andrews		CSO6 875	Option CM 2	Support		Make parents walk their children to school. Stop parents 4x4s, etc. Spend more money on our area. Council tax far too high and what benefits do we receive from the Parish Council?			800
502345	Mr and Mrs Ray and Irene Coulson		CSO6 941	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
502347	Mrs Sarah Cobb		CSO7 034	Option CM 2	Object					800
502381	Mr Cyril Josey		CSO7 045	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
502387	Mr George Kilpatrick		CSO7 026	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
502441	Mrs Ingrid Wells		CSO7 158	Option CM 2	Object					800
502468	Mr Robert Lambert		CSO7 378	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
502568	Mrs Sarah Morgan		CSO7 273	Option CM 2	Object					800
502569	Mr & Ms M & L Skinner & Jeffries		CSO7 301	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
502570	Mr Samways		CSO7 329	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
502579	Mr & Mrs R L Thorne		CSO7 358	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
502595	Mr Colin House		CSO7 414	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
502596	Mr A C Hayter		CSO7 401	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
502610	Mr John Jackson		CSO7 462	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
502612	Hugh and Joy Dickson		CSO7 444	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
502673	Mrs		CSO7	Option	Object		The infrastructure in this area needs to be sorted out			800

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

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 Powell		554	CM 2			before anymore building goes ahead. There are times you cannot move on the roads. The area is being ruined with all the building works that are already going on.			
502701	Mrs M Williams		CSO7 588	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
502708	Ms Julia Owen		CSO7 634	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
502745	Mrs J.M Kenny		CSO7 679	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
502913	Mr & Mrs D Whitmarsh		CSO7 887	Option CM 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			800
502935	Mr Roger Parker		CSO7 806	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
503024	Ms Valerie Measey		CSO8 876	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
503085	Mr P.A. Scott		CSO7 968	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
503156	Mr and Mrs R Blunderfield		CSO8 022	Option CM 2	Object					800
503171	Sally Cooke		CSO8 071	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
503183	Ms B		CSO8 146	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Chissell									
359920	Mr S Parker		CSO9 536	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
359954	Mr Alan FLINT		CSO1 0006	Option CM 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. 			800
360029	Mr David Lanigan		CSO1 0279	Option CM 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.</p> <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</p>			800

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact 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 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 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		CSO9 819	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
360111	Mr K VIVIAN		CSO9 595	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
361037	Mr P STRATFORD		CSO1 1260	Option CM 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, 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.			800
361105	Mr John Gooch	Colehill Parish Council	CSO9 907	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
498775	Mrs P L		CSO1 0751	Option CM 2	Object		I object very strongly to any green belt land being used for housing. The roads are very often impossible			800

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

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						anyway without the massive increase proposed. HANDS OFF OUR GREEN BELT!!			
499748	Ms Soози Cooper		CSO9 736	Option CM 2	Support					800
503233	Mrs F Parkes		CSO8 230	Option CM 2	Object		<p>1. Further housing should only be considered where a proven need is indicated for affordable housing for Corfe Mullen residents (not incomers). Affordable housing should be provided in small local communities where needed by the local inhabitants.</p> <p>2. Restrictions should be placed on private developers so that they provide equal numbers of affordable and other housing.</p> <p>3. The Parish and District Councils should finance council housing, but not for resale, and for fixed terms reviewed at set intervals.</p> <p>4. Any proposals regarding Lockyers School cannot be made until the whole question of schools strategy has been worked out for the whole county; these proposals should not be included in the current Core Strategy.</p> <p>5. Moving the allotments is not a viable concept; its present location is reasonably accessible, there is a considerable waiting list, it has taken many years to bring the ground to a good state and there is not another suitable area within the village.</p> <p>6. Corfe Mullen already has adequate retail and community facilities and there is no demand for a distinctive centre to the village.</p> <p>7. "Could provide valuable green infrastructure" – only at the expense of destroying existing green infrastructure.</p> <p>8. Nothing can replace the unique location of the recreation ground (which by usage now includes the DCC area); the views are among the best in the county and it overlooks an area of outstanding natural beauty. Any other area would be too remote to be practical, be difficult to access and certainly would not have the visual appeal of the existing recreation ground.</p> <p>9. Development land is available on the north-west side of the Wareham Road which does not have an</p>			800

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							impact on the green belt; brown field sites are at present occupied by the old abattoir, the scrap yard and Naked Cross Nursery. Providing substantial fencing is erected on the south-east side of the Wareham Road, there would not be any impingement on the heathland. 10. Finally it is quite wrong to "nibble" away at our green belt when the need is not proven; find out by a referendum in the county what the inhabitants want in detail, and then look at what is needed.			
503250	Mrs Helen Poole		CSO8 244	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
503303	Mr Anthony Roberts		CSO8 305	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
503315	Mr Kenneth Wood		CSO8 333	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
503347	Ms Hardwick		CSO8 360	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
503355	Mr Robert Griffiths		CSO8 388	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
503358	Mrs H C Hoare		CSO8 419	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
503444	Mr R Hobbs		CSO8 560	Option CM 2	Object					800
503482	Mr Ron Hopkins		CSO8 663	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
503554	Mr D Verguson		CSO8 743	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
503598	Mr John Turner		CSO8 764	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
503603	Mrs DJ Morley		CSO8 786	Option CM 2	Object					800
503621	A G Haines		CSO8 827	Option CM 2	Support		As I'm sure you are perfectly aware, all developments I have ticked require serious consideration to the whole road network in the areas concerned.			800
503624	Mr RT Jackson		CSO8 837	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
503635	Mr J Gough		CSO8 890	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
503639	Mrs and Mr M Stevens		CSO8 934	Option CM 2	Object		The A31 is already over-saturated with regular gridlock on Friday/Saturday. Without major redevelopment (min 2 lane carriageway from Ferndown industrial estate to Tolpuddle) it is incapable of taking any more traffic. The entire East Dorset area has already been over-developed versus other areas of the country. It does not have the transport, social, educational, etc. resources for any more. Corfe Mullen-it is ridiculous to build on former landfill.			800
503640	N J and S A White		CSO9 032	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
503644	Mr J Riley		CSO8 965	Option CM 2	Object					800
503687	Mr Nick Smith		CSO9 053	Option CM 2	Object					800
503690	Ms Clare		CSO9 105	Option CM 2	Support					800

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Parvin									
503704	Mr R J Legge		CSO9 107	Option CM 2	Object					800
503725	Mr G A Hughes		CSO9 206	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
503759	Mr D.J. Middleton		CSO9 229	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
503787	Mrs P A Dent		CSO9 281	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
503846	Mr Anthony Hose		CSO9 303	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
503861	Mr E Hawkins		CSO9 335	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
503878	Mr Peter Smith		CSO9 393	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
503879	Mr S Smithson		CSO9 417	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
503943	Mr & Mrs Rumball		CSO9 445	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
504093	Mr & Mrs Vivian		CSO9 476	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
504101	Mrs Mary Trevis-Bell		CSO9 503	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
504216	Mr Mark Rich		CSO9 573	Option CM 2	Object					800
504285	Mr P Miller		CSO9 648	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
505273	Mrs Lorraine Hubbard		CSO9 845	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
505288	Mrs S Cramer		CSO9 881	Option CM 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.			800
505315	Mr Frank W Myerscough		CSO9 933	Option CM 2	Support					800
505354	Mr Tim Edwards		CSO9 953	Option CM 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!!!			800
505369	J Young		CSO9 980	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
505506	Mr Peter Hendra		CSO1 0056	Option CM 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.			800
505561	Mr		CSO1	Option	Support					800

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

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. Calvert		0107	CM 2						
505590	M Spalding		CSO1 0136	Option CM 2	Support					800
505656	Mr Dave Evans		CSO1 0156	Option CM 2	Object		I'm pleased the regional spatial strategy died a death. The percentage of affordable housing will be achieved I hope. The road system is already congested in this area, how will it improve? It appears a decision needs to be made as to the continuance of Lockyers School. Who owns the land that figures in the proposed development?			800
505681	Mr Nick Lewis		CSO1 0191	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
505742	Mr L. J. Ashplant		CSO1 0198	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
505760	J Evans		CSO1 0214	Option CM 2	Object		Corfe Mullen does not have the infrastructure to support further development. Already crowded roads, health services stretched - more building adds pressure. Very suspicious of so called "social housing". Great danger of spoiling rural nature of area. Democratically we should have been given the right to reject all options. It's our village. Development will turn Corfe Mullen into dirty, noisy, overcrowded place.			800
505802	Mr RGH Chapman		CSO1 0248	Option CM 2	Support					800
506161	Mr RD Holyoake		CSO1 0323	Option CM 2	Object		Any more development within Dorset's existing built up areas will end with a complete gridlock of traffic.			800
506196	Mr & Mrs P Stout		CSO1 0352	Option CM 2	Support					800
506754	Mr		CSO1	Option		No Opinion				800

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Derek E Marsh		0380	CM 2						
507026	Mr David Craig		CSO1 0432	Option CM 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.			800
507032	Mr David Oliver		CSO1 0458	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
507789	Mr CJ Barrett		CSO1 1440	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
507800	Mrs K M Platt		CSO1 1469	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
507980	Mrs Sylvia Allen		CSO1 1586	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
508383	Ms Emma Hayter		CSO1 1700	Option CM 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.			800
508413	Mrs S Best		CSO1 1760	Option CM 2	Support					800
359854	Mr T Graham		CSO1 2698	Option CM 2	Object		I was elected by vote to Corfe Mullen Parish Council on an agenda of opposing further proposed housing development in this parish. These core strategy proposals are not in accordance with the Corfe Mullen Parish plan which both CMPC and EDDC approved. Most of the proposals will mean the revision of Green Belt boundaries not in accordance			800

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

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 plan. The core strategy was right to exclude all other parts of Corfe Mullen for more development. So this parish is not a suitable place for development.			
360097	Mr John DOWLING		CSO1 4492	Option CM 2	Object					800
360131	Mr Martin Hanham		CSO1 3026	Option CM 2	Support		I consider that, now that it has been accepted that the Corfe Mullen Meadows SSSI has incorrectly shown as a constraint on residential development, your Council should look once again at the Waterloo Valley, i.e. the land between Waterloo Road and Hillside Road to accommodate further housing. Furthermore, that land constrained by the Upton Heath SSSI, in this area, should be considered for the re-location of Lockyers school.			800
361227	Miss Angela Davis		CSO1 2994	Option CM 2		General Comment	I would prefer it if the allotments were not used.			800
361277	Mrs Judith Deadman		CSO1 2980	Option CM 2		No Opinion	Having attended the stand in the village hall on 06-12 -10 I do not feel able to make an informed decision as no-one seems to have enough information and probably won't until the decision has actually been made. I appreciate the attempt to involve the public, but when all my (very pertinent in my opinion) questions were answered 'we don't know at this stage' or similar it all seems a bit pointless.			800
361300	Mr & Mrs Searley		CSO1 2973	Option CM 2	Support		We are of the opinion that you should stick to the policy of making use of brownfield sites and also make use of infill between properties when they become available. Infrastructure have to be properly sorted out before any new development takes place. If a new school site is required, the relocation to the recreation ground would be ideal as it have a lot of facilities. The old school could be adapted for use as a care home or doctors-dentist etc. The allotments could also be moved onto another part of the recreation ground. This could make way for another access in and out relieving some of the			800

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							congestion at the other entrance. If the above was to take place, it would also reduce transport. The children from the new housing would be on the school/recreation ground door step.			
361313	Ms Sarah Bowley		CSO1 2644	Option CM 2	Support					800
478235	Ms Jane Brooks		CSO1 3012	Option CM 2	Object		<p>1) Potential for increases in population of 300 - 600 people - too many for amenities and change in character of area.</p> <p>2) Current residents have chosen to live in area of low population - this would not suit everyone, but should not be changed.</p> <p>3) Argument for is 'only flat land left in Corfe Mullen so build on'. Surely this is an argument against. We should not build on last bit of flat land.</p> <p>4) If we change Green Belt boundaries, what is the point in having them, where would it stop.</p> <p>5) Light pollution from homes and street lights in rural area.</p> <p>6) Straightening of Wimborne Road brings road too close to residential properties and spoils the character of the road and area.</p> <p>7) Whatever modifications to the road system, there will be too many vehicles at peak times for it to cope.</p> <p>8) Just because wildlife is currently unthreatened - buzzards, badgers, deer, does not mean it will not be in future.</p> <p>Maybe compromise with few properties, but only on Lord Wimborne's field.</p>			800
496659	Mr & Mrs Tony & Hilary Hendy		CSO1 1732	Option CM 2	Object		The Green Belt should stay Green. Allotments should be left as they are.			800
507033	A R Twaits		CSO1 0484	Option CM 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			800

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							cars. In particular problems on the Ferndown and Wimborne bypasses need to be resolved, and the A31 to Poole link built.			
507170	Miss A K Jukes		CSO1 0576	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
507218	Mr and Mrs J Smith		CSO1 0614	Option CM 2	Object					800
507286	Mr N P Butler		CSO1 0692	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
507336	Mr John Page		CSO1 0752	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
507356	Mr and Mrs M Moody		CSO1 0842	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
507363	Mr Kevin Sayer		CSO1 0847	Option CM 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 eyesore 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.			800
507388	Mr David Huggins		CSO1 0899	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
507474	Mark and Jean		CSO1 1034	Option CM 2	Object		1) We are still due a correction in housing prices, housing benefits have artificially underpinned the			800

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Cording						<p>bubble. The so called shortage of housing is also caused by breaking up of the family unit (teenagers and young people do not need their own homes)</p> <p>2) The Green Belt must be protected, a temporary supposed need would and could not be reversed. There are hundreds of brown sites which could be utilised, without the need for more disruptive and expensive infrastructures.</p> <p>3) Green Belt land was created to protect open land between and around developments. We anticipated development and councils saying they need more land, it was and is vital so please do not change the policy. Times change, needs change, populations (immigration and emigration) demands disappear but green land cannot be replaced.</p>			
507524	Mr C G Richardson		CSO1 1078	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
507555	Mr and Mrs C Lamond		CSO1 1105	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
507659	Ms Victoria Johnstone		CSO1 1216	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
507693	Mrs P Carter		CSO1 1264	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
508835	Mrs E.L. Stratford		CSO1 2183	Option CM 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.			800
508852	Mrs L.A.		CSO1 2230	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

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									
508887	Mr J.S. Kidd		CSO1 2303	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
509065	Mrs B Burge		CSO1 2492	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
509100	Mrs Judy Waite		CSO1 2513	Option CM 2	Object					800
509106	Dawn Clark		CSO1 2528	Option CM 2	Object					800
509119	Mr A Reachill		CSO1 2537	Option CM 2	Object		Suggest reconsider land on western slopes where building has already successfully taken place i.e. Orchard Lane, Haywards Lane etc. Leave the remaining flat land i.e. school sports field, recreation ground allotments green.			800
509129	Mr Simon Briscoe		CSO1 2549	Option CM 2	Object		The search area is too limiting, confining the options. They are unacceptable. The housing proposals put forward will not satisfy the perceived affordable housing. These houses will be taken up by people to commute to other areas, as has happened previously. Building on recreational space and infill development has to stop; it is changing the village character. I understand the consultation has revealed an impasse between SSSI, nature conservation, Green Belt and our lineally developed village set on a plateau. The geography cannot change but our use of the surrounding land can - if it is deemed necessary which I doubt. This document and the Local Plan have therefore to look further.			800
509164	Mr Courtney		CSO1 2553	Option CM 2	Support					800
509168	Mr and Mrs P		CSO1 2557	Option CM 2	Object		Both recreation grounds and the allotments should be preserved as they are both an extremely valuable community resource. Lockyers School can use the			800

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Lawton						recreation ground for sporting activities. Both CM 2 and CM3 provide much needed green space for the village.			
509171	Mr and Mrs J Newman		CSO1 2561	Option CM 2	Object		We dispute the alleged requirement for more houses in this area. There are plenty of houses on the market - some would be regarded by definition as 'affordable'. Poole and Bournemouth have some of the highest unemployment in the south so why attract more people into the area to worsen the situation. The only acceptable housing would be housing association rented only to local people.			800
509181	Mrs A Jones		CSO1 2565	Option CM 2	Support		I would support CM2 although entrance would be better placed off cross roads opposite school. As cross roads top Pardy's Hill in my opinion would not cope added pressure of vehicles continuously.			800
509182	Mr K A Jones		CSO1 2569	Option CM 2	Support					800
509272	Greg Dollerson		CSO1 2602	Option CM 2	Support		Most desirable as this is in-filling - allotments could be continued until houses needed.			800
509295	Miss G Burden		CSO1 2623	Option CM 2	Object		<p>* creating more houses will not help those who can't afford a house as they will attract more people into the area. There are enough already if so many were not second homes, and those that have been built recently are far from affordable</p> <p>* The schools/doctors etc. are already full, we don't need to attract more people here. The roads are already inadequate for the level of traffic that uses them.</p> <p>* We do not need any more supermarkets around here, you don't have to travel far to get to one, and we already have the Co-op in the village.</p> <p>* Building on the recreation ground would limit the space available for playing sports and dog walking. Dog walkers would be forced onto the heathlands, which is both unsafe at times of the year (adders), and detrimental to the environment.</p> <p>* Why can we not have some green areas in the village? It will be a far less attractive place to live if</p>			800

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>every available space is built on.</p> <p>*I fail to see how building on so many fields would be creating a 'green infrastructure'.</p> <p>* How many of the people proposing this actually live in the village?</p> <p>* If only up to half of the houses being built would be 'affordable', its not exactly going to help many people buy a house, only those with money.</p>			
509316	Mr Simon Godwin		CSO1 2631	Option CM 2	Support					800
509428	Mrs Vanessa Burden		CSO1 2658	Option CM 2	Object		<p>Roads can't cope with population now. Schools overcrowded. Doctors always fully boked now. Affordable housing should have been thought of years ago instead of allowing so may expensive houses to be built, which only outsiders could afford. Too many housing estates already. Rec is uses and is central. Lockyers needs updating, not moving. Allotments have been well looked after and hard work put in. Corfe Mullen is too big now why make it bigger. It's a village not a town. There are plenty of shops in Broadstone if you can't get what you need in CM so no more supermarkets are needed or a new centre. If affordable housing is built it should only be for people who can prove they have lived in Corfe Mullen for a considerable time.</p>			800
509438	Mr Nigel Burden		CSO1 2665	Option CM 2	Object		<p>These proposals will only exacerbate the problems that already exist in the area. The infrastructure is inadequate to cope with the existing population, with doctors surgeries full to capacity, school full to capacity, woefully inadequate main road (A31 A350) to take the volumes of traffic that pass through the area. Public transport is not the answer due to the fact that residents are travelling to many differing areas for work, something that has been woefully neglected in Dorset for many years. As for social or affordable housing, these problems will not address the problem. This issue has been obvious for many years, yet precedence has been given to the building of more expensive type of residence. This is an attempt to shut the gate after the horse has bolted.</p>			800

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
509454	Mr David Burden		CSO1 2678	Option CM 2	Object		Corfe Mullen is already full - the village does not have the facilities to support any more people. The roads are already used to capacity whilst public transport to the village is almost non-existent. Public services such as the doctors surgery are already full. There is also already a lack of suitable playing areas for kids. Getting rid of most of the recreation will just heighten that and this in an age when we are worried about levels of childhood obesity. People have also put a lot of time and hard work into the allotments so destroying them for some unneeded houses is selfish. If you approve these plans it will just go to show that you don't care about servicing the village but just making a quick buck off rich city folk who will buy these.			800
509466	Mr Andy Cobb		CSO1 2682	Option CM 2	Object					800
509470	Mrs S Joyce		CSO1 2686	Option CM 2	Support		Please do no build in Waterloo Valley.			800
509513	Mr K Moore		CSO1 2707	Option CM 2	Object		This would take away a well used well established set of allotments.			800
509526	Mr E Cornick		CSO1 2714	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
509540	Chris Finlay		CSO1 2724	Option CM 2	Support		Allotment land is fairly easy to obtain as it does not need to be completely flat.			800
509549	Mr D Russell		CSO1 2730	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
509577	Mrs Elizabeth Ann Short		CSO1 2744	Option CM 2	Object					800
509632	Mr and		CSO1	Option	Object		The Recreation Ground is one of Corfe Mullen's			800

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

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 L and D Jackson		2766	CM 2			greatest assets - please leave. The roads, especially Wareham and Blandford Road cannot get any more busy - it is horrendous!! The infrastructure - parking, doctors surgery, parking, cannot handle all these extra houses and people and more cars! Some families have 3 cars.			
509759	Mrs V Kitson		CSO1 2784	Option CM 2	Support		CM2 must provide more than the current allotments on a site with reasonable soil (not heathland).			800
509782	Mr and Mrs Harrison		CSO1 2802	Option CM 2	Object					800
509790	Ian Sparks		CSO1 2810	Option CM 2	Object					800
509796	B Sparks		CSO1 2818	Option CM 2	Object		Corfe Mullen is a village with village facilities and would not cope with large amounts of new housing within its conurbations. Our wildlife would also suffer from building on the scales proposed.			800
509804	Mrs J Best		CSO1 2827	Option CM 2	Object		With reference to the Option CM2. There were originally allotments where Lockyers School is. They were taken years ago although they were originally there as far back as 1895. We already need more allotments and there is a long waiting list. We need to increase plots not deplete them.			800
509814	Mr T M Trickett		CSO1 2838	Option CM 2	Object		To allow housing allotments would need to be moved to another Green Belt site.			800
509826	Mrs P Walker		CSO1 2853	Option CM 2	Object					800
509848	Mr & Mrs I Robertson		CSO1 2868	Option CM 2	Object		We consider the allotments to be an important environmental area and leisure activity for many people, who also wish to be as self-sufficient as possible.			800
509888	Dr A		CSO1 2888	Option CM 2	Object		All three proposals for housing will cause heartache and drive a stake through the heart of the village:			800

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Craven						CM1 - builds on Lockyers site which is a beautiful school in the heart of the village. CM2 - this will destroy all the hours of hard work by the allotment holders and add lots of traffic onto an already dangerous and narrow stretch of road. CM3 - a great community space for activities by children and families. Where will the desecration of our village stop. Another set of badly thought out options for our village.			
509906	Mr P Woodward		CSO1 2908	Option CM 2	Object		CM 1 to 3 are all council/public land areas, more likely to have been acquired for the use of its citizens for recreation and local sports. The use of these areas is not welcome, there are plenty of brown sites and other options available - bunch all together in one area. Your transport dreams are ideal but there is no reality, we already have traffic issues - Lockyers Road and Wimborne Road (around the Windgreen). You have not proposed any road changes or improved access points. Its bad enough that you queue and cannot get onto the A31. This area and 3 proposals on top of each other is madness!!!			800
509923	G Woodward		CSO1 2919	Option CM 2	Object		There is not enough infrastructure to cope with that many houses in Corfe Mullen and surrounding area. Also there is a public footpath that runs through the recreation ground. Where would you relocate the allotments? Does this also mean you are getting rid of Lockyers school? The other schools are not big enough to cope with extra children. The site is of natural beauty and it would be a shame to lose it for future generations.			800
509944	J Sparks		CSO1 2936	Option CM 2	Object					800
509975	Mr and Mrs J M Price		CSO1 2958	Option CM 2	Support		1) There appear to be plenty of private dwellings for sale in Corfe Mullen so emphasis should be on affordable properties. 2) Does not government realise that with no motorway in Dorset, the A31 and other major roads can hardly take more traffic. Has central government			800

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							considered building a new small town in mid/north Dorset. 3) If Lockyers school (1897) is demolished where would a replacement school (bigger?) be built.			
510009	Mr R M Langley		CSO1 2964	Option CM 2	Object		I moved to the Broadstone/Corfe Mullen area in 1971. Since that time there has been a huge increase in housing leading to overload of traffic during peak hours - this will not be reduced/improved by public transport due to the spread out complex - making extensive journeys uneconomical for bus operators. Infill and demolish/rebuild should be the first consideration. Corfe Mullen is a spread out village and to keep referring to the village centre ignores the obvious facts - there isn't one. Housing expansion is not entirely necessary on this scale and should be considered nearby in more suitable locations.			800
510048	Mrs Dorothy Scobey		CSO1 2984	Option CM 2	Support					800
510111	Mr Brian Lane		CSO1 3019	Option CM 2	Support		For CM2 as not threatening urban sprawl nor obvious Green Belt. Should be for Corfe Mullen villagers only and must be supported by proper infrastructure, roads etc. Strongly against any building around Pardy's Hill, east and west of Haywards Lane etc. Agree with EDDC Planning officers and Broadway Malyan, which are both against too, with sound reasoning.			800
510235	Mrs Deborah Hanham		CSO1 3030	Option CM 2		No Opinion	I consider that, now that it has been accepted that the Corfe Mullen Meadows SSSI has incorrectly shown as a constraint on residential development, your Council should look once again at the Waterloo Valley, i.e. the land between Waterloo Road and Hillside Road to accommodate further housing. Furthermore, that land constrained by the Upton Heath SSSI, in this area, should be considered for the re-location of Lockyers school.			800
510241	Miss		CSO1	Option		No Opinion	I consider that, now that it has been accepted that the			800

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Danielle Hanham		3034	CM 2			Corfe Mullen Meadows SSSI has incorrectly shown as a constraint on residential development, your Council should look once again at the Waterloo Valley, i.e. the land between Waterloo Road and Hillside Road to accommodate further housing. Furthermore, that land constrained by the Upton Heath SSSI, in this area, should be considered for the re-location of Lockyers school.			
510252	Mrs J Wright		CSO1 3038	Option CM 2		General Comment	I do not live in Corfe Mullen as you will see. It is no good to build extra housing without something being done re roads. Broadstone can be gridlocked at school collection and delivery times. Bus services need mush improving and to be more reliable. Please - no more pressure on us who live down in Broadstone.			800
510420	Mr Peter Stevens		CSO1 3151	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
510490	Ms Helen Banfield		CSO1 3236	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
510532	Mr W.W. Chant		CSO1 3279	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
510623	Mr Douglas Priest		CSO1 3384	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
360107	Ms Judith Proctor		CSO1 6808	Option CM 2	Support		I support this if the new allotments are on land with suitable soil (e.g. not waterlogged) and are owned by the council in perpetuity. (And IN Corfe Mullen) Our allotment not only gives us cheap food, it's important for exercise and mental relaxation. Also a minimum six month overlap would be needed to allow a chance to clear the new plot before leaving the old one.	The allotments must be relocated to land within walking distance of the village, with reasonable soil and owned by the parish council.		800
361121	Mrs Elizabeth		CSO1 4010	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Jones									
361124	Mrs M.E Brown		CSO1 6356	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
361138	Mr Rod WHITHAM		CSO1 6883	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
361196	Mr J.M Bullivant		CSO1 6274	Option CM 2	Support		It is important to have affordable housing in this area but not to encroach on existing green belt land.			800
361279	Mrs Brenda Tye		CSO1 5715	Option CM 2	Support					800
361298	Mr S.J Damon		CSO1 6780	Option CM 2		General Comment	<p>I note that all three options are baited with the suggestion that up to 50% could be "affordable housing". The current system of allocation has ensured that virtually no suitable affordable housing has been built in Corfe Mullen over the past years, yet the list of housing is prominently used to justify more houses. Since those needing local housing will predominately require affordable homes here is an issue which should be addressed now. The rule, originally intended to assist the homeless, has been worded with a bias totally in favour of the small developer and presented as though graven on tablets of stone. The rule should be changed now, not when the Strategy Consultation is summarized, maybe in some years time. To assist in readdressing the unbalance I propose that ALL new housing in the three options should be affordable.</p> <p>The case for green infrastructure is not impressive. Allotments are an invaluable asset, both to country and town life. Those at Corfe Mullen are too few, there is a waiting list which has had to close and the simple answer is to extend within the curtilage of Option2. Providing the site is not used for a new Lockyers School there would still be much land available for development.</p>			800

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

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 be an access through the site to the recreation ground, presumably from Wimborne Road.			
476264	Mr David Reddaway		CSO1 5666	Option CM 2	Object		Corfe Mullen cannot support more cars on roads in village. Would stretch present services beyond what they could cope with.			800
491252	Margaret Wareham		CSO1 6585	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
510798	Mr F Sullivan		CSO1 3527	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
510844	Mr Michael Guilmany-Cush		CSO1 3573	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
510873	Mr & Mrs B.R. Mayes		CSO1 3621	Option CM 2	Support					800
510974	Mr Jim Cullumbine		CSO1 3649	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
510993	Mr R.A. Cherrett		CSO1 3682	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
511015	Mr Christopher White		CSO1 3730	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
511076	Mr Ian Burden		CSO1 3816	Option CM 2	Object		I do not understand East Dorset's obsession with building on sports and recreation grounds. I have lived in Corfe Mullen and Merley for 60 years and I am very upset that you are proposing to build on Lockyers School, the recreation ground and the playgrounds plus Wimborne Football Club, which I have associated with for 45 years. All of these areas			800

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

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 lovely views over the valley towards Sturminster Marshall and Ashleywood. Please do not repeat the mistake by making more irreversible decisions like the building on Wimborne Cricket Ground.			
511399	Mr & Mrs Michael and Diana Froud		CSO1 4056	Option CM 2	Support					800
511430	Mr A.D. May		CSO1 4116	Option CM 2	Support					800
511489	Mr H G Holden		CSO1 4172	Option CM 2	Support					800
511571	Mr Colin Alborough		CSO1 4227	Option CM 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.			800
511618	Mrs V Blunden		CSO1 4262	Option CM 2	Support					800
511621	Ms Mary A Combe		CSO1 4273	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
511639	Mr Paul Hockey		CSO1 6076	Option CM 2	Object					800
511692	Ms Ruth Blaug		CSO1 4409	Option CM 2	Support					800
511711	Mr Coombes		CSO1 4430	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
512281	Mr Graham Roberts		CSO1 4977	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
512326	Mr Ian Willis		CSO1 5054	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
513639	Mr and Mrs D J A Kirby		CSO1 5436	Option CM 2	Object					800
513881	Mrs S Bagg		CSO1 5531	Option CM 2	Support		By ticking 'SUPPORT BOXES' I am not actively supporting the locations but, if we must have so much development, making the best of a bad job. We must not spoil the area by over development. More houses only bring more people to our already over crowded area. Local houses for local people, yes, but how can that be ensured?			800
513900	Mr P Wall		CSO1 5576	Option CM 2	Support		Unfortunately more development more movement. A comprehensive transport policy should be developed e.g.. road improvement (A31), bus and trams, rail links (restored).			800
513911	Mr Ian Burton		CSO1 5569	Option CM 2	Object		Corfe Mullen does not have the infrastructure to support additional housing.			800
513924	Mrs A F Langford		CSO1 5581	Option CM 2	Object		I support some building in Corfe Mullen but over 300 new homes will mean 400 - 600 more cars trying to get to work and home again at peak times which will create even more traffic congestion. It will be difficult to improve on this, it's bad enough now.			800
513937	Mrs A Boxshall		CSO1 5597	Option CM 2	Object		Corfe Mullen , the village is full. The roads, shops, nursery, schools, etc. are busy. It is a village, not a town! Please respect that.			800
513949	Fay Gardner		CSO1 5610	Option CM 2	Object					800
513954	Mr RW		CSO1 5613	Option CM 2	Object					800

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Heseltine									
359461	Mrs Nicola Brunt	Conservation Officer Dorset Wildlife Trust	CSO1 7492	Option CM 2	Support		Options CM 1 Lockyers Middle School, CM 2 Violet Farm Close, CM 3 Recreation Ground These developments provide opportunity to develop green infrastructure that would benefit residents and divert pressures away from heathlands. They also provide opportunity to protect and enhance local wildlife habitats and this should be taken into account in the development of SANGs. We consider that all sites should be subject to biological survey to inform the options. The green linkages indicated could provide corridors of green infrastructure, beneficial to people and wildlife, maintaining interconnecting open land from the east to the north of Corfe Mullen through areas 1-3. We suggest both these points are included in the general requirements 9.77. Allotments could continue to form part of the green corridor but if these are to be relocated, care must be taken to conduct biological surveys of potential sites to avoid loss of any sites of high wildlife interest in the locality. We have concern that the loss of recreation ground (CM3) could lead to more people accessing the heaths for recreation and therefore this proposal must be supported by robust provision of a SANG. We support the protection of the Waterloo Valley and Pardys Hill from development.			800
359478	Mr Rohan TORKILD SEN	West Territory Planner English Heritage	CSO1 8555	Option CM 2	Object		The evidence associated with the initial assessment fails to demonstrate an understanding of the relative significance of the areas historic environment which now, as result of PPS5, should also include consideration of non designated heritage assets and the broader historic landscape and its setting. The intention to safeguard Lockyers School (founded 1706 and enlarged c.1824) is welcomed.			800
359482	Ms Helen Powell	Conservation Officer Natural England, Dorset and	CSO1 8711	Option CM 2		No Opinion	CM1, 2, 3 These options offer opportunities for significant green infrastructure that could remove potential adverse effects (from recreational pressures) on the Dorset heaths and increase the value of the locality for			800

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
		Somerset Team					biodiversity. Our opinion on this option will therefore be shaped by the strength and detail of policy on delivery of the green infrastructure as an integral part of the development.			
359571	Mr Renny Henderso n	Conservation Officer Royal Society for the Protection of Birds	CSO1 8698	Option CM 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:			800
359891	Mrs Susanne Parkin		CSO1 8391	Option CM 2	Support		<p>The plan for Corfe Mullen is flawed from its conception with the exception of the land off Violet Farm Close. It is a 'what if' situation, hardly fair on the village - the school is a non - starter, the allotments are in the only place possible (regarding soil condition) in fact they should be enlarged. Most of Corfe Mullen has been built on heathland and the BSI condition of the land required for allotments would be hard to find elsewhere in the village certainly not in the south - in fact the adjoining field would be suitable for additional allotments which are badly needed. Corfe Mullen has few amenities and to propose taking these with no creditable plan of replacement is very unfair and in my view unprofessional. The village can only comment with speculation in mind and to expect a supportive consultation is impossible. A very bad plan ill thought out.</p> <p>I would now like to address Corfe Mullen. We have been told that the consultants were advised by the officers. Why is Corfe Mullen treated differently than the rest of the district. Why do we have for most part a wish list of improbables. Corfe Mullen has always been the Cinderella part of the district in the way it is being treated it seems yet again it has drawn the short straw. One can't help wondering why is 11,000 inhabitants are treated in this way. We have so few amenities compared to the other areas in the district and to propose to diminish these with no idea of how to redress this shortfall is very unprofessional and says little of the care that should have been taken on is there a hidden agenda!!!</p> <p>The aim of the district is to be able to build affordable</p>			800

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							homes. What is proposed in CM will deliver so few - and do we have to have those homes at the cost of our amenities.			
360302	Mrs Hilary Chittenden	Chairperson Environment TAG (East Dorset)	CSO1 8175	Option CM 2	Object		Biodiversity interest includes a number of mature oaks. Root zones of all trees would need to be protected. Observation indicates that full survey would be required. A wet area at the SW of the field adjacent to Violet Farm Close could be enhanced for biodiversity. A suitable alternative site for allotments would need to be found. ETAG would not support relocation of the allotments to the Waterloo Valley.			800
361026	Mr Steve Hellier	Network Planning Manager Highways Agency	CSO1 7743	Option CM 2	Support		The removal of the RSS requirements to provide substantial new housing in the Corfe Mullen area suggests that there is an opportunity for a considered approach involving the use of SEDMMTS, among other evidence. This would enable the suitability of the Corfe Mullen area for new housing to be reviewed, alongside other options There is evidence of a high level of car dependency in this area, which implies that further growth (Options CM1, CM2 and CM3) could exacerbate the existing high level of demand for movements via the A31. The village has poor public transport provision, therefore any future growth needs to be linked with improvements to sustainable transport provisions			800
513958	Mr A Bough		CSO1 5622	Option CM 2	Object		Regarding Lockyers School site this school should remain as a school this school was given to the village and should not be turn into some super-market and if all these homes to be built in and around the village I doubt it will be people from the village who will live in them. There should be no more building in or around Corfe Mullen.			800
513966	Mr and Mrs Howard		CSO1 5640	Option CM 2	Support					800
513973	Mr and Mrs RM		CSO1 5651	Option CM 2	Object		Our concern re the land at the rear of Violet Farm Close is the amount of water that collects after heavy rain and doesn't drain away. The presence of reeds			800

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Bowles						indicates how wet the soil remains all the time. We also have badgers/foxes, deer and rabbits in a pleasant environmental setting.			
513974	Mr A Moore		CSO1 5807	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
514009	L Stock		CSO1 5703	Option CM 2	Object					800
514023	Mr WR Cox		CSO1 5713	Option CM 2	Support		Use of green belt land for allotments is better than losing it to housing.			800
514039	Mrs R Doman		CSO1 5732	Option CM 2	Support					800
514043	E Fookes		CSO1 5722	Option CM 2	Object					800
514049	Mrs E Hellier		CSO1 5740	Option CM 2	Object		Where would you put a new school in Corfe Mullen? Wherever you build it, it will be a long distance from the main housing estates, therefore children will not walk to school, therefore more traffic. Also local doctors surgery busy now; how will it cope with more people?			800
514078	Mr G D Hart		CSO1 5765	Option CM 2	Object					800
514083	Mr R Munt		CSO1 5771	Option CM 2		No Opinion	Of the three options, CM2, but I must object to all three.			800
514087	Joan Smithies		CSO1 5794	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
514091	Mr RJ Potts		CSO1 5805	Option CM 2	Object		All the changes in Corfe Mullen are in one area-need to look at alternative areas. Must preserve existing wild areas and allotments. Development on flood plains are not a good idea.			800

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
514099	Mr and Mrs T C Blakeley		CSO1 5846	Option CM 2	Support					800
514107	The Payne Family		CSO1 5864	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
514111	Penelope Webiery		CSO1 5892	Option CM 2	Object		We don't have the facilities for any more people in Corfe Mullen. We don't have a proper supermarket, only a small doctors surgery and a library which is closed more than its open. For God's sake we still have to put black plastic bags out for the dustmen, because we are the only place in Dorset without bins. The Rec is important to us for exercising our dogs and for our children to play. LEAVE CORFE MULLEN ALONE.			800
514114	Ms Karen Maund		CSO1 5901	Option CM 2	Object		I object to the proposed development in Corfe Mullen, because I feel it is too many houses in a confined area. Also the road structure will not cope with additional volume of traffic. 310 houses amounts to an additional 600+ cars on the road at peak times. No thoughts have been given to further amenities regarding schools, shops, doctors.			800
514136	Mrs J Crumb		CSO1 5943	Option CM 2	Object					800
514225	Mr Simon Dixon	Secretary West Moors Traders Association	CSO1 5963	Option CM 2	Support					800
514246	Theresa Monahan & Jonathon Chaffey		CSO1 5991	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
514274	Mr		CSO1	Option	Support		Instead of new housing there should be a new			800

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Showell		6048	CM 2			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.			
514467	Mrs Lesley Cripps		CSO1 6196	Option CM 2	Support		It must be stressed that a new school to replace the existing Lockyers School must be of paramount importance for Corfe Mullen before any new homes would be built. Recreation facilities also need to be developed in the southern end of the village including allotments and play park for Waterloo Road area. Can the village infrastructure support more people and motorcars? Moreover could the roads in and out of Corfe Mullen cope with the extra traffic especially through Broadstone.			800
514482	C E T Gilbert		CSO1 6224	Option CM 2	Support		Corfe Mullen (CM 1), further commercial/retail premises are not a priority. Any new school can be built on the playing fields to incorporate a community centre, existing buildings to be cleared for new play area.			800
514504	Mr and Mrs B Gibbs		CSO1 6249	Option CM 2	Support		The options in the survey do not allow a considered and unbiased answer as they include vague terms such as ' school may be relocated' and 'allotments would need to be relocated elsewhere' but do not offer a solution. Thus it is almost impossible to make a proper judgement. We feel the only sensible solution is to utilise some green belt land but not the recreation ground, as this is used by many people in the village. Also, if the school is to be built elsewhere, it should not be on the present recreation ground, as previously suggested. The other option might be CM2 which does not appear to encroach the recreation space. If houses are to be built on the school site, then 80 families will cause unacceptable congestion traffic-wise to new and existing residents. Why do we need so many houses? If this scheme goes ahead it will cause much anger and frustration, particularly if no adequate facilities are provided.			800

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

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		CSO1 6261	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
514649	Mrs June Sawyer		CSO1 6311	Option CM 2	Object					800
514674	Mrs J Williams		CSO1 6339	Option CM 2	Object					800
514752	Claire Richards on & Jamie Shirley		CSO1 6386	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
514812	Mr C Sawyer		CSO1 6423	Option CM 2	Object					800
514912	Mrs Mary Carsbury		CSO1 6472	Option CM 2	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 it is 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.			800
514913	Mr and Mrs M Clark		CSO1 6459	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
514939	Mr D		CSO1 6501	Option CM 2	Object		The more land you concrete over the more you have to because you just increase demand. Infill best			800

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

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						option.			
514959	Mr and Mrs R Fisher		CSO1 6532	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
514993	Dr Peter J Hardwick		CSO1 6565	Option CM 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.			800
515033	Mr T Crump		CSO1 6603	Option CM 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.			800
515287	Mr L Jackson		CSO1 6678	Option CM 2	Support		The A31 trunk road from Ferndown by-pass should be widened to form a dual carriageway all the way through to Bere Regis.			800

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

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		CSO1 6789	Option CM 2	Support					800
518491	Mr and Mrs Bargewel I		CSO1 7374	Option CM 2	Object		<p>Following the issue of the latest Core Strategy Options by yourselves, please accept this letter, and the points contained with-in, as formal objection to the Options being considered for Corfe Mullen. Although from our address that we would be immensely affected by the option concerning land off Violet Farm Close, please be assured our objections are not purely on a personal nature and hope that our objections will be considered by yourselves and not be discounted simply due to our location. Having been residents of the village for many years, we feel the village is now at full capacity and see no reason why the village should be forced to accommodate large scale housing developments which are simply not needed. Having attended the Core Strategy meeting at the Council Offices in November, one of your representatives clearly stated that the Regional Spatial Strategy has now been abolished and that you no longer have any housing targets which need to be met. This point is by far the strongest reason for objecting to any housing development plans on the scale of which you are now proposing.</p> <p>Large Scale Housing Development - Not Needed A development of this nature, on any of the 3 sites, is simply not needed on a scale such as this, nor is it wanted by the residents of Corfe Mullen. Current housing needs should be accommodated by in-fill, not a major new housing estate. We are a village – not a town.</p> <p>A new housing estate would have an environmental impact on the village - more pollution / power usage / carbon footprint/ car emissions / noise pollution / light pollution / waste etc. etc. Development would add to already strained power supplies. This are of Corfe Mullen already experiences regular 'power cuts' especially at the Pavilion / Rec area. Adding 150 dwellings will put additional strain on local power stations. What provision is in place to accommodate this?</p>			800

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact 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 supermarkets / shops / Post Offices / Banks etc. are sufficient for the current population of the village. More services are only required due to development plans – no development = no need for more services. Green Belt / Open Space / Wildlife haven</p> <p>Although not all the resident wildlife species are protected, habitats will be lost. Resident buzzards, rabbits, deer, foxes, badgers, field mice, many species of birds etc. use the areas under consideration as feeding grounds / habitat – particularly the land off Violet Farm Close. We feel it is essential that these 'pockets' of open space be retained as wildlife havens for many species, as such spaces are now being reduced at an alarming rate, not just locally but nationally.</p> <p>Local Residents - in the immediate area</p> <p>What, if any, compensation will be provided for those who will see a dramatic fall in the value of their homes caused by this development? House prices in the immediate area reflect the current rural setting which will be lost if this development goes ahead. The saying goes that you 'cannot put a price tag on a view' – meaning house prices do not reflect location. On this I would disagree. The market value of my property reflected its' location, and the privacy given by backing onto 'open space' and not dwellings. A new development here would reduce the value of my property immensely – what provision has been made for residents who would be affected like ourselves? Are there any plans to compensate those in the immediate vicinity of such a development - as your proposals would lose those residents many thousands of pounds on property value should they choose to move. A loss I would expect the Council, as proposer of said development, to rectify.</p> <p>Traffic</p> <p>Windgreen roundabout (Esso garage) already heavily congested at rush hour. Long queues already occur down towards Corfe Hills (heading towards Windgreen), Blandford Road (from Lockyers to Windgreen) and Wareham Road, both sides of the roundabout, at peak times.</p> <p>Any development at Lockyers / Rec / Violet Farm would add significant numbers of vehicles, possibly 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>excess of another 150 cars, to the already busy highways at that end of the village, most of which would join the rush hour traffic and all of which would need to access their destined routes via the Windgreen area.</p> <p>Education / Schools. All 4 of the first schools which 'feed in to' Lockyers (Henbury, Rushcombe, Springdale, Sturminster Marshall) are already full and have been for the last few years. Where would the primary school aged children, from the proposed development, be expected to go? Although the argument for a 2 tier education system is on-going, the existing first schools could not at this time accommodate Years 5 and 6 should we go 2 tier, and Corfe Hills are unable to extend either pupil capacity nor site size, so to add 150 dwellings – (each of which could have the average 2.4 children - which could number 300 additional school children!) to this already 'strained' education provision is unacceptable.</p> <p>Health Provision. Local doctor's surgeries were full in 1992 when I became a Corfe Mullen resident thus my family had to register with a practice in Broadstone. What provision is being made for the residents of the proposed development regarding Health Care / Doctors Surgeries? 150 dwellings could add in the region of 600 new residents to Corfe Mullen. In the current economical climate is the NHS likely to provide and fund new surgeries / GPs just for one development? It is highly unlikely that the existing Health provisions in the village would cope with an influx of these numbers.</p> <p>Allotments – The allotments are well established with a small knit, community feel. The Corfe Mullen Allotment Association is volunteer run group. Many allotment holders, including ourselves, are with-in walking distance of current site but would need to drive to any proposed new site. Would the allotments even be relocated and, if so, would the land be of the same quality of the current site, which many plot holders have spent years improving? Would new site be as 'fertile' / productive for growing as current site? Some</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>plot holders have rented their plots for many, many years. Yet again, development would damage the ethos / feel of village 'community.' Perhaps the best suggestion for the land off Violet Farm Close would be to extend the current allotment site which has been in situ for in excess of a 100 years but has seen its' size dramatically reduced over that time.</p> <p>Service Providers / Current Economic Climate – Additional strain on already struggling financial budgets of all major service providers who would be required to maintain new developments – Wessex Water / Electric and Gas Companies/ Highways Agencies / Rubbish collection / Parish Council / Telephone Service Providers / Transport - bus companies etc. etc. As the proposer of said developments, what contribution will EDDC make to all these companies who are expected to bear the maintenance costs of a new housing development? Lastly – Site Suitability?</p> <p>Building on the land off Violet Farm Close would rule out any future access to the land at the Recreation Ground, should that area ever be developed. Also, is the land off Violet Farm Close actually suitable for development? The area is known to be an old 'landfill' site and is always heavily waterlogged over the winter with poor drainage and excess surface water in situ for months. There is also a Tree Protection Order in force – the large trees situated on the land 'off Violet Farm Close' are protected by a Preservation Order, issued by your own Council, indicating a desire to protect not to develop this area!</p>			
518513	Mr Christian Westwood		CSO17379	Option CM 2	Object		<p>I would like to log an objection to the use of the land off Violet Farm Close being used to provide land for housing development. In my own opinion this proposal is not a valid option as my family's home is directly opposite to the proposed site. We purchased our house approximately 18 months ago and the reasons for so doing was the rural environment in which it is located, the fact that it is not overlooked by a myriad of other properties and the close proximity of recreational facilities for our son. At the time of purchasing our property, we were only</p>	<p>Consider redevelopment of an area to which the addition of further housing and commercial activity would damage less than that proposed. The development of the Lockyers School site removes access to fantastic views of our beautiful countryside and living in a rural</p>		800

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>aware of the possible redevelopment of Lockyers School that would maintain the position of the main buildings, which is a much more favourable option to developing the site for residential and commercial purposes.</p> <p>The proposed housing development, together with the associated infrastructure, in particular the road network, would result in the area becoming a much more urban setting, absolutely destroying the reason why we, and many other families, elect to live in this area.</p> <p>The appeal of the village is its rural surroundings, combined with the convenience of the commercial areas found in the neighbouring towns of Wimborne and Broadstone.</p> <p>The Core Strategy Options for Consideration Response Form</p> <p>housing areas available in these already built up communities surely mean that there is no reason to tarnish the landscape surrounding Corfe Mullen with similar domiciles.</p> <p>The option of using the land off Violet Farm Close for a residential development would result in the current views from our property that extend as far as Badbury Rings being replaced by one of a housing estate.</p> <p>This proposal would also produce a huge increase in traffic utilising the part of Wimborne Road on which we live, resulting in a much noisier, polluted and more dangerous environment in which to raise our son.</p> <p>In conclusion, I consider that not only would this proposal adversely affect the value of our property, it would also have a large detrimental effect on the community as a whole. The appeal of this part of the village is that it is not excessively developed and therefore this proposal would have a dramatic effect on both the area and the lifestyle of its inhabitants.</p>	environment whilst providing commercial facilities within a 5-10 mile radius.		
519991	Ms Claire Aldridge	Planning Liaison Officer Environment Agency	CSO17575	Option CM 2		General Comment	Options CM1, 2 and 3 are all located within a SPZ 2 so similar to Wimborne and Colehill there may be a restriction on what can be built and suitable assessment will need to be undertaken to show that			800

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact 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 development will not have a detrimental impact on groundwater.</p> <p>Waste</p> <p>Option CM 2 is located on the site of Gravel Pit historic landfill. This will need to be considered.</p> <p>Overall issues for consideration are: SUDS; foul drainage; water supply / water efficiency; groundwater and contaminated Land; sustainable construction (recommend at least Code for Sustainable Homes Level 3); waste management facilities; green infrastructure/ biodiversity issues; pollution prevention. Further information on these topics can be seen in the general section of our letter.</p>			
359875	Dr Lesley Haskins		CSO19291	Option CM 2	Object		<p>The urban fringe of south-east Dorset supports a range of acid and neutral grasslands which seem to have escaped improvement to some degree or another by virtue of being marginal to main stream agriculture. Many of these grasslands are grazed by horses, tending to mask their floristic composition, and making recognition of their value, without the opportunity for a properly timed and prepared survey, an inevitably random affair While some have been recognised as SSSIs, or SNCIs others are certainly yet to be formally identified and recognised by such proper survey. Yet they represent a most important and rapidly diminishing biodiversity resource which must be properly identified and protected. There is little or no reference to this resource in the Core Strategy and it is most worrying that no proper attempt at assessment was made of preferred sites prior to its publication. Consequently the number of preferred options in the Core Strategy which impact upon important grasslands is simply not known, and it will be essential 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</p>			800

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

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 areas where grasslands of interest would most likely to have been substantially threatened. This is welcomed and supported. If it is essential to relocate the allotments, great caution will have to be exercised in the selection of a site, not least because many areas of grassland around Corfe Mullen, and particularly down the Waterloo valley, are of high biodiversity interest. The decision not to propose development on land southward from Pardys' Hill is strongly supported. Use as a SANG will need to take account of intrinsic wildlife interest. The area will not be suitable for any relocation of sports facilities or allotments and so forth, as clearly these would be damaging to wildlife interests.			
360768	Cllr. Mr David Packer	Colehill West Ward East Dorset District Council	CSO2 0651	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
360977	Mr Nick Solomon		CSO2 0699	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
489765	Mr Derek Kearey		CSO1 9493	Option CM 2	Support					800
490854	Mr D Mutton		CSO2 0131	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
507361	Mr Kenneth Archer		CSO2 0330	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
507546	Mr Nigel Pugsley	Senior Planner BNP Paribas Real Estate	CSO1 7989	Option CM 2		General Comment	The abovementioned policies options relate to potential Greenfield housing allocations on the fringes of Corfe Mullen. Whichever of the options the Council is minded to progress with (following further consultation and examination); it would be essential that the infrastructure needed to support the planned growth			800

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

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 provided for in a timely manner.			
507737	Mrs S Philpot		CSO2 0202	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
511383	Mrs Jean Archer		CSO2 0382	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
521315	Janet & Kevin Healy Paul Timberlake		CSO1 7925	Option CM 2	Support		<p>SUMMARY: CM2 EAST OF VIOLET FARM CLOSE (80) We will NOT OBJECT to this site. It is probably marginally better than the Lockyers site as only allotments have to be relocated and some could perhaps be located on the far eastern edge of the CM3 site. Our approval would be dependant on achieving 40% affordable housing. Adding another potential 120 cars to the commuting/school run in Corfe Mullen is not good. It is such an unsustainable settlement when accessing employment and services. This location and Verwood are two locations that should not be developed any further. PURPOSES OF THE GREENBELT PPG2 (as applicable to this site) This location is both Green Belt and recreational land. To check the unrestricted sprawl of built up areas. Corfe Mullen will be spreading ever further north and closer to the edge of the ridge which would make housing visible from the river valley, this must be avoided. To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. The allotments would have to be re-located and this would mean further encroachment into the countryside. It would be possible perhaps to relocate them to the far eastern end of the recreation ground providing it did not reduce the recreational facilities too much. VISUAL IMPACT ON BOTH THE NATURAL AND HISTORIC LANDSCAPE This site is comprised of two small fields and allotments. The perimeter of the three areas are</p>			800

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>surrounded by mature oak trees and yew which would have to be protected as they would soften any housing and help to maintain some wildlife. The potential site has housing to the east and west so between the housing and the trees it is quite an enclosed site. The loss of this site would not impact much on the wider landscape but it constitutes yet another loss of open green space and recreational land. This site and the Lockyers school site would infill this open green area with housing and so creating a large solid block of housing to this part of Corfe Mullen.</p> <p>SUSTAINABLE LOCATION PPS1 Location Primary Schools Middle and Upper Daily shopping Post Office Doctors East of Violet Farm Close 1.9km 1.9km Middle? 2.1 km - U 1.3km 2.6km 2.6km If the Lockyers school site were developed, the proposed GI would reduce the distances. They were measured by road and this makes them much longer than if a short cut existed.</p> <p>EMPLOYMENT There are few employment opportunities within the settlement. Only 22% live and work in Corfe Mullen, 86% of all commuters were car drivers or passengers. (taken from the Core Strategy which uses the 2001 census figures). There are a number of employment centres in Wimborne; otherwise the main centres are Ferndown Industrial Estate, Bournemouth Airport, Bournemouth and Poole. Commuting for Corfe Mullen : 2001 census Internal commuters - 1151 In commuters - 606</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>Out commuters - 3986 Total commuters (in and out) - 4592 86% of all commuters are car drivers or passengers (Core Strategy: ONS 2001 census). This is not a sustainable location. PUBLIC TRANSPORT This is very poor. Number 3 to Poole is a ½ hourly service. It does not stop at the Creekmoor out of town shopping centre so it is no good for any one working there. Time to Poole is 24 minutes. Number 3 to Wimborne is a ½ hourly service. Time is 7 minutes. Number 13 to Ferndown Industrial Estate and Bournemouth. A 1/2 hourly service from Wimborne, so potential passengers must catch the number 3 and change buses. Time to Bournemouth is 1hr from Wimborne. NEAREST CENTRE WITH FULL RANGE OF SERVICES There is a reasonable supermarket in north Corfe Mullen, but for a full range of services a car trip to Wimborne, Broadstone or Poole. PROVISION OF MULTI-FUNCTIONAL GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE AND OPEN SPACES: (Natural England's Green Infrastructure Guidance NE176 & PPG17 Planning for Open Spaces There is no open space planned for this site, but it is adjacent to the very large open area of recreational ground and informal open space with lovely views. As for the Lockyers school site, a GI to link to the existing paths to take residents onto the Roman Road would make for excellent recreational space for those with wheels of one type or another that both developments could use. 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 two small fields appear to be unimproved grassland, a full survey 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>TRANQUILLITY: sense of place Natural green spaces always convey a rural tranquillity. It is on the opposite side of the road to the Lockyers site so it would be quite a quiet location once school was out.</p> <p>LIGHT POLLUTION See the ETAG Response which includes a report from Bob Mizon.</p> <p>DRAINAGE PPS25 (causing increase in river flooding or surface water problems) This is a high and flat area, ideal for SUDS and permeable surfaces.</p> <p>PROXIMITY TO HEATHLAND AND AVAILABILITY OF SANGS FOR MITIGATION Corfe Mullen is surrounded by sensitive areas. This northern edge of the village sweeps down from the ridge, across the A31, to the flood plain of the Stour Valley. It is highly commendable that a great swathe to the north and west of this plateau should be set aside as SANGS. It should be protected as such for the foreseeable future to prevent more intrusive development encroaching on the wider landscape.</p> <p>PROVISION OF ADDITIONAL INFRASTRUCTURE (schools etc.) The old Lockyers school building would make a good community centre. According to the Dorset Explorer over lay, the only doctor is at the far south of the village. Maybe the school's modern extensions can be demolished and a small doctor's surgery/health centre can be built to serve this end of the settlement.</p> <p>IMPACT ON TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE Have you ever considered providing an information sheet advising residents on how much of their income they can save if partners/households car share? In order to facilitate one car families, safe cycle tracks must be provided. It is not much good if cars park over cycle tracks or if the tracks suddenly stop before a difficult junction. They need to be a continuous safe system that bypasses the very bad roundabouts and junctions.</p> <p>Cycling and cheaper more efficient public transport are the only means of stabilising the traffic situation. It is unlikely that the modifications to existing congested junctions and roundabouts will make any</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
							difference, especially with the scale of development planned up to 2027. The only way forward is to make settlements more self-contained. If the school run can be eliminated, the in and out commuting by car moderated, then just maybe the traffic will not grind to a halt. Punishing the shoppers, who help to keep the retail areas profitable, by restricting shoppers parking is not the answer. If shopping gets too difficult the internet will take over. Heavier charging on all day parking may help keep workers out of the car parks, but this is no good if there is no reasonable alternate means of travel. It is important that residents are not made to feel as if they are being punished for past and future development not of their choosing.			
359264	Mr Peter Atfield	Director Goadsby Ltd	CSO1 8173	Option CM 2	Support		<p>J. Havelock and A. Lloyd are the owners of approximately 1 hectare of land to the south west of Blandford Road at Corfe Mullen. This is identified on the plan (Appendix 1) attached to this form of representation. The site is just to the north of a petrol filling station (Windgreen Garage) with an ancillary shop. Beyond this are sports facilities, including a hall, and a library. Some of these areas are already the subject of Policy CM3 of the adopted East Dorset Local Plan. This policy states that:</p> <p>“Developments falling within Use Classes A1, A2, A3, B1 and community uses will be permitted in accordance with Policy SHDEV1 Para 6.236 along Wareham Road at Hill View Post Office, around the junction with Albert Road, the library and Windgreen garage in areas shown on the Proposals Map. Any such development or redevelopment will be subject to the provision of off-street car parking and/or rear service areas and must not prejudice the amenities of residential properties. Residential development at first floor level will also be permitted in association with such development.”</p> <p>The intention of this policy was to consolidate and strengthen the two principal centres at Corfe Mullen, including the area around the Windgreen Garage site. Given that the Core Strategy may allocate more than additional 300 new dwellings to the northern part of the settlement, there is an even greater need to strengthen the commercial and community centre</p>	<p>Add new Option CM4: “Development could take place on land west of Blandford Road to create an enhanced village centre to this part of Corfe Mullen. Appropriate future uses for the site could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retail • Medical surgery / health care facility, with pharmacy • Care Home • Residential (where in excess of 400 metres from Dorset heath land) <p>As a consequence, the green belt should be amended in accordance with the plan attached as Appendix 2 to this form of representation.</p>		800

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>around the Windgreen Garage site. The land south west of Blandford Road is ideal to accommodate these additional uses.</p> <p>A Parish Plan for Corfe Mullen was prepared in 2006. Questionnaires were sent to residents. The responses were analysed and the views were summarised in the plan. Key points relevant to these representations are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a need for a new dental practice in the settlement. • There may be a further need for a doctor's surgery if more housing is constructed at Corfe Mullen – some respondents stated that they currently travel outside of the area to get to a doctor or dentist. • A cyber café is required. • A focal point will help bring the village together. <p>A Corfe Mullen Focus Group meeting, held in May 2008, confirmed some of the identified needs; in particular the lack of shops and doctors facilities. The Core Strategy Issues and Options develops some of these matters. It acknowledges that the village has limited facilities, but that there is capacity to accommodate another retail store in the settlement. Paragraph 9.44 summarises the facilities required to support further development at Corfe Mullen:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More shops of all kinds, including banks and retain the existing Post Offices. • More health facilities, especially dentists and doctors. • Employment opportunities. • Facilities and entertainment for young people. <p>The plan reproduced on Page 169 of the Core Strategy identifies various sites within the northern 'Area of Search'. The accompanying text, in Paragraphs 9.68 – 9.71, describes landscape, environment / conservation, land use and other constraints to the development of six sites. Land west of Blandford Road is not one of these. Together with the three sites that have been identified as potential allocations, it is free from any impediment to development.</p> <p>It is therefore submitted that the site is suitable to accommodate a range of uses to compliment 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
							residential development of 300+ dwellings at Lockyer's School, east of Violet Farm Close and at the eastern end of the recreation ground. The range of uses could include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retail • Medical surgery / health care facility, with pharmacy • Care Home • Residential (where in excess of 400 metres from Dorset heath land) Options CM1 – CM3 will require an amendment to the boundary of the green belt around Corfe Mullen. It is submitted that a new boundary can also exclude land west of Blandford Road from the green belt so as to permit the development of the site with the range of uses set out above.			
522396	Mr Keith Stannard		CSO1 8135	Option CM 2	Object					800
522444	Adrian Barker	Terence O'Rourke Ltd	CSO1 8149	Option CM 2	Object		<p>This representation has been prepared by Terence O'Rourke Ltd, on behalf of the Perry Family Trust, in response to the current consultation on the Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy. Specifically we refer to the options presented for the delivery of housing at Corfe Mullen. The Perry Family Trust is the owner of 4.4 hectares of land between Pardy's Hill and the B3074, Blandford Road in Corfe Mullen.</p> <p>Having reviewed the consultation document and the suggested housing sites for Corfe Mullen, we do not consider that they represent the most acceptable strategy for the community.</p> <p>Background and need for housing</p> <p>The draft regional strategy for the south west was subject to public examination in 2007 and consequential additional studies were being carried out when, in July 2010 the Coalition Government revoked all Regional Strategies, effectively halting the production of the strategy. The draft strategy has however informed work on the current Core Strategy, including the level of housing, which stands at 6,500 new houses across East Dorset. Furthermore,</p>			800

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact 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 a high court judgement in November 2010 Regional Strategies have been reinstated, for the time being and it is therefore appropriate to treat the emergent policies as a material consideration.</p> <p>The need to deliver housing in Corfe Mullen is also recognised at a local level. At the recent meeting of Corfe Mullen Parish Council, on 6 December 2010, 10 out of 14 voting councillors agreed that 200 or more new dwellings would be required to adequately serve the community over the plan period, with only a single councillor arguing that no new housing should be delivered. Enclosed is a copy of the minutes of that meeting, for your information.</p> <p>The recently published Localism Bill will remove Regional Spatial Strategies from the development plan, whilst at the same time removing the need for local planning authorities to address regional housing targets. However there is likely to remain a local need for housing land even it at a lower level than previously identified. The need for local planning policies to be tested for soundness will also remain. With the publication of the Localism Bill it is clear that local views have growing significance in shaping planning policies. In this context the views of local groups and parish councils will have increased significance. In the context of the current consultation the parish council's position of recognising the need for new housing, but opposing the currently suggested strategy for delivery of that growth is significant.</p> <p>The need for soundness</p> <p>Planning Policy Statement 12: Creating strong safe and prosperous communities through Local Spatial Planning (PPS12) sets out the steps that Local Planning Authorities must take when preparing Local Development Frameworks. It also sets out the standards against which Development Plan Documents are judged, in order to be considered sound. Namely, the policies must be justified, effective and consistent with national policy. In order to fulfil these criteria, development plan documents and, by extension, strategic land allocations emerging through them must be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Justified 			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

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"> - Founded on a robust and credible evidence base - Represent the most appropriate strategy when considered against the reasonable alternatives • Effective - Deliverable - Flexible - Able to be monitored • Consistent with national policy <p>Paragraph 4.44 of PPS12 establishes that the deliverability of a strategy is predicated on there being no regulatory or national policy barriers to the delivery of the strategy, such as the presence of protected wildlife sites and landscapes or sites of historic or cultural importance. Paragraph 4.45 goes on to highlight that deliverability also requires those partners essential to the delivery of the plan such as landowners and developers to be signed up to it. Planning Policy Statement 3: Housing (PPS3) stipulates that in order for housing sites to be considered deliverable, they must be Available, Suitable and Achievable</p> <p>The Draft Core Strategy</p> <p>The approach to the delivery of housing, which has emerged through the draft Core Strategy, is to provide housing through a series of modest extensions to existing settlements. In this context, three contiguous sites have been identified as options for housing growth within Corfe Mullen, at Lockyers School, land off Violet Farm Close and the eastern part of the recreation ground.</p> <p>Overall, we consider it important that all potential sites for housing delivery are considered so that the most appropriate strategy for the village can be developed. The individual sites should therefore be considered in the context of the PPS3 and PPS12 tests set out above. In the first instance, we would highlight that significantly no alternatives have been presented with regard to providing replacement sites for the facilities which would be lost as a result of the suggested strategic allocations. This casts doubt over the effectiveness of the strategy as a whole, in terms of its deliverability, its flexibility and its suitability. We consider that in its current form, there is a risk of the strategy being found unsound, when the above tests</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>are applied.</p> <p>Corfe Mullen Parish Council has objected to the identification of the sports pitches (CM3) and allotments (CM2). The Corfe Mullen Sports Association, which operates the recreation ground has echoed the objection to site CM3, both sets of comments are enclosed. While the principle of development of the Lockyers School site (CM1) is not considered unacceptable, the availability of the site is uncertain. The suitability of each of the suggested sites is discussed below. There cannot be certainty about them until all uses have been found an appropriate location. The current strategy relies on a chain of events which cannot, at this time, be guaranteed.</p> <p>Land off Violet Farm Close (CM2) – 80 dwellings</p> <p>This site comprises a combination of allotments, a paddock and undeveloped and unmanaged wasteland. It is considered that, of the options presented, this is the most suitable for development. However the loss of the established allotments, which are some of the oldest in the area, having been established in the late 1800s, without suitable replacement would be regrettable and could be avoided if other, more suitable sites were allocated which did not necessitate such relocation.</p>			
522650	Mrs H C Wheeler		CSO1 8160	Option CM 2	Object					800
523300	Mr Trevor Abbott		CSO1 8285	Option CM 2	Object					800
523319	Mr Ryan Johnson	Turley Associates	CSO1 8330	Option CM 2	Object		<p>As stated above, the uncertainty surrounding the delivery of such options calls into question their eligibility as either deliverable or developable sites within the terms of PPS3. In the absence of robust housing land supply evidence to the contrary, Taylor Wimpey also considers the reduction of housing requirements at Corfe Mullen from 700 to 310 homes is unsound. Taylor Wimpey maintains that discounted area 3 should therefore be retained as a deliverable</p>			800

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

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 or addition to the Council's options to meet the strategic housing requirements directed to Corfe Mullen. Taylor Wimpey is willing to work in partnership with the Council, landowners and the local community to deliver the most suitable and deliverable options for growth north/north west of Corfe Mullen within this context. Further evidence will be provided to elaborate on these representations through subsequent consultation stages of this DPD. Taylor Wimpey supports the need to identify the new neighbourhoods and SANG land on the Key Diagram and has land available to contribute towards such provision. Taylor Wimpey is willing to work with the Council to identify the most suitable and deliverable options for housing and SANG provision north / north west of Corfe Mullen. Further evidence will be provided to elaborate on these representations through subsequent consultation stages of this DPD. See attachment			
523531	Mr Tim Hoskinson	Savills	CSO1 8432	Option CM 2	Support		<p>The identification of land east of Violet Farm Close as an option for housing development is fully supported as a logical site to select through the LDF process for the delivery of housing in a sustainable manner. The site is in the ownership of The Canford Estate and Harry J Palmer Holdings Ltd. The accompanying Land at Wimborne Road Corfe Mullen – development concept document submitted in support of these representations has been prepared on behalf of the landowners to illustrate the opportunity for the site to deliver a sustainable, high quality development to meet identified housing needs. The site is exceptionally well placed to contribute to meeting the housing needs of East Dorset by providing a mix of dwelling types, styles and tenures including family homes at a location that is well related to existing services, facilities, and public transport services. The site is located on the northern edge of Corfe Mullen between Lockyers Middle School and the recreation ground, bounded to the east and west by residential development. The site is level, free from physical and environmental constraints and has the</p>	Amend the first bullet point in Option CM 2 to reflect the capacity of the site as set out in the Land at Wimborne Road Corfe Mullen – development concept document submitted in support of these representations		800

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact 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 to accommodate a modest, well contained and clearly defined development without compromising the key purpose, functions and role of the Green Belt. Mature hedgerows along with existing tree planting along the northern edge will visually contain development and provide a strong boundary. The existing allotments would either be relocated, or retained within the development. There are a number of potential options available for the relocation of the allotments on land in the ownership of the Canford Estate or Harry J Palmer, including land at Merley Park Road, land at Wareham Road, and land at Broadmoor Road. If relocated, there will be the opportunity to provide additional allotment plots, improved parking and facilities.</p> <p>The site can be developed without the need for extensive infrastructure works associated with larger urban extensions, and does not raise significant landscape, environmental, technical or servicing issues. Development at this site has the potential to provide contributions to the off-site provision of new or improved community facilities.</p> <p>This site represents a sustainable, viable, well located and deliverable housing opportunity and should therefore be phased to come forward at an early stage in the LDF timeframe.</p>			
527750	Mr Colin MacNee		CSO1 8912	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
527818	Mr Nigel Lester	Synergy Housing Association	CSO1 8962	Option CM 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.			800
527849	Miss Kate Tunks	Transport Planning Officer Dorset County Council	CSO1 9036	Option CM 2		General Comment	Options CM2 and CM3 These options are largely dependant on the provision of a significant local service centre as outlined in CM1. If this is not provided then the developments would be likely to follow the same, car dependent,			800

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							pattern as the rest of Corfe Mullen. Vehicular access to, from and through the site from Wimborne Road needs to be carefully designed for option CM2.			
533834	Mr Tim Harris		CSO1 9202	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
534353	Mr Keith Summers		CSO1 9331	Option CM 2	Object		We have worked our allotment for the past 4 years which has provided us with fresh fruit and vegetables and is an important part of our leisure time. The allotments are easily accessible from where we live and a good deal of time and effort has been spent bringing them to their current state. Relocating to a new location and starting from scratch will cause us considerable effort and expense to get us back to the position that we are currently in. We also feel that the infrastructure in the surrounding area will be insufficient to support an additional 80 plus houses and their occupants.			800
534358	Mrs Margaret Summers		CSO1 9332	Option CM 2	Object		We have worked our allotment for the past 4 years which has provided us with fresh fruit and vegetables and is an important part of our leisure time. The allotments are easily accessible from where we live and a good deal of time and effort has been spent bringing them to their current state. Relocating to a new location and starting from scratch will cause us considerable effort and expense to get us back to the position that we are currently in. We also feel that the infrastructure in the surrounding area will be insufficient to support an additional 80 plus houses and their occupants.			800
534820	Mr Paul Batten		CSO1 9428	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
534837	Mrs P Martin		CSO1 9490	Option CM 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.			800
534875	Mr		CSO1	Option		No Opinion				800

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Brian Lane		9534	CM 2						
534914	Mrs P Froud		CSO1 9651	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
535070	Mr Alan Reade		CSO1 9624	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
535112	Mr Jack Tindall		CSO1 9699	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
535167	Mrs Lynda Lake		CSO1 9750	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
535209	Mr P Webster		CSO1 9790	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
535349	P Thomas		CSO1 9818	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
535368	Mr Andrew Evans		CSO1 9869	Option CM 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.			800
535387	Mr Brian Cox		CSO1 9944	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
535393	Mr Jeremy Berg		CSO1 9896	Option CM 2	Support		ROADS, ROADS, ROADS, BEFORE YOU BUILD ANYWHERE & DESTROY EVERYONES WAY OF LIFE FOREVER, BUILD ROADS & BY PASSES.			800

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

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		CSO2 0610	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
535457	Mr Matthew Newman		CSO1 9955	Option CM 2	Support		As a life long resident of Wimborne I feel the need for a sizable housing development is greatly needed for families & young professionals as the town is seriously lacking in affordable private ownership family & starter homes. Family sized properties in the Wimborne area are very over priced (as demand is high) and I am aware of many families living in inadequate sized dwellings that are unable to bridge the price gap to buy a home that is suitable for their needs. In recent years the majority of development that has taken place in the area has been small scale and is usually aimed at the executive high end market. A larger housing development would cater for a wider range of housing stock which is greatly needed by the residents of the town.			800
535500	David Veevers		CSO2 0007	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
361024	Mr & Mrs Kenny Pearce		CSO2 2092	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
361288	Mrs Ruth DOLLERSON		CSO2 1499	Option CM 2	Support		CM2 is the most desirable, as this is in-filling. The allotments could continue to be used until housing actually needed. Green belt & beautiful sites and existing facilities would be protected.			800
482494	Mrs Yvette Jones		CSO2 1874	Option CM 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			800

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							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.			
498211	Mrs J Auckland		CSO2 1725	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
498402	Mrs T Hughes		CSO2 2232	Option CM 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.			800
508735	Mr Peter Barham		CSO2 2265	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
535504	Mr Michael Beer		CSO2 0059	Option CM 2	Object					800
535509	Mrs S Durant		CSO2 0073	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
535517	Mr Roy		CSO2 0088	Option CM 2	Object					800

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

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									
535550	Mrs D Mogg		CSO2 0166	Option CM 2	Support					800
535566	Mrs L Cook		CSO2 0214	Option CM 2	Object					800
535567	Ms Judy McMath		CSO2 0225	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
535574	Mr and Mrs Ralph Williams		CSO2 0239	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
535591	A Walker		CSO2 0287	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
535610	Mr Stewart Bullen		CSO2 0351	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
535662	Dianne Trevett		CSO2 0395	Option CM 2	Support		b) My support for CM2 land off Violet Farm Close is a reluctant compromise because Corfe Mullen does need more housing and this site looks appropriate but the problem being that it would involve building on green belt. IF this were to go ahead it should be as a single instance compromise and not taken as support for building on green belt land in general.			800
535670	Mr Dave Allen		CSO2 0406	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
535678	Mr Andrew Bryant		CSO2 0434	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
535688	Mrs Susan Hobbs		CSO2 0524	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
535698	Mr John Stone		CSO2 0472	Option CM 2	Object					800
535701	Mr Andy Skeats		CSO2 0481	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
535815	Mrs C M Davies		CSO2 0551	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
535836	Mr Peter Parsons		CSO2 0578	Option CM 2	Support					800
535865	Mr D.C Bryson		CSO2 0641	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
535875	Mr John Kitchenside		CSO2 0671	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
535907	Mr Christopher Baxendale		CSO2 0710	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
535935	Mr Peter J Medler		CSO2 0827	Option CM 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			800

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

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 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.			
535940	Mrs Linda Medler		CSO2 0773	Option CM 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?			800
536014	Mrs Dawn Tindall		CSO2 0867	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
536046	Mr L Appleton		CSO2 0887	Option CM 2	Support					800
536129	Mr Peter Houghton		CSO2 0962	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
536169	Mr Tony Trevis-Bell		CSO2 1012	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
536267	Trish Wheeler		CSO2 1150	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
536282	Mrs Doreen Kingaby		CSO2 1182	Option CM 2	Object					800
536324	Paul Sumner		CSO2 1266	Option CM 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			800

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							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 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 sites and they will all destroy habitat for local wildlife, VWM4 will also see ssi sites reed beds ancient hedgerows etc. severely disrupted. Did you know that there is a flood plain? What about the scientific report on the River Crane and fishing lakes down there? Common-sense please.			
536330	A Aylmore		CSO2 1258	Option CM 2	Object					800
536335	S Aylmore		CSO2 1277	Option CM 2	Object					800
536341	Mr Adrian Bowyer		CSO2 1303	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
536346	Mr Ben Richards		CSO2 1345	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
536349	Mrs C Bowyer		CSO2 1371	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
536449	Mr Dave Isaacs		CSO2 1444	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
536543	Mrs		CSO2	Option	Support		NO MORE HOUSES IN VERWOOD. ENOUGH IS			800

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Samantha Fysh		1516	CM 2			ENOUGH!!!!			
536572	Mr Roger Fysh		CSO2 1575	Option CM 2	Support		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			800
536576	Mrs Valerie Green		CSO2 1581	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
536628	Mr C.A Wills		CSO2 1642	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
536699	Ms Kathryn D'Arcy		CSO2 1772	Option CM 2	Support		Ensure that all existing unoccupied homes are utilised. Look at infill in a positive way- Ensure that all infrastructure REALLY supports proposed development Do not build homes if the occupants are unable to find work locally. This leads to juvenile problems and a group of unemployed within the community. There is not enough employment in Wimborne for the number of homes proposed.			800
536771	Mr B Lusher		CSO2 1841	Option CM 2	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			800

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							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.			
536790	David Steadman		CSO2 1894	Option CM 2	Object					800
536802	Mrs Anida Griffiths		CSO2 1948	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
536808	Ms Yvette Allen		CSO2 1986	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
536812	Mr R H Barker		CSO2 1981	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
536830	Mrs Janet Sutcliffe		CSO2 2049	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
536838	Ms Anita		CSO2 2053	Option CM 2	Object		We consider that Corfe Mullen cannot cope with this amount of rapid housing increase; it will have a			800

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Pearman						detrimental effect on the lives of all the current residents of Corfe Mullen, and will create overdevelopment to what is currently a semi rural location. For example 150 new family homes could create another 300 plus cars all trying to make the morning commute which is already at breaking point.			
536848	Ola Steadman		CSO2 2131	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
536850	Mr Michael Hird		CSO2 2124	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
536860	Mrs Sparks		CSO2 2182	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
536866	Ms Emma Huns		CSO2 2207	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
536932	Mr Paul Bason		CSO2 2297	Option CM 2	Object					800
537050	Diane Fletcher		CSO2 2406	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
359419	Mrs K. Blee	Clerk Corfe Mullen Parish Council	CSO2 2950	Option CM 2	Support		District and County Councils should proactively work with the Parish Council in identifying suitable land for additional allotments, for instance there may be suitable land which currently forms part of Candys Farm, either abutting the recreation ground county field or land on either side of Candy's Lane. Alternatively there may be suitable land within 400m of the heath or which is unsuitable for housing. The field next to the current site used to be allotments and should also be considered.			800
361342	Mr Graham Clarke	Spatial Planning Officer Dorset County Council	CSO2 2829	Option CM 2		General Comment	With regard to the proposed housing site CM2 in Corfe Mullen, the site is currently in use as allotments. Dorset County Council recognises the value of allotments to local residents. County Councillors representing the local area would			800

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							welcome a commitment to make alternative provision for loss of allotments, and would like to see some consideration given in the Core Strategy to potential alternative sites.			
537075	Mrs Elaine Holt		CSO2 2440	Option CM 2	Support					800
537106	Mrs C Hebditch		CSO2 2471	Option CM 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 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			800
537362	Mr Peter Constable		CSO2 2529	Option CM 2	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.			800
537435	Ms Pauline Burton		CSO2 2557	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
537529	Mrs C White		CSO2 2584	Option CM 2	Object		I am particularly concerned about the proposals for Lockyers School, Corfe Mullen and the relocation of allotments. I hope the old school building can be retained for some form of community use. I do not object to the school being redeveloped on the existing site, provided the old building is retained, and the wild area. My son attended this school, and he shares my concerns. Since most children walk to school there, placing a new school at the other side of the recreation ground increases their journey, especially as it is away from the main bulk of existing housing, and majority of the school population. I hope the rural nature and existing wildlife can be retained and even enhanced. Decades of soil improvement and cultivation are lost when allotments are moved; the tenants do not always acquire land of equivalent quality in return. This view applies to Cuthbert allotments as well. More land needs to be made available for community growing of food, including a community orchard, as local food production will become more important in the future. We should not use farmland for housing. Our green belts need to be protected without question. Architectural style and environmental good practice are crucial if new houses or industrial units have to be sited close to existing countryside. It would be appropriate to incorporate some form of green energy generation into any industrial sites and to encourage developers to find ways of making each new area of housing self sufficient in terms of energy. Land may need to be incorporated into their plans to accommodate this.			800
537571	Mr and Mrs N Leatherdale		CSO2 2636	Option CM 2		No Opinion				800
538210	Mr and Mrs Peter Griffiths		CSO2 2714	Option CM 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, and work and will alleviate pressure on rural communities with			800

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

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 facilities to provide affordable housing in the Green Belt.			
361276	Mr John Goddard		CSO1 20	9.83	Support					803
480020	Mr Richard Aylmore		CSO2 36	9.83	Object		<p>These proposed plans significantly reduce the provision of open space in Corfe Mullen - they do not improve it. There are no definitive plans for where the displaced recreational facilities would be relocated to and how this would be paid for (i.e. the on-going maintenance costs of two recreation grounds instead of one). The briefly mentioned area to the south of the Village would be very close to the heath land and may threaten this valuable area of land.</p> <p>The location of Lockyer's should be confirmed - surely this would have a bearing on how many houses could be built? If it is relocated to the south of the Village it may threaten Corfe Mullen's heath land. It has previously been established that it cannot be absorbed into the Corfe Hills School site and that local residents want to preserve the original Lockyer's School building - how will the Council meet the costs of preserving this building at a time of significant budget cuts? Also, how suitable would the building be for community use in the 21st Century?</p> <p>A development of this size would require significant infrastructure improvements - no such improvements have been proposed. Therefore, traffic congestion would increase exponentially both in and around Corfe Mullen.</p> <p>A development of this size would completely change the character of Corfe Mullen - such a population increase could bring into question Corfe Mullen's status as a village. It would place significant pressure on local facilities and services and thus lower the standard of living for existing residents.</p> <p>Corfe Mullen's Green Belt should be preserved, not built upon.</p> <p>One has to question, what is the point in designating an area as Green Belt if, at a later date, its boundaries can be so easily changed and it built upon?</p>			803

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact 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 Council should promote more in-filling, i.e. where bungalows/houses are replaced by low-rise flats - examples of this can be seen around the village, the impact of in-filling is certainly less than what the Core Strategy proposes.</p> <p>Building on the Green Belt should be prevented and actively opposed. Amending the Green Belt boundaries to suit these plans is not acceptable. As noted, the proposals are contradictory - it wishes to improve the provision of open space and yet in reality it will reduce the provision of open space if plans to build on the Green Belt are realised. Corfe Mullen's Green Belt should be preserved, not built upon.</p> <p>This paragraph mentions accessibility to services, facilities and employment opportunities as key reasons for why Corfe Mullen has been considered to be an appropriate place to consider housing development.</p> <p>This however contradicts what has been said in previous paragraphs.</p> <p>Accessibility - It has been stated (in paragraph 9.5) that Corfe Mullen has a very limited public transport system. This limits resident's ability to access local services unless they have a car. If the proposal is realised the number of cars will rise and accessibility to services would most likely be reduced due to the subsequent increase in road congestion.</p> <p>Facilities - Corfe Mullen's current facilities have been described as 'modest' for a village of its size (in paragraph 9.11). The proposal posits that additional retail provision should be provided; this however would be on a scale which would completely change the character of the village and place existing retailers (such as the Post Office) at risk. In addition, other facilities such as Doctors and Dentists are not mentioned - a steep population increase would place these and other existing facilities/services under pressure.</p> <p>Employment opportunities - It has been acknowledged in paragraph 9.20 that there are few employment opportunities in Corfe Mullen itself. The reasons for considering Corfe Mullen as an appropriate place to consider building additional</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
							housing do not seem to meet with the reality of the situation as presented by the proposal itself.			
483385	Mr Clive Fisher		CSO3 48	9.83	Object		Would be 2nd of my preferred options, but unhappy with loss of recreational ground unless land is found in southern part of village. Must be cheaper to maintain one area rather than two.			803
478218	Mr Michael Denmark		CSO2 885	9.83	Object		This land forms part of an exceptionally extensive recreation ground and a significant asset to the village. It should not be used for development			803
481504	MR ANTHONY FRANCIS		CSO1 65	Option CM 3	Object		The Corfe Mullen recreation ground needs to be viewed as a whole. The open space is one of the best in the South providing room not only for sports but also for all ages to enjoy the freedom to exercise in a safe all weather environment on the edge of open countryside with views. If the Eastern section of the recreation ground was used for development it could never be replaced and would be a loss to existing and future generations. Any alternative space provided elsewhere in the village would not compensate for the loss of a unique asset. We have a responsibility to treasure and protect this recreational space.			804
480020	Mr Richard Aylmore		CSO2 44	Option CM 3	Object		These proposed plans significantly reduce the provision of open space in Corfe Mullen - they do not improve it. There are no definitive plans for where the displaced recreational facilities would be relocated to and how this would be paid for (i.e. maintenance costs of two recreation grounds instead of one). The briefly mentioned area to the south of the Village would be very close to the heath land and may threaten this valuable area of land. The location of Lockyer's should be confirmed - surely this would have a bearing on how many houses could be built? If it is relocated to the south of the Village it may threaten Corfe Mullen's heath land. It has previously been established that it cannot be absorbed into the Corfe Hills School site and that local residents want to preserve the original Lockyer's School building - how will the Council meet the costs			804

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact 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 preserving this building at a time of significant budget cuts? Also, how suitable would the building be for community use in the 21st Century?</p> <p>A development of this size would require significant infrastructure improvements - no such improvements have been proposed. Therefore, traffic congestion would increase exponentially both in and around Corfe Mullen.</p> <p>A development of this size would completely change the character of Corfe Mullen - such a population increase could bring into question Corfe Mullen's status as a village. It would place significant pressure on local facilities and services and thus lower the standard of living for existing residents.</p> <p>Corfe Mullen's Green Belt should be preserved, not built upon.</p> <p>One has to question, what is the point in designating an area as Green Belt if, at a later date, its boundaries can be so easily changed and it built upon?</p> <p>The Council should promote more in-filling, i.e. where bungalows/houses are replaced by low-rise flats - examples of this can be seen around the village, the impact of in-filling is certainly less than what the Core Strategy proposes.</p> <p>Building on the Green Belt should be prevented and actively opposed. Amending the Green Belt boundaries to suit these plans is not acceptable.</p> <p>As noted, the proposals are contradictory - it wishes to improve the provision of open space and yet in reality it will reduce the provision of open space if plans to build on the Green Belt are realised.</p> <p>Corfe Mullen's Green Belt should be preserved, not built upon.</p> <p>This paragraph mentions accessibility to services, facilities and employment opportunities as key reasons for why Corfe Mullen has been considered to be an appropriate place to consider housing development.</p> <p>This however contradicts what has been said in previous paragraphs.</p> <p>Accessibility - It has been stated (in paragraph 9.5) that Corfe Mullen has a very limited public transport system. This limits resident's ability to access 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>services unless they have a car. If the proposal is realised the number of cars will rise and accessibility to services would most likely be reduced due to the subsequent increase in road congestion.</p> <p>Facilities - Corfe Mullen's current facilities have been described as 'modest' for a village of its size (in paragraph 9.11). The proposal posits that additional retail provision should be provided; this however would be on a scale which would completely change the character of the village and place existing retailers (such as the Post Office) at risk. In addition, other facilities such as Doctors and Dentists are not mentioned - a steep population increase would place these and other existing facilities/services under pressure.</p> <p>Employment opportunities - It has been acknowledged in paragraph 9.20 that there are few employment opportunities in Corfe Mullen itself. The reasons for considering Corfe Mullen as an appropriate place to consider building additional housing do not seem to meet with the reality of the situation as presented by the proposal itself.</p>			
483385	Mr Clive Fisher		CSO3 49	Option CM 3	Object		Last of my preferred option owing to loss of recreational space.			804
490527	Corfe Mullen Parish Council	Corfe Mullen Parish Council	CSO9 75	Option CM 3	Object		<p>Strongly object. This is the most visible part of Corfe Mullen. Contrary to the information in the consultation document, this area of the Recreation Ground in fact houses the majority of the football pitches and offers excellent flat recreational space. It is an integral part of the recreation ground and used widely for non-sports recreational use too. The south of the village needs recreational and sports facilities but to halve the size of that provided in the north is not the answer. This land should be protected as a recreation ground in perpetuity. The Corfe Mullen Sports Association has prepared a very comprehensive response to this option which is to be submitted by them in due course.</p>			804
360714	Mrs Carol		CSO2 019	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

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									
361055	Mr David Oakley		CSO1 007	Option CM 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.			804
361099	Mrs Lynette Payne		CSO1 253	Option CM 3	Object		A good number of these options, especially in Wimborne and Parley, are on the edges of the urban areas. Building in these locations changes the whole ethos of the area. When you leave Wimborne you see fields, trees and rivers dotted with thatched cottages. Even along Leigh Road, there is a definite rural feel, with true separation between Wimborne and Colehill. Developing along here or Cranborne Road will dramatically change the area, for the worst. This in turn reduces people's quality of life, as we see our area creep closer to urbanisation, field by field. Why can't some of the brownfield sites be used instead?			804
361111	Mr Raymond Brown		CSO2 072	Option CM 3	Support		Affordable Homes - What would be the process on the allocation / purchase / rental of affordable homes? Would they be available only to local East Dorset residents, (say minimum of 10 years residency in the East Dorset District)? I would be concerned if they ended up being allocated to EU or non EU immigrants with little connection to the area.			804
361170	Mr T Harvey		CSO2 842	Option CM 3	Support					804
484088	Mr David Price		CSO2 506	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
490852	Mr C J TIMMS		CSO1 065	Option CM 3	Object		Building 310 (approx.) homes in this area will completely change the character of this old part of the village, changing forever the relative tranquillity enjoyed by the residents. In my opinion housing on this scale should be carried out to the west of the village in the Naked Cross area, where there will be much less impact.			804
491311	Mr		CSO2	Option	Support					804

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Kevin Gilling		709	CM 3						
491317	M S WALKER		CSO1 210	Option CM 3	Object		To lose the recreational facilities which are well placed and extremely well used would impact significantly on the community 'quality of life' and 'well being'. Putting buildings in the area CM3 would have a negative impact on the Stour Valley. These facilities and sports fields are easily accessible to all locals through the public footpaths and roads. As Corfe Mullen has been extensively developed already to one to the largest villages in the UK, I feel that it has had more than its fair share of development over the past years.			804
491401	Mr S Ost		CSO1 271	Option CM 3	Object		The local roads, schools, hospitals would be unable to cope with extra movements of traffic and people coming into the area.			804
495562	Mr MJ Banting		CSO1 510	Option CM 3	Support					804
495625	Mr Michael McMath		CSO1 537	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
495971	Mr T A Reith		CSO2 196	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
496188	Mr RE Vogel		CSO1 617	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
496479	Charlotte Dixon		CSO1 703	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
496564	Mr JH Lockwood		CSO1 750	Option CM 3	Support		How are you going to ensure these so called affordable homes aren't snapped up by outsiders buying second homes?			804
496612	Mr and Mrs		CSO1 800	Option CM 3	Object					804

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	JP Lovell									
496958	Mrs J Beech		CSO1 930	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
497026	Doreen Smith		CSO1 987	Option CM 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.			804
497060	Mrs Mary Tuffrey		CSO2 059	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
497089	Mr Frank A Soan		CSO2 103	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
497184	Mr Hilling		CSO2 192	Option CM 3	Support					804
497343	Sharon Sutcliffe		CSO2 274	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
497743	Mrs Susan Jefferies		CSO2 459	Option CM 3	Object		Vital part of our Recreation Ground, home to 5 football pitches in the season.			804
497773	Mr R Johnstone		CSO2 477	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
498044	Mrs Carolyne Banks		CSO2 662	Option CM 3	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.			804
498047	Mr CD Bradford		CSO2 649	Option CM 3	Support					804

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
498062	Mr Nick Crawford		CSO2 717	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
498084	Mr P Hartley		CSO2 749	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
498125	Mr and Mrs P Dashwood		CSO2 791	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
498169	Mrs D WEAVER		CSO2 896	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
498184	Mrs Angela Barker		CSO2 923	Option CM 3	Object		Not every area needs affordable housing - if a lot of people are retired and/or own their own homes, does it matter?			804
359908	Mr F.D.A Revill		CSO6 241	Option CM 3	Object					804
359927	Mrs Ann Bissex		CSO6 356	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
360037	Mr Dave Barnes		CSO4 045	Option CM 3	Object	General Comment	What alternative locations, if any, have been considered? There is mention of heathland development.....where would this be?			804
360685	Mr M.P Hose		CSO4 632	Option CM 3	Object		CM 3 - My objections are on the grounds of additional charge on the community charge payer. General Comment - East Dorset District Council should adopt a policy of increasing the annual community charge in line with the increase of pensions financed from the public sector. From the money raised, the first call must be for statutory obligations of the council, the remainder may be used for supporting sporting facilities and such like.			804
361041	Mr & Mrs		CSO4	Option		No Opinion				804

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

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 Hampton		018	CM 3						
361089	Mr David Nash	Director Urban DNA	CSO3 352	Option CM 3	Object		Adverse impact on the green belt, visual setting of the village (viewed from the Stour Valley) and loss of recreational / leisure land.	Land only to be used as playing fields and allotments, maintaining its predominantly open character, to facilitate comprehensive development on 'Sites 2-3' including the relocation and replacement of Lockyer's School and mixed use development at the current school site.		804
361106	Mr and Mrs Robin and Janet WALL		CSO3 672	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
361210	Mr John East		CSO5 115	Option CM 3	Support		This is fine providing facilities and access are properly catered for. This must include improved access to the A31 which is already a nightmare for local residents			804
361222	Ms Sarah WASTELL		CSO6 327	Option CM 3	Object		The recreation ground is so well utilised by the Corfe Mullen community that I think it would be a great loss to build on this area. I think it would be fragmented if facilities were relocated elsewhere. It's a wonderful asset for the community. People of all ages and interests use the recreation ground and I think any community would aspire to have this type of resource and set up. A new road infrastructure is needed as Wimborne Road already struggles with current volume and people do not stick to speed limit.			804
361246	Mr Andy Edwards		CSO4 136	Option CM 3	Object	General Comment	I strongly believe that the Waterloo Valley in Corfe Mullen (including Broadmoor Road and Pardy's Hill) should be protected from new housing due to the fact that is beautiful, gives much pleasure to cyclists, drivers, runners, horses. This is why it is an important part of high quality Green Belt land to protect. Any building towards the top of Pardy's Hill (Sleigh Lane /			804

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							Haywards Lane) will lead to further future encroachment down the beautiful Waterloo Valley. The Rec is a wonderful community asset and the space is fully utilised at the weekend with so many sports matches all over the land. It seems sensible to build on CM 2 and CM 1 if schooling needs can be met in another way (again without infringing on the Waterloo Valley).			
361278	Mrs Nicola Hoar		CSO3 748	Option CM 3	Object		A31 should be increased to dual carriageway as far west as Merley before any of this can happen. Even at non-rush hour times, this road cannot cope. I hope the transport improvements include subsidised bus fares and regular services. Otherwise people will persist in using cars even if there is gridlock.			804
361295	Mr & Mrs Arnold		CSO6 720	Option CM 3	Object					804
361303	Lt.Col R.A Peake		CSO3 329	Option CM 3	Support		A good "link up" with Corfe Mullen 1 & 2 proposals. The visible impact from Wimborne would be largely shielded by the current "East End estate".	The south of the village off the Wareham Road is an eye sore. An illegal scrap yard; sad, neglected paddocks all on relatively flat ground. Could make alternative sports grounds and allotments.		804
361309	Mr Ronald Loader		CSO3 385	Option CM 3	Support		To provide adequate affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly, it is necessary to build 150 homes. Avoid need to re-locate school and allotments			804
361318	Mr F.L Marsh		CSO6 249	Option CM 3	Object					804
477822	Ms Susan Rayment		CSO6 768	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
491232	Mr Keith Barnett		CSO6 973	Option CM 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			804

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							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.			
498268	Mr and Mrs R Cullen		CSO3 004	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
498271	Ms Mandy Cheeseman		CSO3 051	Option CM 3	Object		Corfe Mullen is a large enough village at present. Traffic in the mornings is horrendously busy without adding to it. I walk up to the Rec often and it's always being used and would be a real shame to lose it to houses in such a picturesque spot. Also, the main reason I moved to Stour View Gardens!			804
498280	Mr and Mrs G Norris		CSO3 044	Option CM 3	Object		We/I am not sure that there is enough employment in this area. New residents would have to travel to any work i.e. putting a further strain on local roads and transport. There is already a parking/access problem at the parade of shops in the main road of the village i.e. Wareham Road. There are not enough or large enough facilities in Corfe Mullen as it is. We don't think there should be any further encroachment on the Green Belt.			804
498335	Mr and Mrs Lester		CSO3 203	Option CM 3	Object					804
498336	Mr & Mrs A Basterfield		CSO3 074	Option CM 3	Object		We believe it is important to keep Green Belt areas and retain all of the recreation land.			804
498421	Mr Jeremy		CSO3 182	Option CM 3	Object					804

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Hett									
498485	Mrs E Seward		CSO3 253	Option CM 3	Support		My preferred option. Build new school on existing school playing field. New houses on current school site from school car park to corner of Blandford/Wimborne road. Move allotments to other side on corner Lockyers/Wimborne road-edge of new school, all topsoil to make good allotment ground. New houses off Violet Farm Close- allotment current site, as per CM2. Leave playing field in recreation ground CM3.			804
498495	Mr John Williams		CSO3 272	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
498711	Mr Tam Chant		CSO3 384	Option CM 3	Object					804
498996	Mrs M E Clarke		CSO3 451	Option CM 3	Object					804
499231	Mrs A Lathbury		CSO3 521	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
499236	Mr J Pipe		CSO3 541	Option CM 3	Object					804
499245	Mr and Mrs N Butler		CSO3 576	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
499261	Mrs Norma Jackson		CSO3 610	Option CM 3	Support		I have no objection to the limited use of green belt land for development, as long as there are no water/flooding issues, and there are enough green spaces in any development for children's play areas. There does not seem to be a village centre in Corfe Mullen anyway, so a new development should be welcomed as an opportunity to provide this. Can't see any detriment to the Co-op or Library - there are still			804

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

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 people living around them.			
499290	Mrs Lisa TURNBULL		CSO3 643	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
499384	Mr A I ROSE		CSO3 716	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
499858	Mr & Mrs M Palmer		CSO3 971	Option CM 3	Support					804
499873	Mr Graham Holt		CSO3 986	Option CM 3	Object					804
500060	Mr Stuart Piddock		CSO4 074	Option CM 3	Object					804
500070	Mr J W ELCOCK		CSO4 106	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
500113	Mr and Mrs T J Gurr		CSO5 743	Option CM 3	Object		Houses on our recreation ground? Out of the question.			804
500147	Mrs R Edwards		CSO4 161	Option CM 3	Object		The Waterloo Valley, including the fields around Pardy's Hill, Broadmoor Road and Hayward's Lane, is a beautiful area, giving Corfe Mullen its unique 'rural' feel. It is constantly in use by walkers, cyclists and horse riders. Any building on the fields surrounding this area would completely destroy the natural beauty, enjoyed by so many. If any new houses have to be built, keep them close to the areas that are already built up - as this will not change the character of the village. Also any building on the hills adjacent to Pardy's Hill will greatly increase the risk of flooding to houses below.			804

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
500222	Mr S Hartley		CSO4 186	Option CM 3	Object					804
500350	Mr P H Bartlett		CSO4 218	Option CM 3	Support					804
500361	Mr and Miss N and A Middleton and Turner		CSO4 258	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
500427	Mrs D J LYONS		CSO4 309	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
500558	Mr A Baker		CSO4 350	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
500697	Mr Thomas SMITH		CSO4 478	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
500706	Mr and Mrs R Jeans		CSO4 508	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
500720	Mrs VALLIER		CSO4 524	Option CM 3	Object					804
500748	Mrs Lauren Matthews		CSO4 585	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
500802	Mr J Hayward		CSO4 677	Option CM 3	Object					804
500814	B Fagan		CSO4 707	Option CM 3	Object					804

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
500836	Mrs Sylvia Hines		CSO4 724	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
500903	Mr and Mrs S and R Harris		CSO4 773	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
501012	Mrs Louise Arnold		CSO4 842	Option CM 3	Support					804
501015	Mr & Mrs W McMillan		CSO4 860	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
501018	Mr Robert P Hand		CSO4 846	Option CM 3	Object		<p>Re: Corfe Mullen Options. Development of Recreation Ground / Lockyers School Site.</p> <p>Could the reason for any possible development on the eastern side of Corfe Mullen Recreation Ground be more to do with its prestigious location, rather than the need for housing and / or a new school? (i.e. the view). No doubt the more expensive properties would be designed and built with the view in mind! Why should this area / view be taken away from the many and given to the few.</p> <p>No part of Corfe Mullen Recreation Ground should be built upon EVER! It was provided as an open space to be used and enjoyed by local people, and should remain as such. Indeed, it has already been used for this purpose by generations, and as such would quite rightly meet all the required criteria for any future application for 'Town Green' status!</p> <p>Surely the most logical solution to building any new properties in the Lockyers School area of Corfe Mullen would be to allow building on the area between 'Violet Close Farm' and the 'Allotments'. Development could also be permitted on the existing school playing field! Lockyers School could be redeveloped on its existing site, with the facilities at the Recreation Ground being used for school sporting / games activities. The recreation ground could be accessed from the school via a purpose built crossing</p>			804

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

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 walkway! This option would have the benefits of: 1: Not having to relocate Lockyers School or the Allotments to elsewhere in the village. 2: The recreation ground would not need to be built on. 3: That any new housing would be adjacent to already residential areas.			
501056	Dr and Mrs M S Taylor		CSO4 908	Option CM 3	Object		We feel with so much Government emphasis on well being, that the unique recreation ground, which gives enormous pleasure to the residents of Corfe Mullen could be broken up, and even though there is suggestion of re siting, the recreation ground is irreplaceable, and we feel it would be an unwise decision to build on this wonderful site.			804
501079	Mrs Linda M O'Connell		CSO4 961	Option CM 3	Object					804
501107	Mr & Mrs E C Lacey		CSO4 977	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
501118	Mr Ron Cook		CSO5 002	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
501331	Mr Michael Henry		CSO5 186	Option CM 3	Support					804
501351	Mr and Mrs R D'Cruze		CSO5 221	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
501364	Mr M Devetta		CSO5 850	Option CM 3	Object					804
501485	Mrs J Jackson		CSO5 289	Option CM 3	Object		You need to take into account impact or roads, transport, shops, doctor's surgery, schools, when building new homes, not just roads alone.			804

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
501488	Mr Chris Lamb		CSO5 320	Option CM 3	Support					804
501502	Mr Michael WAREHAM		CSO5 367	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
501503	Mr N F Stripp		CSO5 363	Option CM 3	Object					804
501508	Mr Martin Davies		CSO5 411	Option CM 3	Object		We totally object to any buildings in CM1, CM2 and CM3. We moved to Corfe Mullen in 1979 to live in this lovely rural area with views of the fields behind our property.			804
501513	Mr O E Beverley		CSO5 403	Option CM 3	Support					804
501520	Mrs Z Merrifield		CSO5 427	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
501523	Rita Gilbert		CSO5 459	Option CM 3	Object					804
359598	Mr A Ketchley		CSO7 995	Option CM 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			804
359873	Mrs M Hughes		CSO8 612	Option CM 3	Support		A31 Canford Bottom needs to be bridged if increased traffic from new housing takes place; it just can't take any further loading (or a dual carriage way up to A350 from Ferndown).			804

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
359889	Mr and Mrs P Clark		CSO8 482	Option CM 3	Object		With any developments we would need to be assured that infrastructure improvements are in place BEFORE any development is consented to. This is particularly important with regard to public transport provisions. It is also important that feedback is forthcoming as an acknowledgement of our response to this survey.			804
359977	Miss M.G. Earp		CSO8 046	Option CM 3	Object					804
360145	Mr Nigel WARREN		CSO8 202	Option CM 3	Support					804
361015	Mr and Mrs M.S and C.E Hack		CSO8 484	Option CM 3	Support					804
361113	Mr Alan Meade		CSO7 182	Option CM 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.			804
361123	Mr Iain STEVENSON		CSO8 221	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
361178	Mr and Mrs Norman and Sarah Wall		CSO8 762	Option CM 3	Object		CM3 is too big for the village and would put too much pressure on existing facilities e.g. medical, educational. How would this take pressure off Upton Heath? This is unique in our area and would not be replicated by other recreational facilities.			804
361206	Mr Iain Robinson		CSO9 033	Option CM 3	Object		As housing has become unaffordable for many young people, making developers contribute to transport improvements will just mean the costs passed on and make the new homes even more out of their price			804

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							bracket. Public transport fails at the moment to connect where people live to where they work, after all people tend to go to work more often than they go shopping and thus cars are needed for employment and having their own transport makes buses irrelevant and less in touch with the 24/7 and shiftwork employment patterns.			
501542	Mr and Mrs STRACHAN		CSO5 519	Option CM 3		No Opinion	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. i.e. Verwood Hub; Lenham, Kent; Ditton, Nr Maidstone, Kent. My ref: 10 years as a Parish Councillor in Ditton, Kent.			804
501547	Mrs Helen Lessnoff		CSO5 574	Option CM 3	Object					804
501560	Mr Christopher Clarke		CSO5 575	Option CM 3	Object					804
501589	Mrs P Parkes		CSO5 655	Option CM 3	Object		I object to the homes on Lockyers School site if the new school is built on a green field site. Future generations will not thank us for losing these open spaces.			804
501596	Mr and Mrs B & K O'Loughlin		CSO5 708	Option CM 3	Object					804
501616	Mr R J Joyce		CSO5 767	Option CM 3	Support		No building in Waterloo Valley.			804
501626	Mrs J A		CSO5 750	Option CM 3	Object		I strongly object to building houses or a school on east of Corfe Mullen recreation ground. This is a			804

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Russell						necessary amenity which is used greatly by a large majority of the village. Sports activities, dog walking, children's leisure time, is a necessity for the wellbeing of all, mentally and physically. The recreation space is a place to go to escape the hustle and bustle of everyday life and to even consider building on this beautiful landscape is complete madness! We do not have enough green space at the moment and to destroy the recreation ground would be insane !! Corfe Mullen could not cope with building 150 new homes. The infrastructure - more traffic, not enough doctors, dentists or schools would be impossible for every day life to run smoothly. Although I do not agree with any building of new housing in Corfe Mullen, Option CM2 (Violet Farm) is the lesser of 3 evils !! We do not need another supermarket in the village; it is already one of the largest villages in Europe. We do not want it turned into a town! The Co-op is adequate for all our needs - Thank You !!			
501694	Mr R Bryan		CSO5 790	Option CM 3	Support					804
501699	B THOMAS		CSO5 817	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
501720	Dr and Mrs D Harlow		CSO5 908	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
501761	Mr D Curtis		CSO6 009	Option CM 3	Object		The most urgent and critical limiting factors are the A31 single carriageways E and W and density of traffic using Canford Bottom roundabout - Encouraging increased commercial traffic re. PC 4 to PC 9 would only exacerbate the present traffic problems.			804
501788	Mr Evan Waterman		CSO6 058	Option CM 3	Object		As you will see from my comments overleaf, I favour 2 options for Corfe Mullen, and am against one. However, I need to further clarify: Option CM 1 - This would depend on the education system adopted, and as yet no decision has been			804

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							made. Option CM 2 - Care would need to be taken to ensure the density of dwellings was not too great. Option CM 3 - Corfe Mullen needs its green space.			
501794	Mr and Mrs G Hattermore		CSO6 088	Option CM 3	Support					804
501813	Peter Holdaway		CSO6 110	Option CM 3	Support					804
501830	Mrs Yvonne Legg		CSO6 166	Option CM 3	Object					804
501867	Mrs I M Marks		CSO6 173	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
501873	Mr and Mrs H Lilley		CSO6 225	Option CM 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 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.			804
501876	Mr J Long		CSO6 194	Option CM 3	Object					804
501880	Mr and Mrs Anderson		CSO6 210	Option CM 3	Object		I can't see how you imagine people will be able to buy all these properties that are proposed when they are unable to get mortgages, losing their jobs, all the cutbacks that if not at the present time, will be felt in the near future. Also there is not the infrastructure to accommodate hundreds more families and the cars			804

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

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 go with them. The roads around and through the centre of Corfe Mullen are already some of the busiest and dangerous at certain times of the day. I could go on, but these are a few points to seriously think of, as it seems you are set on keeping already very greedy builders in work!			
501881	B W Deverill		CSO6 224	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
501900	Miss Theresa Gale		CSO6 251	Option CM 3	Object					804
501940	Mr M J Godfrey		CSO6 341	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
502022	Mr HWR Stevens		CSO6 382	Option CM 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.			804
502029	Mr J MacArthur		CSO6 419	Option CM 3	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.			804
502032	Mr and Mrs Pitt		CSO6 438	Option CM 3	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			804

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							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 Sedona		CSO6 493	Option CM 3	Object		Development should be restricted to brownfield sites. Greenbelt must be preserved. Any development impacting on environmentally important areas such as Wimborne watermeadows and River Allen must be avoided at all costs. Affordable homes should not be built on greenfield sites which have high environmental value to the community. These heritage sites must be preserved.			804
502076	Kay Stead		CSO6 546	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
502099	Mrs Carolyn Lourens		CSO6 584	Option CM 3	Object		Increased housing means increased population. The current infrastructure is already stretched to its limits, traffic and facilities will only suffer. There is insufficient parking already for the co-op store and nearby church. How will this help our fragile environment?			804
502114	Mr P Foster		CSO6 632	Option CM 3	Support					804
502136	Mr and Mrs WA Forster		CSO6 674	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
502138	Mrs E Mason		CSO6 684	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
502312	Mrs Sally Brierley		CSO6 796	Option CM 3	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			804

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							at risk of creating a need in order to service developers rather than establishing if there will be a real need in the first place?			
502317	Cllr Peter Lucas		CSO6 824	Option CM 3	Object					804
502326	Mr and Mrs T Bennett		CSO6 867	Option CM 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.			804
502333	Mr B M Andrews		CSO6 879	Option CM 3	Support		Make parents walk their children to school. Stop parents 4x4s, etc. Spend more money on our area. Council tax far too high and what benefits do we receive from the Parish Council?			804
502345	Mr and Mrs Ray and Irene Coulson		CSO6 942	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
502347	Mrs Sarah Cobb		CSO7 035	Option CM 3	Object					804
502381	Mr Cyril Josey		CSO7 048	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
502387	Mr George Kilpatrick		CSO7 028	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
502441	Mrs Ingrid Wells		CSO7 159	Option CM 3	Object					804
502468	Mr Robert Lambert		CSO7 379	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

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	Mrs Sarah Morgan		CSO7 274	Option CM 3	Object					804
502569	Mr & Ms M & L Skinner & Jeffries		CSO7 302	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
502570	Mr Samways		CSO7 330	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
502579	Mr & Mrs R L Thorne		CSO7 359	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
502595	Mr Colin House		CSO7 416	Option CM 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.			804
502596	Mr A C Hayter		CSO7 403	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
502610	Mr John Jackson		CSO7 465	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
502612	Hugh and Joy Dickson		CSO7 446	Option CM 3	Object					804
502673	Mrs A Powell		CSO7 556	Option CM 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 these building works that are already going on.			804
502701	Mrs M Williams		CSO7 589	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
502708	Ms		CSO7	Option		No Opinion				804

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

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		635	CM 3						
502745	Mrs J.M Kenny		CSO7 680	Option CM 3	Object					804
502913	Mr & Mrs D Whitmarsh		CSO7 891	Option CM 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			804
502935	Mr Roger Parker		CSO7 808	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
503024	Ms Valerie Measey		CSO8 877	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
503085	Mr P.A. Scott		CSO7 969	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
503156	Mr and Mrs R Blunderfield		CSO8 024	Option CM 3	Object					804
503171	Sally Cooke		CSO8 073	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
503183	Ms B Chissell		CSO8 150	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
359920	Mr S Parker		CSO9 537	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
359954	Mr Alan FLINT		CSO1 0007	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
360029	Mr David Lanigan		CSO1 0280	Option CM 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.</p> <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</p>			804

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>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 Polkinghorn		CSO9 820	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
360111	Mr K VIVIAN		CSO9 596	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
361037	Mr P STRATFORD		CSO1 1263	Option CM 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, and 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.			804
361105	Mr John Gooch	Colehill Parish Council	CSO9 908	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
498775	Mrs P L Buckler		CSO1 0755	Option CM 3	Object		I object very strongly to any green belt land being used for housing. The roads are very often impossible anyway without the massive increase proposed. HANDS OFF OUR GREEN BELT!!			804
499748	Ms Soozie Cooper		CSO9 738	Option CM 3	Support					804
503233	Mrs F Parkes		CSO8 238	Option CM 3	Object		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Further housing should only be considered where a proven need is indicated for affordable housing for Corfe Mullen residents (not incomers). Affordable housing should be provided in small local communities where needed by the local inhabitants. 2. Restrictions should be placed on private developers so that they provide equal numbers of affordable and other housing. 3. The Parish and District Councils should finance 			804

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>council housing, but not for resale, and for fixed terms reviewed at set intervals.</p> <p>4. Any proposals regarding Lockyers School cannot be made until the whole question of schools strategy has been worked out for the whole county; these proposals should not be included in the current Core Strategy.</p> <p>5. Moving the allotments is not a viable concept; its present location is reasonably accessible, there is a considerable waiting list, it has taken many years to bring the ground to a good state and there is not another suitable area within the village.</p> <p>6. Corfe Mullen already has adequate retail and community facilities and there is no demand for a distinctive centre to the village.</p> <p>7. "Could provide valuable green infrastructure" – only at the expense of destroying existing green infrastructure.</p> <p>8. Nothing can replace the unique location of the recreation ground (which by usage now includes the DCC area); the views are among the best in the county and it overlooks an area of outstanding natural beauty. Any other area would be too remote to be practical, be difficult to access and certainly would not have the visual appeal of the existing recreation ground.</p> <p>9. Development land is available on the north-west side of the Wareham Road which does not have an impact on the green belt; brown field sites are at present occupied by the old abattoir, the scrap yard and Naked Cross Nursery. Providing substantial fencing is erected on the south-east side of the Wareham Road, there would not be any impingement on the heathland.</p> <p>10. Finally it is quite wrong to "nibble" away at our green belt when the need is not proven; find out by a referendum in the county what the inhabitants want in detail, and then look at what is needed.</p>			
503250	Mrs Helen Poole		CSO8 245	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
503303	Mr		CSO8	Option		No Opinion				804

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Anthony Roberts		306	CM 3						
503315	Mr Kenneth Wood		CSO8 334	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
503347	Ms Hardwick		CSO8 361	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
503355	Mr Robert Griffiths		CSO8 389	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
503358	Mrs H C Hoare		CSO8 420	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
503444	Mr R Hobbs		CSO8 561	Option CM 3	Object					804
503482	Mr Ron Hopkins		CSO8 665	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
503554	Mr D Verguson		CSO8 745	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
503598	Mr John Turner		CSO8 765	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
503603	Mrs DJ Morley		CSO8 788	Option CM 3	Object					804
503621	A G Haines		CSO8 829	Option CM 3	Support		As I'm sure you are perfectly aware, all developments I have ticked require serious consideration to the whole road network in the areas concerned.			804
503624	Mr RT Jackson		CSO8 839	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
503635	Mr J Gough		CSO8 891	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
503639	Mrs and Mr M Stevens		CSO8 935	Option CM 3	Object		The A31 is already over-saturated with regular gridlock on Friday/Saturday. Without major redevelopment (min 2 lane carriageway from Ferndown industrial estate to Tolpuddle) it is incapable of taking any more traffic. The entire East Dorset area has already been over-developed versus other areas of the country. It does not have the transport, social, educational, etc. resources for any more. Corfe Mullen-it is ridiculous to build on former landfill.			804
503640	N J and S A White		CSO9 039	Option CM 3	Object					804
503644	Mr J Riley		CSO8 966	Option CM 3	Object					804
503687	Mr Nick Smith		CSO9 054	Option CM 3	Object					804
503690	Ms Clare Parvin		CSO9 110	Option CM 3	Object					804
503704	Mr RJ Legge		CSO9 108	Option CM 3	Object					804
503711	Mr SR May		CSO9 142	Option CM 3	Object		Feel this is much to oblige a development which would bring traffic to a standstill every morning as it's already congested due to heavy school/work traffic. Also the recreation ground is a very well used space by all sections of the community from young to old.			804
503725	Mr G A Hughes		CSO9 211	Option CM 3	Object					804

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
503759	Mr D.J. Middleton		CSO9 230	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
503787	Mrs P A Dent		CSO9 265	Option CM 3	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.			804
503846	Mr Anthony Hose		CSO9 304	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
503861	Mr E Hawkins		CSO9 336	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
503878	Mr Peter Smith		CSO9 394	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
503879	Mr S Smithson		CSO9 419	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
503943	Mr & Mrs Rumball		CSO9 446	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
504093	Mr & Mrs Vivian		CSO9 477	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
504101	Mrs Mary Trewiss-Bell		CSO9 504	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
504216	Mr		CSO9	Option	Object					804

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Mark Rich		574	CM 3						
504285	Mr P Miller		CSO9 637	Option CM 3	Object		Density - particularly FWP2. To achieve the densities you are proposing will be disastrously small - this is churning out rabbit hutches. Infrastructure. On the basis of 7 movements per property this amounts to almost 6000 additional movements per day on roads that are already overloaded. Highways works will only be tinkering with a situation that cannot cope with a minor accident or road works.			804
505273	Mrs Lorraine Hubbard		CSO9 846	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
505288	Mrs S Cramer		CSO9 882	Option CM 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.			804
505315	Mr Frank W Myerscough		CSO9 934	Option CM 3	Support					804
505354	Mr Tim Edwards		CSO9 954	Option CM 3	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!!!			804
505369	J Young		CSO9 981	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
505506	Mr Peter Hendra		CSO1 0057	Option CM 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			804

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

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 using them to make a transition to a low energy sustainable future for our children. Please listen to local residents and reject further development.			
505561	Mr D. Calvert		CSO1 0108	Option CM 3	Object					804
505590	M Spalding		CSO1 0137	Option CM 3	Object					804
505656	Mr Dave Evans		CSO1 0157	Option CM 3	Object		I'm pleased the regional spatial strategy died a death. The percentage of affordable housing will be achieved I hope. The road system is already congested in this area, how will it improve? It appears a decision needs t be made as to the continuance of Lockyers school. Who owns the land that figures in the proposed development?			804
505681	Mr Nick Lewis		CSO1 0173	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
505742	Mr L. J. Ashplant		CSO1 0199	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
505760	J Evans		CSO1 0215	Option CM 3	Object		Corfe Mullen does not have the infrastructure to support further development. Already crowded roads, health services stretched - more building adds pressure. Very suspicious of so called "social housing". Great danger of spoiling rural nature of area. Democratically we should have been given the right to reject all options. It's our village. Development will turn Corfe Mullen into dirty, noisy, overcrowded place.			804
505802	Mr RGH Chapman		CSO1 0250	Option CM 3	Object					804
506161	Mr RD Holyoake		CSO1 0324	Option CM 3	Object		Any more development within Dorset's existing built up areas will end with a complete gridlock of traffic.			804

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
506196	Mr & Mrs P Stout		CSO1 0353	Option CM 3	Object		The recreation ground is used a lot by the community and this site should not go forward for that reason.			804
506754	Mr Derek E Marsh		CSO1 0381	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
507026	Mr David Craig		CSO1 0433	Option CM 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.			804
507032	Mr David Oliver		CSO1 0459	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
507789	Mr CJ Barrett		CSO1 1441	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
507800	Mrs K M Platt		CSO1 1470	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
507980	Mrs Sylvia Allen		CSO1 1587	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
508383	Ms Emma Hayter		CSO1 1701	Option CM 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.			804
508413	Mrs S Best		CSO1 1761	Option CM 3	Support					804
359854	Mr T		CSO1 2699	Option CM 3	Object		I was elected by vote to Corfe Mullen Parish Council on an agenda of opposing further proposed housing			804

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

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						development in this parish. These core strategy proposals are not in accordance with the Corfe Mullen Parish plan which both CMPC and EDDC approved. Most of the proposals will mean the revision of Green Belt boundaries not in accordance with the plan. The core strategy was right to exclude all other parts of Corfe Mullen for more development. So this parish is not a suitable place for development.			
360097	Mr John DOWLING		CSO1 4494	Option CM 3	Object					804
360131	Mr Martin Hanham		CSO1 3027	Option CM 3	Object		I consider that, now that it has been accepted that the Corfe Mullen Meadows SSSI has incorrectly shown as a constraint on residential development, your Council should look once again at the Waterloo Valley, i.e. the land between Waterloo Road and Hillside Road to accommodate further housing. Furthermore, that land constrained by the Upton Heath SSSI, in this area, should be considered for the re-location of Lockyers school.			804
361227	Miss Angela Davis		CSO1 2992	Option CM 3	Object		Far too big. Impact on Wimborne Road traffic. Object to Recreation Ground being used for housing or anything else that is not free to be used by the general public.			804
361277	Mrs Judith Deadman		CSO1 2981	Option CM 3		No Opinion	Having attended the stand in the village hall on 06-12 -10 I do not feel able to make an informed decision as no-one seems to have enough information and probably won't until the decision has actually been made. I appreciate the attempt to involve the public, but when all my (very pertinent in my opinion) questions were answered 'we don't know at this stage' or similar it all seems a bit pointless.			804
361313	Ms Sarah Bowley		CSO1 2645	Option CM 3	Object		It would be such a shame if houses were built on the Rec as it is so well used by people of all ages.			804
478235	Ms Jane		CSO1 3014	Option CM 3	Object		1) Potential for increases in population of 300 - 600 people - too many for amenities and change in			804

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Brooks						<p>character of area.</p> <p>2) Current residents have chosen to live in area of low population - this would not suit everyone, but should not be changed.</p> <p>3) Argument for is 'only flat land left in Corfe Mullen so build on'. Surely this is an argument against. We should not build on last bit of flat land.</p> <p>4) If we change Green Belt boundaries, what is the point in having them, where would it stop?</p> <p>5) Light pollution from homes and street lights in rural area.</p> <p>6) Straightening of Wimborne Road brings road too close to residential properties and spoils the character of the road and area.</p> <p>7) Whatever modifications to the road system, there will be too many vehicles at peak times for it to cope.</p> <p>8) Just because wildlife is currently unthreatened - buzzards, badgers, deer, does not mean it will not be in future.</p>			
496659	Mr & Mrs Tony & Hilary Hendy		CSO1 1734	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
507033	A R Twaits		CSO1 0485	Option CM 3	Support	General Comment	<p>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.</p> <p>In particular problems on the Ferndown and Wimborne bypasses need to be resolved, and the A31 to Poole link built.</p>			804
507170	Miss A K Jukes		CSO1 0577	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
507218	Mr and Mrs J Smith		CSO1 0615	Option CM 3	Object					804

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
507286	Mr N P Butler		CSO1 0693	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
507336	Mr John Page		CSO1 0754	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
507356	Mr and Mrs M Moody		CSO1 0843	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
507363	Mr Kevin Sayer		CSO1 0849	Option CM 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 eyesore 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.			804
507388	Mr David Huggins		CSO1 0902	Option CM 3	Object					804
507474	Mark and Jean Cording		CSO1 1035	Option CM 3	Object		1) We are still due a correction in housing prices; housing benefits have artificially underpinned the bubble. The so called shortage of housing is also caused by breaking up of the family unit (teenagers and young people do not need their own homes) 2) The Green Belt must be protected, a temporary supposed need would and could not be reversed. There are hundreds of brown sites which could be utilised, without the need for more disruptive and expensive infrastructure. 3) Green Belt land was created to protect open land between and around developments. We anticipated development and councils saying they need more land, it was and is vital so please do not change the policy. Times change, needs change, populations			804

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							(immigration and emigration) demands disappear but green land cannot be replaced.			
507524	Mr C G Richardson		CSO1 1079	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
507555	Mr and Mrs C Lamond		CSO1 1106	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
507659	Ms Victoria Johnstone		CSO1 1217	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
507693	Mrs P Carter		CSO1 1265	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
508835	Mrs E.L. Stratford		CSO1 2184	Option CM 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.			804
508852	Mrs L.A. Chesshire		CSO1 2232	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
508887	Mr J.S. Kidd		CSO1 2305	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
509065	Mrs B Burge		CSO1 2493	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
509100	Mrs Judy Waite		CSO1 2516	Option CM 3	Object					804

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
509106	Dawn Clark		CSO1 2529	Option CM 3	Object					804
509119	Mr A Reachill		CSO1 2538	Option CM 3	Object		Suggest reconsider land on western slopes where building has already successfully taken place i.e. Orchard Lane, Haywards Lane etc. Leave the remaining flat land i.e. school sports field, recreation ground allotments green.			804
509129	Mr Simon Briscoe		CSO1 2550	Option CM 3	Object		The search area is too limiting, confining the options. They are unacceptable. The housing proposals put forward will not satisfy the perceived affordable housing. These houses will be taken up by people to commute to other areas, as has happened previously. Building on recreational space and infill development has to stop; it is changing the village character. I understand the consultation has revealed an impasse between SSSI, nature conservation, Green Belt and our lineally developed village set on a plateau. The geography cannot change but our use of the surrounding land can - if it is deemed necessary which I doubt. This document and the Local Plan have therefore to look further.			804
509164	Mr Courtney		CSO1 2554	Option CM 3	Object					804
509168	Mr and Mrs P Lawton		CSO1 2558	Option CM 3	Object		Both recreation grounds and the allotments should be preserved as they are both an extremely valuable community resource. Lockyers school can use the recreation ground for sporting activities. Both CM 2 and CM3 provide much needed green space for the village.			804
509171	Mr and Mrs J Newman		CSO1 2562	Option CM 3	Object		We dispute the alleged requirement for more houses in this area. There are plenty of houses on the market - some would be regarded by definition as 'affordable'. Poole and Bournemouth have some of the highest unemployment in the south so why attract more people into the area to worsen the situation. The only acceptable housing would be housing association rented only to local people.			804
509181	Mrs		CSO1	Option		No Opinion				804

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

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 Jones		2566	CM 3						
509182	Mr K A Jones		CSO1 2570	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
509272	Greg Dollerson		CSO1 2604	Option CM 3	Object		Objections to using Rec. CM3: 1) It is very well used and amenities well established. 2) Vital for recreation for all to enjoy and use and beautiful for all. 3) Protects Green Belt. 4) Do we need 150 houses so far from potential work and with limited transport possibilities?			804
509295	Miss G Burden		CSO1 2625	Option CM 3	Object		* creating more houses will not help those who can't afford a house as they will attract more people into the area. There are enough already if so many were not second homes, and those that have been built recently are far from affordable * The schools/doctors etc. are already full, we don't need to attract more people here. The roads are already inadequate for the level of traffic that uses them. * We do not need any more supermarkets around here, you don't have to travel far to get to one, and we already have the Co-op in the village. * Building on the recreation ground would limit the space available for playing sports and dog walking. Dog walkers would be forced onto the heathlands, which is both unsafe at times of the year (adders), and detrimental to the environment. * Why can we not have some green areas in the village? It will be a far less attractive place to live if every available space is built on. * I fail to see how building on so many fields would be creating a 'green infrastructure'. * How many of the people proposing this actually live in the village? * If only up to half of the houses being built would be 'affordable', its not exactly going to help many people buy a house, only those with money.			804
509316	Mr		CSO1	Option	Object					804

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

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 Godwin		2633	CM 3						
509428	Mrs Vanessa Burden		CSO1 2660	Option CM 3	Object		Roads can't cope with population now. Schools overcrowded. Doctors always fully booked now. Affordable housing should have been thought of years ago instead of allowing so many expensive houses to be built, which only outsiders could afford. Too many housing estates already. Rec is used and is central. Lockyers needs updating, not moving. Allotments have been well looked after and hard work put in. Corfe Mullen is too big now why make it bigger. It's a village not a town. There are plenty of shops in Broadstone if you can't get what you need in CM so no more supermarkets are needed or a new centre. If affordable housing is built it should only be for people who can prove they have lived in Corfe Mullen for a considerable time.			804
509438	Mr Nigel Burden		CSO1 2666	Option CM 3	Object		These proposals will only exacerbate the problems that already exist in the area. The infrastructure is inadequate to cope with the existing population, with doctors surgeries full to capacity, school full to capacity, woefully inadequate main road (A31 A350) to take the volumes of traffic that pass through the area. Public transport is not the answer due to the fact that residents are travelling to many differing areas for work, something that has been woefully neglected in Dorset for many years. As for social or affordable housing, these problems will not address the problem. This issue has been obvious for many years, yet precedence has been given to the building of more expensive type of residence. This is an attempt to shut the gate after the horse has bolted.			804
509454	Mr David Burden		CSO1 2679	Option CM 3	Object		Corfe Mullen is already full - the village does not have the facilities to support any more people. The roads are already used to capacity whilst public transport to the village is almost non-existent. Public services such as the doctors surgery are already full. There is also already a lack of suitable playing areas for kids. Getting rid of most of the recreation will just heighten that and this in an age when we are worried about levels of childhood obesity. People have also			804

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							put a lot of time and hard work into the allotments so destroying them for some unneeded houses is selfish. If you approve these plans it will just go to show that you don't care about servicing the village but just making a quick buck off rich city folk who will buy these.			
509466	Mr Andy Cobb		CSO1 2683	Option CM 3	Object					804
509470	Mrs S Joyce		CSO1 2687	Option CM 3	Support		Please do no build in Waterloo Valley.			804
509513	Mr K Moore		CSO1 2708	Option CM 3	Object		As a recreational area it must be fully protected. It fulfils all the outdoor sporting and leisure facilities for the Corfe Mullen residents and beyond.			804
509526	Mr E Cornick		CSO1 2715	Option CM 3	Object		1) Drainage from recreation ground - footpath rear style to Stourview Gardens is often under water. Disturbing land will probably exacerbate this and cause problems for properties there. 2) Transport - the road from Lake Gates to Windgreen Garage/Lockyers School is extremely busy with most traffic in excess of 30MPH speed limit. It can be a very long wait on a dangerous cross for vehicles leaving Stourview Gardens - extra traffic - more chance of a serious accident. 3) Affordable housing - yes - but it soon becomes unaffordable. The process has been used in the past - rather unsuccessfully - a problem living near to coast.			804
509540	Chris Finlay		CSO1 2726	Option CM 3	Object		Land for new football pitches will be difficult to find as it needs to be flat. Also, it has taken very many years to get the current pitches into a good condition.			804
509549	Mr D Russell		CSO1 2732	Option CM 3	Object		I strongly object to building houses or a school on the eastern part of Corfe Mullen Recreation Ground. The recreation Ground is a necessary amenity, which is used greatly by the majority of the village. Sports activities, dog walking and children's leisure time is a necessity for well being of all, mentally and physically.			804

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

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 recreation space is a place to go to escape the hustle and bustle of life, and to even consider building on this beautiful landscape is beyond belief! We do not have enough green space in Corfe Mullen at the moment; to destroy this park would be insane! Corfe Mullen could not cope with 150 new homes, more traffic, not enough doctors, dentists or schools. Although I do not agree with any new building in Corfe Mullen, Option CM2 (Violet Farm) is the lesser of 3 evils!!			
509577	Mrs Elizabeth Ann Short		CSO1 2745	Option CM 3	Object		The Recreation Ground is a large green open space which is used by many hundreds of people. The uses range from football (8 pitches at present, one of which cannot be used because it is waterlogged many months of the season), cricket, tennis, dog walking, base ball, picnics, jogging and many other activities. Should the Rec be split it will incur extra costs as groundsmen, grass cutting machine etc. will have to travel to an extra site. Many (young) children are not having enough exercise why would you even consider replacing it with housing?			804
509632	Mr and Mrs L and D Jackson		CSO1 2769	Option CM 3	Object		The Recreation Ground is one of Corfe Mullen's greatest assets - please leave. The roads, especially Wareham and Blandford Road cannot get any more busy - it is horrendous!! The infrastructure - parking, doctors surgery, parking, cannot handle all these extra houses and people and more cars! Some families have 3 cars.			804
509759	Mrs V Kitson		CSO1 2787	Option CM 3	Object		Sites should not be ruled out because they are steep (think of Swanage!)			804
509782	Mr and Mrs Harrison		CSO1 2803	Option CM 3	Object					804
509790	Ian Sparks		CSO1 2811	Option CM 3	Object					804
509796	B Sparks		CSO1 2820	Option CM 3	Object		Corfe Mullen is a village with village facilities and would not cope with large amounts of new housing			804

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							within its conurbations. Our wildlife would also suffer from building on the scales proposed.			
509804	Mrs J Best		CSO1 2830	Option CM 3	Object					804
509814	Mr T M Trickett		CSO1 2841	Option CM 3	Object		Would appear to be in the Green Belt with no suitable access.			804
509826	Mrs P Walker		CSO1 2855	Option CM 3	Object					804
509848	Mr & Mrs I Robertson		CSO1 2871	Option CM 3	Support		We support the recreation ground, as sport/recreational activities could be carried out at Lockyers school site.			804
509888	Dr A Craven		CSO1 2889	Option CM 3	Object		All three proposals for housing will cause heartache and drive a stake through the heart of the village: CM1 - builds on Lockyers site which is a beautiful school in the heart of the village. CM2 - this will destroy all the hours of hard work by the allotment holders and add lots of traffic onto an already dangerous and narrow stretch of road. CM3 - a great community space for activities by children and families. Where will the desecration of our village stop? Another set of badly thought out options for our village.			804
509906	Mr P Woodward		CSO1 2910	Option CM 3	Object		CM 1 to 3 are all council/public land areas, more likely to have been acquired for the use of its citizens for recreation and local sports. The use of these areas is not welcome, there are plenty of brown sites and other options available - bunch all together in one area. Your transport dreams are ideal but there is no reality, we already have traffic issues - Lockyers Road and Wimborne Road (around the Windgreen). You have not proposed any road changes or improved access points. Its bad enough that you			804

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							queue and cannot get onto the A31. This area and 3 proposals on top of each other is madness!!!			
509923	G Woodward		CSO1 2921	Option CM 3	Object		There is not enough infrastructure to cope with that many houses in Corfe Mullen and surrounding area. Also there is a public footpath that runs through the recreation ground. Where would you relocate the allotments? Does this also mean you are getting rid of Lockyers school? The other schools are not big enough to cope with extra children. The site is of natural beauty and it would be a shame to lose it for future generations.			804
509944	J Sparks		CSO1 2938	Option CM 3	Object					804
509975	Mr and Mrs J M Price		CSO1 2959	Option CM 3	Support		<p>1) There appear to be plenty of private dwellings for sale in Corfe Mullen so emphasis should be on affordable properties.</p> <p>2) Does not government realise that with no motorway in Dorset, the A31 and other major roads can hardly take more traffic. Has central government considered building a new small town in mid/north Dorset.</p> <p>3) If Lockyers school (1897) is demolished where would a replacement school (bigger?) be built?</p>			804
510009	Mr R M Langley		CSO1 2965	Option CM 3	Object		<p>I moved to the Broadstone/Corfe Mullen area in 1971. Since that time there has been a huge increase in housing leading to overload of traffic during peak hours - this will not be reduced/improved by public transport due to the spread out complex - making extensive journeys uneconomical for bus operators. Infill and demolish/rebuild should be the first consideration.</p> <p>Corfe Mullen is a spread out village and to keep referring to the village centre ignores the obvious facts - there isn't one.</p> <p>Housing expansion is not entirely necessary on this scale and should be considered nearby in more suitable locations.</p>			804
510048	Mrs Dorothy		CSO1 2985	Option CM 3	Object		1) The present recreation ground is one of the 'jewels' of this village.			804

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Scobey						2) It is used by village people across the age range, coming together on one site. You only have to be there at weekends to see the significance to the village - this should not be fragmented. We also have the benefit from a very good range of buildings linked to the sports facilities. 3) To attempt to create a village centre with the new development, on this site would make it very 'top heavy'. Much better to develop it around the Co-op, library area.			
510111	Mr Brian Lane		CSO1 3022	Option CM 3	Object		Strongly against any building on eastern part of the Recreation Ground.			804
510235	Mrs Deborah Hanham		CSO1 3031	Option CM 3	Object		I consider that, now that it has been accepted that the Corfe Mullen Meadows SSSI has incorrectly shown as a constraint on residential development, your Council should look once again at the Waterloo Valley, i.e. the land between Waterloo Road and Hillside Road to accommodate further housing. Furthermore, that land constrained by the Upton Heath SSSI, in this area, should be considered for the re-location of Lockyers school.			804
510241	Miss Danielle Hanham		CSO1 3035	Option CM 3	Object		I consider that, now that it has been accepted that the Corfe Mullen Meadows SSSI has incorrectly shown as a constraint on residential development, your Council should look once again at the Waterloo Valley, i.e. the land between Waterloo Road and Hillside Road to accommodate further housing. Furthermore, that land constrained by the Upton Heath SSSI, in this area, should be considered for the re-location of Lockyers school.			804
510252	Mrs J Wright		CSO1 3039	Option CM 3		General Comment	I do not live in Corfe Mullen as you will see. It is no good to build extra housing without something being done re roads. Broadstone can be gridlocked at school collection and delivery times. Bus services need mush improving and to be more reliable. Please - no more pressure on us who live down in Broadstone.			804
510420	Mr		CSO1	Option		No Opinion				804

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Peter Stevens		3152	CM 3						
510490	Ms Helen Banfield		CSO1 3238	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
510532	Mr W.W. Chant		CSO1 3280	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
510623	Mr Douglas Priest		CSO1 3385	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
361121	Mrs Elizabeth Jones		CSO1 4011	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
361124	Mrs M.E Brown		CSO1 6357	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
361138	Mr Rod WHITHAM		CSO1 6884	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
361196	Mr J.M Bullivant		CSO1 6275	Option CM 3	Support		It is important to have affordable housing in this area but not to encroach on existing green belt land.			804
361279	Mrs Brenda Tye		CSO1 5716	Option CM 3	Object					804
361298	Mr S.J Damon		CSO1 6788	Option CM 3		General Comment	I note that all three options are baited with the suggestion that up to 50% could be "affordable housing". The current system of allocation has ensured that virtually no suitable affordable housing has been built in Corfe Mullen over the past years, yet the list of housing is prominently used to justify more houses. Since those needing local housing will predominately require affordable homes here is an issue which should be addressed now. The rule,			804

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>originally intended to assist the homeless, has been worded with a bias totally in favour of the small developer and presented as though graven on tablets of stone. The rule should be changed now, not when the Strategy Consultation is summarized, maybe in some years time. To assist in readdressing the unbalance I propose that ALL new housing in the three options should be affordable.</p> <p>I am reluctant to accept any encroachment on recreational facilities and oppose full housing development on this site. The field does, however, cover a large area. It might be acceptable to build a single row of houses backing onto those in Stour View Gardens with access to Wimborne Road. The open access between the fields should be kept. It is essential that the unparalleled view from the footpath over the valley towards Badbury Rings and far beyond should not be constrained in any way, even by the proximity of any new housing. This view, in depth and quality, far exceeds any other in this village which has many fine aspects.</p>			
476264	Mr David Reddaway		CSO1 5668	Option CM 3	Object		Corfe Mullen cannot support more cars on roads in village. Would stretch present services beyond what they could cope with			804
491252	Margaret Wareham		CSO1 6587	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
510798	Mr F Sullivan		CSO1 3528	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
510844	Mr Michael Guilmany-Cush		CSO1 3574	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
510873	Mr & Mrs B.R. Mayes		CSO1 3622	Option CM 3	Support					804
510974	Mr		CSO1	Option		No Opinion				804

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Jim Cullumbine		3650	CM 3						
510993	Mr R.A. Cherrett		CSO1 3683	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
511015	Mr Christopher White		CSO1 3731	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
511076	Mr Ian Burden		CSO1 3818	Option CM 3	Object		I do not understand East Dorset's obsession with building on sports and recreation grounds. I have lived in Corfe Mullen and Merley for 60 years and I am very upset that you are proposing to build on Lockyers School, the recreation ground and the playgrounds plus Wimborne Football Club, which I have associated with for 45 years. All of these areas have lovely views over the valley towards Sturminster Marshall and Ashleywood. Please do not repeat the mistake by making more irreversible decisions like the building on Wimborne Cricket Ground.			804
511399	Mr & Mrs Michael and Diana Froud		CSO1 4057	Option CM 3	Object					804
511430	Mr A.D. May		CSO1 4117	Option CM 3	Support					804
511489	Mr H G Holden		CSO1 4173	Option CM 3	Object					804
511571	Mr Colin Alborough		CSO1 4228	Option CM 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			804

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

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 to give young people a change of getting on the property ladder.			
511618	Mrs V Blunden		CSO1 4263	Option CM 3	Support					804
511621	Ms Mary A Combe		CSO1 4274	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
511639	Mr Paul Hockey		CSO1 6077	Option CM 3	Object					804
511692	Ms Ruth Blaug		CSO1 4410	Option CM 3	Object		I			804
511711	Mr Coombes		CSO1 4431	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
512281	Mr Graham Roberts		CSO1 4979	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
512326	Mr Ian Willis		CSO1 5055	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
512703	Rita Sweatland		CSO1 5234	Option CM 3	Support					804
513639	Mr and Mrs D J A Kirby		CSO1 5437	Option CM 3	Object					804
513881	Mrs S Bagg		CSO1 5533	Option CM 3	Object					804
513900	Mr P		CSO1 5578	Option CM 3	Object		Unfortunately more development more movement. A comprehensive transport policy should be developed			804

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Wall						e.g. road improvement (A31), bus and trams, rail links (restored).			
513911	Mr Ian Burton		CSO1 5570	Option CM 3	Object		Corfe Mullen does not have the infrastructure to support additional housing.			804
513924	Mrs A F Langford		CSO1 5582	Option CM 3	Object		I support some building in Corfe Mullen but over 300 new homes will mean 400 - 600 more cars trying to get to work and home again at peak times which will create even more traffic congestion. It will be difficult to improve on this, it's bad enough now.			804
513937	Mrs A Boxshall		CSO1 5599	Option CM 3	Object		Corfe Mullen, the village is full. The roads, shops, nursery, schools, etc. are busy. It is a village, not a town! Please respect that.			804
513949	Fay Gardner		CSO1 5611	Option CM 3	Object		CM3 already provided 'green infrastructure' and the total developments (310 min) within such a small area and with less recreational ground would put even more pressure on heathlands, not to mention the additional traffic and pressures on services.			804
513954	Mr RW Heseltine		CSO1 5614	Option CM 3	Support					804
359461	Mrs Nicola Brunt	Conservation Officer Dorset Wildlife Trust	CSO1 7493	Option CM 3	Support		Options CM 1 Lockyers Middle School, CM 2 Violet Farm Close, CM 3 Recreation Ground These developments provide opportunity to develop green infrastructure that would benefit residents and divert pressures away from heathlands. They also provide opportunity to protect and enhance local wildlife habitats and this should be taken into account in the development of SANGs. We consider that all sites should be subject to biological survey to inform the options. The green linkages indicated could provide corridors of green infrastructure, beneficial to people and wildlife, maintaining interconnecting open land from the east to the north of Corfe Mullen through areas 1-3. We suggest both these points are included in the general requirements 9.77. Allotments could continue to form part of the green corridor but if these are to be relocated, care must be taken to			804

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							conduct biological surveys of potential sites to avoid loss of any sites of high wildlife interest in the locality. We have concern that the loss of recreation ground (CM3) could lead to more people accessing the heaths for recreation and therefore this proposal must be supported by robust provision of a SANG. We support the protection of the Waterloo Valley and Pardys Hill from development.			
359478	Mr Rohan TORKILD SEN	West Territory Planner English Heritage	CSO1 8556	Option CM 3	Object		The evidence associated with the initial assessment fails to demonstrate an understanding of the relative significance of the areas historic environment which now, as result of PPS5, should also include consideration of non designated heritage assets and the broader historic landscape and its setting. The intention to safeguard Lockyers School (founded 1706 and enlarged c.1824) is welcomed.			804
359482	Ms Helen Powell	Conservation Officer Natural England, Dorset and Somerset Team	CSO1 8713	Option CM 3		No Opinion	CM1, 2, 3 These options offer opportunities for significant green infrastructure that could remove potential adverse effects (from recreational pressures) on the Dorset heaths and increase the value of the locality for biodiversity. Our opinion on this option will therefore be shaped by the strength and detail of policy on delivery of the green infrastructure as an integral part of the development.			804
359571	Mr Renny Henderso n	Conservation Officer Royal Society for the Protection of Birds	CSO1 8699	Option CM 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:			804
359891	Mrs Susanne Parkin		CSO1 8393	Option CM 3	Object		The plan for Corfe Mullen is flawed from its conception with the exception of the land off Violet Farm Close. It is a 'what if' situation, hardly fair on the village - the school is a non - starter, the allotments are in the only place possible (regarding soil condition) in fact they should be enlarged. Corfe Mullen has few amenities and to propose taking these			804

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>with no credible plan of replacement is very unfair and in my view unprofessional. The village can only comment with speculation in mind and to expect a supportive consultation is impossible. A very bad plan ill thought out.</p> <p>I would now like to address Corfe Mullen. We have been told that the consultants were advised by the officers. Why is Corfe Mullen treated differently than the rest of the district? Why do we have for most part a wish list of improbables?? Corfe Mullen has always been the Cinderella part of the district in the way it is being treated it seems yet again it has drawn the short straw. One can't help wondering why is 11,000 inhabitants are treated in this way. We have so few amenities compared to the other areas in the district and to propose to diminish these with no idea of how to redress this shortfall is very unprofessional and says little of the care that should have been taken on is there a hidden agenda!!!</p> <p>The aim of the district is to be able to build affordable homes. What is proposed in CM will deliver so few - and do we have to have those homes at the cost of our amenities. As already said to take away part of the recreation ground which as it stands is the only redeeming positive amenity the village has cannot be fair. Not to mention that any building would be very visible on the escarpment as seem from the river basin. I realise that the councils must maximise their assets - but the field running below would have been less contentious and not nearly so visible. For the people of Corfe Mullen who have little this is a real slap in the face yet again.</p>			
360302	Mrs Hilary Chittenden	Chairperson Environment TAG (East Dorset)	CSO1 8176	Option CM 3		General Comment	<p>There are native hedgerows and mature trees throughout the area some of which are protected by TPOs. Evidence of significant badger activity was observed on 13.11.10. The whole area would require protected species survey.</p> <p>As a dog walking area, this is clearly a very popular spot. Development could divert people to heaths and encourage people to use their cars to get there.</p> <p>There are some areas of longer grass which have a recovering biodiversity interest. The sports fields (not solely used by CM residents) are unexpectedly</p>			804

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							tranquil when not in use. The need for a SANG in connection with this development is going to be especially critical because the existing site to be developed is already a very significant open space in terms of recreation and dog walking deflecting access away from the heaths. Even here there is evidence of some biodiversity interest in the oaks and scrub (badgers, House Sparrow, Meadow Pipit and migrating Pied Wagtail (Motacilla alba alba) the white continental sub-species were noted on 13.11.10. This underlines that it is essential for full survey if the site is taken forward to the next stage ETAG would not support loss of sports facilities generally and there is concern that land for a SANG may not be available nearby. There is considerable biodiversity interest in much of the grassland around Corfe Mullen. Consequently, protection and management of biodiversity within a 'replacement' SANG will be a critical issue.			
361026	Mr Steve Hellier	Network Planning Manager Highways Agency	CSO1 7744	Option CM 3	Support		The removal of the RSS requirements to provide substantial new housing in the Corfe Mullen area suggests that there is an opportunity for a considered approach involving the use of SEDMMTS, among other evidence. This would enable the suitability of the Corfe Mullen area for new housing to be reviewed; alongside other options There is evidence of a high level of car dependency in this area, which implies that further growth (Options CM1, CM2 and CM3) could exacerbate the existing high level of demand for movements via the A31. The village has poor public transport provision, therefore any future growth needs to be linked with improvements to sustainable transport provisions			804
513958	Mr A Bough		CSO1 5624	Option CM 3	Object		Regarding Lockyers School site this school should remain as a school this school was given to the village and should not be turn into some super-market and if all these homes to be built in and around the village I doubt it will be people from the village who will live in them. There should be no more building in or around Corfe Mullen.			804

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
513966	Mr and Mrs Howard		CSO1 5641	Option CM 3	Object					804
513973	Mr and Mrs RM Bowles		CSO1 5656	Option CM 3	Support		Our concern re the land at the rear of Violet Farm Close is the amount of water that collects after heavy rain and doesn't drain away. The presence of reeds indicates how wet the soil remains all the time. We also have badgers/foxes, deer and rabbits in a pleasant environmental setting.			804
513974	Mr A Moore		CSO1 5809	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
514009	L Stock		CSO1 5706	Option CM 3	Object					804
514039	Mrs R Doman		CSO1 5737	Option CM 3	Support					804
514043	E Fookes		CSO1 5725	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
514049	Mrs E Hellier		CSO1 5741	Option CM 3	Object		Where would you put a new school in Corfe Mullen? Wherever you build it, it will be a long distance from the main housing estates; therefore children will not walk to school, therefore more traffic. Also local doctors surgery busy now; how will it cope with more people?			804
514078	Mr G D Hart		CSO1 5766	Option CM 3	Object					804
514083	Mr R Munt		CSO1 5773	Option CM 3	Object		Of the three options, CM2, but I must object to all three.			804
514087	Joan Smithies		CSO1 5796	Option CM 3	Object					804
514091	Mr RJ		CSO1 5808	Option CM 3	Object		All the changes in Corfe Mullen are in one area-need to look at alternative areas.			804

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Potts						Must preserve existing wild areas and allotments. Development on flood plains are not a good idea.			
514099	Mr and Mrs T C Blakeley		CSO1 5849	Option CM 3	Object					804
514107	The Payne Family		CSO1 5867	Option CM 3	Object		The Recreation Ground is a part of Corfe Mullen. On weekends 250 kids play football Saturday and Sunday. Four adult teams use the Rec as their home ground. Hundreds of people walk dogs around the Rec. As I am one of the team of people who runs the Rec (C.M.S.A) you will get my report on the running of the Rec and two pavilions which on money terms can't be done. As your meeting said, the Rec was chosen because its flat. Poor reason!			804
514111	Penelope Webiery		CSO1 5893	Option CM 3	Object		We don't have the facilities for any more people in Corfe Mullen. We don't have a proper supermarket, only a small doctors surgery and a library which is closed more than its open. For God's sake we still have to put black plastic bags out for the dustmen, because we are the only place in Dorset without bins. The Rec is important to us for exercising our dogs and for our children to play. LEAVE CORFE MULLEN ALONE.			804
514114	Ms Karen Maund		CSO1 5903	Option CM 3	Object		I object to the proposed development in Corfe Mullen, because I feel it is to many houses in a confined area. Also the road structure will not cope with additional volume of traffic. 310 houses amounts to an additional 600+ cars on the road at peak times. No thoughts have been given to further amenities regarding schools, shops, doctors.			804
514136	Mrs J Crumb		CSO1 5945	Option CM 3	Object					804
514225	Mr Simon Dixon	Secretary West Moors Traders	CSO1 5976	Option CM 3	Support					804

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
		Association								
514246	Theresa Monahan & Jonathon Chaffey		CSO1 5992	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
514274	Mr Showell		CSO1 6050	Option CM 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.			804
514467	Mrs Lesley Cripps		CSO1 6197	Option CM 3	Support		It must be stressed that a new school to replace the existing Lockyers School must be of paramount importance for Corfe Mullen before any new homes would be built. Recreation facilities also need to be developed in the southern end of the village including allotments and play park for Waterloo Road area. Can the village infrastructure support more people and motorcars? Moreover could the roads in and out of Corfe Mullen cope with the extra traffic especially through Broadstone?			804
514482	C E T Gilbert		CSO1 6227	Option CM 3	Object		Corfe Mullen (CM 1), further commercial/retail premises are not a priority. Any new school can be built on the playing fields to incorporate a community centre, existing buildings to be cleared for new play area.			804
514504	Mr and Mrs B Gibbs		CSO1 6252	Option CM 3	Object		The options in the survey do not allow a considered and unbiased answer as they include vague terms such as ' school may be relocated' and 'allotments would need to be relocated elsewhere' but do not offer a solution. Thus it is almost impossible to make a proper judgement. We feel the only sensible solution is to utilise some green belt land but not the recreation ground, as this is used by many people in the village. Also, if the school is to be built elsewhere, it should not be on the			804

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

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 recreation ground, as previously suggested. The other option might be CM2 which does not appear to encroach on the recreation space. If houses are to be built on the school site, then 80 families will cause unacceptable congestion traffic-wise to new and existing residents. Why do we need so many houses? If this scheme goes ahead it will cause much anger and frustration, particularly if no adequate facilities are provided.			
514507	Mr and Mrs C Macy		CSO1 6264	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
514649	Mrs June Sawyer		CSO1 6312	Option CM 3	Object					804
514674	Mrs J Williams		CSO1 6340	Option CM 3	Object					804
514752	Claire Richards on & Jamie Shirley		CSO1 6387	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
514812	Mr C Sawyer		CSO1 6424	Option CM 3	Object					804
514912	Mrs Mary Carsbury		CSO1 6474	Option CM 3	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			804

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							character and charm that it used to enjoy it is hard to know where the so called green belt begins and ends.			
514913	Mr and Mrs M Clark		CSO1 6460	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
514939	Mr D Porter		CSO1 6502	Option CM 3	Object		The more land you concrete over the more you have to because you just increase demand. Infill best option.			804
514959	Mr and Mrs R Fisher		CSO1 6533	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
514993	Dr Peter J Hardwick		CSO1 6567	Option CM 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.			804
515033	Mr T Crump		CSO1 6604	Option CM 3	Support					804
515287	Mr L Jackson		CSO1 6679	Option CM 3	Support		The A31 trunk road from Ferndown by-pass should be widened to form a dual carriageway all the way through to Bere Regis.			804
515367	Mr & Mrs J		CSO1 6792	Option CM 3	Support					804

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Pottinger									
515736	Mr and Mrs David and Shirley Clarkson		CSO1 6767	Option CM 3	Object		A lot of people spent a lot of time stopping this site being turned into a gravel pit approximately 25 years ago. This appears to have slipped your memory and as soon as East Dorset relinquish any interest in keeping this as green belt or a recreational field, I would imagine Dorset County Council will want to extract the gravel before any building takes place? We were opposed to the gravel pit and are equally opposed to this beautiful field being used for anything other than recreation.			804
518481	Corfe Mullen Sports Association		CSO1 7366	Option CM 3	Object		<p>Please find attached the response to the latest Core Strategy Options from Corfe Mullen Sports Association. The CMSA are the association who manages the recreational facilities at the Recreation Ground. We are particularly lodging our objections to Option 3 (CM 3) the Eastern end of the Recreation Ground.</p> <p>Points of Objection</p> <p>The Corfe Mullen Sports Association strongly object to the EDDC Strategy Option CM3, Eastern Part of the Recreation Ground, for the following reasons:-</p> <p>General 'feel' of the village.</p> <p>- Proposed development of the Recreation Ground would damage the ethos of it being at the heart of the village for sports / recreational provision - especially if the facility is to be split into 2 locations. Current facility is well established, well maintained and has been heavily invested in, both financially and personally, by the Corfe Mullen Community for many decades. No housing development at the Recreation Ground would mean there would be no need for development of recreational space, on a large scale, elsewhere.</p> <p>- Tennis / Cricket / Football communities are thriving at recreation ground. The suggestion of moving football facility elsewhere may isolate football community from Cricket / Tennis communities / rest of village - as all 3 sports 'communities' currently mix well under current provision arrangement. The CMSA would suggest moving all sports provision or none.</p> <p>CMSA – Small group of volunteers / 2 sites not</p>			804

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>feasible</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - CMSA can manage one facility not 2. Not feasible for current body of (6-8) volunteers to manage 2 separate sites. - 2 sites would mean outgoings would double but income would remain the same from current sports clubs. Who would fund / run the proposed 2nd facility with no additional income to cover its cost? - Unlikely to attract many new football teams to proposed new grounds, as existing teams would already have their own established 'home grounds'. - If CMSA were expected to run two sites, sports fees would have to double to accommodate double expenditure/single income. - 2 sites would be impractical for management purposes - The distance between the two sites would cause issues for both volunteers and Parish Council Staff (Groundstaff) and double their already strained work-load. - Assuming the 2nd site would supply mainly football provision, this is a seasonal Winter sport thus what usage would this 2nd site attract over the Summer months? Would 2nd site be fully utilised all year round? <p>Football / Sports provision</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - County field sufficient for needs of current football community. - Corfe Mullen Untied Juniors FC are the main football club operating from the Recreation Ground. They have over 250 children registered with the club, ranging from Under 6's to Under 15's. The club is run by a body of volunteers. - 6 Adult football clubs use facilities as their 'home ground' and have chosen Corfe Mullen Rec over other sites due to the quality of provision. - Regular use by other local football clubs (when their home ground is unfit for use, the pitches at Corfe Mullen Rec remain viable.) - Many of the 250 members of CMU Jnrs are with-in walking distance of current site. This would not be the case if the facility moved to the South of the village. - Every weekend, during the season, there in an average of around 10 football matches at Corfe Mullen Recreation Ground - attracting 280 players 			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>plus spectators.</p> <p>Current pitches (Best in area) v New Provision</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Youth / Adult pitches situated on the County Field (CM3 Option) are some of the best in the area. They are well drained and very rarely waterlogged thus matches rarely postponed here unlike many other local football clubs. - Can same be said for proposed new site? <p>Especially as suggested location is at the bottom of a hill which raises major concerns over quality of any new provision – possible drainage issues at such a location?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Any potential new site to accommodate football provision would possibly cost an estimated 1 ½ - 2 million pounds. Is this cost effective? Such a figure unlikely to be recouped from sale of one County field. - New site would need at least 5 adult pitches and 3 mini-soccer pitches – any less would not accommodate current need / usage. Any less would also necessitate Corfe Mullen United Juniors operating from 2 separate grounds. Not a viable option. - What arrangements would be in place for transition between current and proposed new site? <p>Community use for Recreation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Proposal would half the available 'open space' at that end of the village. - Loss of amenity for community events. (Carnival / Dog Shows / Running Competitions etc.) - Adversely affect both residents in the immediate vicinity, and the wide cross section of the community, who currently use the Rec. Site utilised by 80% of the Corfe Mullen Community, as well as those travelling from outside the village - Young Families / Walkers / Guides / Scouts / Dog Walkers / Running Clubs / Footballers / Cricketers / Tennis Players / Baseball Players / Young People / Cyclists / Local Schools etc. - Recreation Ground sits upon cross-section of many public footpaths and 'Rights of Way' thus accessible via many 'green' routes and is also surrounded by many dwellings. Surrounding area of proposed new site less heavily populated so would attract far less 'en-route' visitors. - A typical weekend attracts a footfall of over 1500 			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							visitors to the Recreation Ground, if open space halved many of these visitors would be deterred. – Many users of the current provision actually travel from outside the area to use the grounds – e.g. Dog walkers travel from Broadstone / Creekmoor / Canford Heath and beyond, as they favour Corfe Mullen Recreation Ground rather than use other open spaces closer to their own homes. They favour the site due to 'feeling safe' there owing to the fact it is well utilised and seldom deserted, the vast open space, wonderful views, convenient parking etc.			
518491	Mr and Mrs Bargewel I		CSO1 7375	Option CM 3	Object		<p>Following the issue of the latest Core Strategy Options by yourselves, please accept this letter, and the points contained with-in, as formal objection to the Options being considered for Corfe Mullen. Although from our address that we would be immensely affected by the option concerning land off Violet Farm Close, please be assured our objections are not purely on a personal nature and hope that our objections will be considered by yourselves and not be discounted simply due to our location. Having been residents of the village for many years, we feel the village is now at full capacity and see no reason why the village should be forced to accommodate large scale housing developments which are simply not needed. Having attended the Core Strategy meeting at the Council Offices in November, one of your representatives clearly stated that the Regional Spatial Strategy has now been abolished and that you no longer have any housing targets which need to be met. This point is by far the strongest reason for objecting to any housing development plans on the scale of which you are now proposing.</p> <p>Large Scale Housing Development - Not Needed A development of this nature, on any of the 3 sites, is simply not needed on a scale such as this, nor is it wanted by the residents of Corfe Mullen. Current housing needs should be accommodated by in-fill, not a major new housing estate. We are a village – not a town. A new housing estate would have an environmental impact on the village - more pollution / power usage /</p>			804

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>carbon footprint/ car emissions / noise pollution / light pollution / waste etc. etc. Development would add to already strained power supplies. This area of Corfe Mullen already experiences regular 'power cuts' especially at the Pavilion / Rec area. Adding 150 dwellings will put additional strain on local power stations. What provision is in place to accommodate this?</p> <p>The supermarkets / shops / Post Offices / Banks etc. are sufficient for the current population of the village. More services are only required due to development plans – no development = no need for more services. Green Belt / Open Space / Wildlife haven</p> <p>Although not all the resident wildlife species are protected, habitats will be lost. Resident buzzards, rabbits, deer, foxes, badgers, field mice, many species of birds etc. use the areas under consideration as feeding grounds / habitat – particularly the land off Violet Farm Close. We feel it is essential that these 'pockets' of open space be retained as wildlife havens for many species, as such spaces are now being reduced at an alarming rate, not just locally but nationally.</p> <p>Local Residents - in the immediate area</p> <p>What, if any, compensation will be provided for those who will see a dramatic fall in the value of their homes caused by this development? House prices in the immediate area reflect the current rural setting which will be lost if this development goes ahead. The saying goes that you 'cannot put a price tag on a view' – meaning house prices do not reflect location. On this I would disagree. The market value of my property reflected its' location, and the privacy given by backing onto 'open space' and not dwellings. A new development here would reduce the value of my property immensely – what provision has been made for residents who would be affected like ourselves?</p> <p>Are there any plans to compensate those in the immediate vicinity of such a development - as your proposals would lose those residents many thousands of pounds on property value should they choose to move. A loss I would expect the Council, as proposer of said development, to rectify.</p> <p>Traffic</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>Windgreen roundabout (Esso garage) already heavily congested at rush hour. Long queues already occur down towards Corfe Hills (heading towards Windgreen), Blandford Road (from Lockyers to Windgreen) and Wareham Road, both sides of the roundabout, at peak times.</p> <p>Any development at Lockyers / Rec / Violet Farm would add significant numbers of vehicles, possibly in excess of another 150 cars, to the already busy highways at that end of the village, most of which would join the rush hour traffic and all of which would need to access their destined routes via the Windgreen area.</p> <p>Education / Schools.</p> <p>All 4 of the first schools which 'feed in to' Lockyers (Henbury, Rushcombe, Springdale, Sturminster Marshall) are already full and have been for the last few years. Where would the primary school aged children, from the proposed development, be expected to go? Although the argument for a 2 tier education system is on-going, the existing first schools could not at this time accommodate Years 5 and 6 should we go 2 tier, and Corfe Hills are unable to extend either pupil capacity nor site size, so to add 150 dwellings – (each of which could have the average 2.4 children - which could number 300 additional school children!) to this already 'strained' education provision is unacceptable.</p> <p>Health Provision.</p> <p>Local doctors surgeries were full in 1992 when I became a Corfe Mullen resident thus my family had to register with a practice in Broadstone. What provision is being made for the residents of the proposed development regarding Health Care / Doctors Surgeries? 150 dwellings could add in the region of 600 new residents to Corfe Mullen. In the current economical climate is the NHS likely to provide and fund new surgeries / GPs just for one development? It is highly unlikely that the existing Health provisions in the village would cope with an influx of these numbers.</p> <p>Allotments –</p> <p>The allotments are well established with a small knit, community feel. The Corfe Mullen Allotment</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>Association is volunteer run group. Many allotment holders, including ourselves, are with-in walking distance of current site but would need to drive to any proposed new site. Would the allotments even be relocated and, if so, would the land be of the same quality of the current site, which many plot holders have spent years improving? Would new site be as 'fertile' / productive for growing as current site? Some plot holders have rented their plots for many, many years. Yet again, development would damage the ethos / feel of village 'community.' Perhaps the best suggestion for the land off Violet Farm Close would be to extend the current allotment site which has been in situ for in excess of a 100 years but has seen its' size dramatically reduced over that time.</p> <p>Service Providers / Current Economic Climate – Additional strain on already struggling financial budgets of all major service providers who would be required to maintain new developments – Wessex Water / Electric and Gas Companies/ Highways Agencies / Rubbish collection / Parish Council / Telephone Service Providers / Transport - bus companies etc. etc. As the proposer of said developments, what contribution will EDDC make to all these companies who are expected to bear the maintenance costs of a new housing development? Lastly – Site Suitability?</p> <p>Building on the land off Violet Farm Close would rule out any future access to the land at the Recreation Ground, should that area ever be developed. Also, is the land off Violet Farm Close actually suitable for development? The area is known to be an old 'landfill' site and is always heavily waterlogged over the winter with poor drainage and excess surface water in situ for months. There is also a Tree Protection Order in force – the large trees situated on the land 'off Violet Farm Close' are protected by a Preservation Order, issued by your own Council, indicating a desire to protect not to develop this area!</p>			
518513	Mr Christian Westwood		CSO17381	Option CM 3	Object		I would like to log an objection to the use of the Eastern part of the Recreation Ground being used to provide land for housing development. In my own opinion this proposal is not a valid	Consider redevelopment of an area to which the addition of further housing and commercial		804

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>option as my family's home is opposite the proposed site. We purchased our house approximately 18 months ago and the reasons for so doing was the rural environment in which it is located and the close proximity of recreational facilities for our son.</p> <p>At the time of purchasing our property, we were only aware of the possible redevelopment of Lockyers school that would maintain the positions of the main buildings, which is a much more favourable option to developing the site for residential and commercial purposes.</p> <p>The proposed housing development, together with the associated infrastructure, in particular the road network, would result in the area becoming a much more urban setting, absolutely destroying the reason why we, and many other families, elect to live in this area.</p> <p>The appeal of the village is its rural surroundings, combined with the convenience of the commercial areas found in the neighbouring towns of Wimborne and Broadstone. The housing areas available in these already built up communities surely mean that there is no Core Strategy Options for Consideration Response Form</p> <p>reason to tarnish the landscape surrounding Corfe Mullen with similar domiciles.</p> <p>The option of using the Eastern part of the Recreation Ground for a residential development would result in the loss of the local recreation area. It would also result in the current views from our property that extend as far as Badbury Rings being replaced by one of a housing estate.</p> <p>This proposal may also produce an increase in traffic utilising the part of Wimborne Road on which we live, resulting in a much noisier, polluted and more dangerous environment in which to raise our son.</p> <p>In conclusion, I consider that not only would this proposal adversely affect the value of our property, it would also have a large detrimental effect on the community as a whole. The appeal of this part of the village is that it is not</p>	<p>activity would damage less than that proposed. The development of the Lockyers School site removes access to fantastic views of our beautiful countryside and living in a rural environment whilst providing commercial facilities within a 5-10 mile radius.</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
							excessively developed and therefore this proposal would have a dramatic effect on both the area and the lifestyle of its inhabitants.			
519991	Ms Claire Aldridge	Planning Liaison Officer Environment Agency	CSO1 7576	Option CM 3		General Comment	Options CM1, 2 and 3 are all located within a SPZ 2 so similar to Wimborne and Colehill there may be a restriction on what can be built and suitable assessment will need to be undertaken to show that the development will not have a detrimental impact on groundwater. Waste Overall issues for consideration are: SUDS; foul drainage; water supply / water efficiency; groundwater and contaminated Land; sustainable construction (recommend at least Code for Sustainable Homes Level 3); waste management facilities; green infrastructure/ biodiversity issues; pollution prevention. Further information on these topics can be seen in the general section of our letter.			804
359875	Dr Lesley Haskins		CSO1 9292	Option CM 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			804

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>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>Land allocated as potential landscaping in the north east supports both archaeological and some wildlife interest which needs to be protected and maintained. The decision not to propose development on land southward from Pardys' Hill is strongly supported. Use as a SANG will need to take account of intrinsic wildlife interest. The area will not be suitable for any relocation of sports facilities or allotments and so forth, as clearly these would be damaging to wildlife interests.</p>			
360768	Cllr. Mr David Packer	Colehill West Ward East Dorset District Council	CSO2 0655	Option CM 3	Support					804
360977	Mr Nick Solomon		CSO2 0706	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
489765	Mr Derek Kearey		CSO1 9496	Option CM 3	Support					804
490854	Mr D Mutton		CSO2 0129	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
507361	Mr Kenneth Archer		CSO2 0331	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
507546	Mr Nigel Pugsley	Senior Planner BNP Paribas Real Estate	CSO1 7990	Option CM 3		General Comment	The abovementioned policies options relate to potential Greenfield housing allocations on the fringes of Corfe Mullen.			804

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							Whichever of the options the Council is minded to progress with (following further consultation and examination); it would be essential that the infrastructure needed to support the planned growth is provided for in a timely manner.			
507737	Mrs S Philpot		CSO2 0204	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
511383	Mrs Jean Archer		CSO2 0383	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
521315	Janet & Kevin Healy Paul Timberlake		CSO1 7928	Option CM 3	Support		<p>SUMMARY: CM3 EAST END OF RECREATION GROUND (150)</p> <p>With the greatest reluctance we will NOT OBJECT to this site. We have agreed to the relocation of Wimborne's rugby and football clubs and we have to remain consistent in our arguments.</p> <p>The recreation ground contains 3 or 4 pitches, it is very large. We were assured by one gentleman that the area was well used at weekends for kicking a ball around. We visited this site, mid morning on a lovely sunny day during half term. Apart from some organised tennis practice, there were no children on the super play area or the BMX site. Our photos show not a child in sight anywhere else on this enormous area. Just lots of dog walkers.</p> <p>However, our reluctant agreement to this site depends on the successful relocation of these pitches. We have been given some information that suggests an alternate space has been put forward. Not only is it said to be much smaller, but it is located close to an old tip which releases a foul smelling mix of methane throughout the year. If true, this would certainly not be acceptable as an alternative site for the pitches and we would withdraw our agreement.</p> <p>One alternative would be to retain a good portion of this recreation ground and just build some houses on the eastern edge. This would still leave plenty of room for ball games. Taken in conjunction with the equally large more formalised ground to the west, we think there would still be plenty of space available.</p>			804

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>Obviously our approval would be subject to achieving 40% affordable housing.</p> <p>It is the least sustainable of the three sites as it is further from schools and services. This site if built on would add approximately 225 cars that would have the potential to add to the morning and afternoon/evening traffic congestion.</p> <p>PURPOSES OF THE GREENBELT PPG2 (as applicable to this site)</p> <p>This is both Green Belt and recreational land.</p> <p>To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas.</p> <p>CM1 and CM2 infill between two blocks of development. This site sprawls out further into the open countryside and is much closer to the edge of the northern part of the ridge. Buildings could possibly protrude into the view of the ridge from the river valley. The housing would certainly have a detrimental impact on the rather beautiful informal open spaces.</p> <p>To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.</p> <p>Not only will the housing encroach on the countryside but so too may the re-location of the pitches.</p> <p>VISUAL IMPACT ON BOTH THE NATURAL AND HISTORIC LANDSCAPE</p> <p>Corfe Mullen has a very large recreation area; the more formal part to the west will remain as it is. This eastern section is a large informal part of the grounds used for ball games. It is a large flat area with no permanent structures; it spreads to the edge of the ridge. It cannot be described as an area of beauty, but a valuable open space does not have to fulfil that function. PPG2 Green Belts: 1.7: 'the quality of the landscape is not relevant to the inclusion of land within the Green Belt or to its continued protection.' If the whole of this site were built on it would be a visual loss of a large area of green open space. However, this site is adjacent to the edge of the ridge, any housing built to the edge of it may be visible from across the valley and destroy valuable local landscape.</p> <p>SUSTAINABLE LOCATION PPS1</p> <p>Location</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>Primary Schools Middle and Upper Daily shopping Post Office Doctors East end of recreation ground 2.0km 1.8km Middle? 1.7km – U (Corfe Hills) 0.8km 2.4km 2.4km</p> <p>EMPLOYMENT There are few employment opportunities within the settlement. Only 22% live and work in Corfe Mullen, 86% of all commuters were car drivers or passengers. (Taken from the Core Strategy which uses the 2001 census figures). There are a number of employment centres in Wimborne; otherwise the main centres are Ferndown Industrial Estate, Bournemouth Airport, Bournemouth and Poole. Commuting for Corfe Mullen : 2001 census Internal commuters - 1151 In commuters - 606 Out commuters - 3986 Total commuters (in and out) - 4592 86% of commuters were car drivers or passengers (Core Strategy 2001 ONS census). This is not a sustainable location.</p> <p>PUBLIC TRANSPORT This is very poor. Number 3 to Poole is a ½ hourly service. It does not stop at the Creekmoor out of town shopping centre so it is no good for any one working there. Time to Poole is 24 minutes. Number 3 to Wimborne is a ½ hourly service. Time is 7 minutes. Number 13 to Ferndown Industrial Estate and Bournemouth. A 1/2 hourly service from Wimborne, so potential passengers must catch the number 3 and change buses. Time to Bournemouth is 1hr 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>Wimborne. NEAREST CENTRE WITH FULL RANGE OF SERVICES There is a reasonable supermarket in north Corfe Mullen, but for a full range of services a car trip to Wimborne, Broadstone or Poole. PROVISION OF MULTI-FUNCTIONAL GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE AND OPEN SPACES: (Natural England's Green Infrastructure Guidance NE176 & PPG17 Planning for Open Spaces The GI planned will help to shorten the distances to schools and daily shopping needs. Unfortunately there is little to enable workers to cycle to work. The Roman Road goes to the east of Upton, are there cycle links from here to Poole? A footpath from Brog Street links into both the Roman Road and the old railway line (between Sturminster Marshall and Broadstone), this could be improved as a cycle way. This track could be used to access Broadstone and there may be a possibility of linking from here to cycle tracks to Poole, it could also be used to access employment at the out of town shopping centre at Creekmoor. What is also needed is a safe cycle track to Ferndown Industrial 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 It is recreation ground with no wild areas and only trees around the periphery. It may be useful for wild life to graze and forage. However, if building took place on this site, it would impact badly on the adjoining land which is an informal open space, mainly grass and trees. Part of the land to the east is used for grazing cattle. These areas would be protected at night from the built up part of Corfe Mullen so would possibly suffer from both noise and light pollution if the built up area encroached on it. TRANQUILLITY: sense of place The whole of the recreation area and the adjoining informal open space, make a very large open green</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>area, cushioned from noise as it is not adjacent to the roads. The sweep of green fields down to the river valley is lovely and there is a view across to Badbury Rings. Very tranquil and must not be spoilt.</p> <p>LIGHT POLLUTION See the ETAG Response and report from Bob Mizon.</p> <p>DRAINAGE PPS25 (causing increase in river flooding or surface water problems) This is a large flat area suited to SUDS, normal planning policy would apply.</p> <p>PROXIMITY TO HEATHLAND AND AVAILABILITY OF SANGS FOR MITIGATION Corfe Mullen is surrounded by nature reserves and sensitive sites. The options 1, 2 and 3 do propose a very large area of SANGS that protects the north facing slope of the ridge down to the A31 and also all the open land to the west. This should have some protection so it remains as a SANGS in perpetuity.</p> <p>PROVISION OF ADDITIONAL INFRASTRUCTURE (schools etc.) As for the other two sites, where would the school go? A doctor's surgery or small health centre would be of benefit to this northern end of Corfe Mullen. The old school building should be used as a community centre to protect it.</p> <p>IMPACT ON TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE Have you ever considered providing an information sheet advising residents on how much of their income they can save if partners/households car share? In order to facilitate one car families, safe cycle tracks must be provided. It is not much good if cars park over cycle tracks or if they suddenly stop before a difficult junction. They need to be a continuous safe system that bypass the very bad roundabouts and junctions.</p> <p>Cycling and cheaper more efficient public transport are the only means of stabilising the traffic situation. It is unlikely that the modifications to existing congested junctions and roundabouts will make any difference, especially with the scale of development planned up to 2027. The only way forward is to make settlements more self-contained. If the school run can be eliminated, the in and out commuting by car moderated, then just maybe the traffic will not grind 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
							a halt. Punishing the shoppers, who help to keep the retail areas profitable, by restricting shoppers parking is not the answer. If shopping gets too difficult the internet will take over. Heavier charging on all day parking may help keep workers out of the car parks, but this is no good if there is no reasonable alternate means of travel. It is important that residents are not made to feel as if they are being punished for past and future development not of their choosing.			
359264	Mr Peter Atfield	Director Goadsby Ltd	CSO1 8174	Option CM 3	Support		<p>J. Havelock and A. Lloyd are the owners of approximately 1 hectare of land to the south west of Blandford Road at Corfe Mullen. This is identified on the plan (Appendix 1) attached to this form of representation. The site is just to the north of a petrol filling station (Windgreen Garage) with an ancillary shop. Beyond this are sports facilities, including a hall, and a library. Some of these areas are already the subject of Policy CM3 of the adopted East Dorset Local Plan. This policy states that:</p> <p>"Developments falling within Use Classes A1, A2, A3, B1 and community uses will be permitted in accordance with Policy SHDEV1 Para 6.236 along Wareham Road at Hill View Post Office, around the junction with Albert Road, the library and Windgreen garage in areas shown on the Proposals Map. Any such development or redevelopment will be subject to the provision of off-street car parking and/or rear service areas and must not prejudice the amenities of residential properties. Residential development at first floor level will also be permitted in association with such development."</p> <p>The intention of this policy was to consolidate and strengthen the two principal centres at Corfe Mullen, including the area around the Windgreen Garage site. Given that the Core Strategy may allocate more than additional 300 new dwellings to the northern part of the settlement, there is an even greater need to strengthen the commercial and community centre around the Windgreen Garage site. The land south west of Blandford Road is ideal to accommodate these additional uses.</p> <p>A Parish Plan for Corfe Mullen was prepared in 2006. Questionnaires were sent to residents. The</p>	<p>Add new Option CM4: "Development could take place on land west of Blandford Road to create an enhanced village centre to this part of Corfe Mullen. Appropriate future uses for the site could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retail • Medical surgery / health care facility, with pharmacy • Care Home • Residential (where in excess of 400 metres from Dorset heath land) <p>As a consequence, the green belt should be amended in accordance with the plan attached as Appendix 2 to this form of representation.</p>		804

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>responses were analysed and the views were summarised in the plan. Key points relevant to these representations are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a need for a new dental practice in the settlement. • There may be a further need for a doctor's surgery if more housing is constructed at Corfe Mullen – some respondents stated that they currently travel outside of the area to get to a doctor or dentist. • A cyber café is required. • A focal point will help bring the village together. <p>A Corfe Mullen Focus Group meeting, held in May 2008, confirmed some of the identified needs; in particular the lack of shops and doctors facilities. The Core Strategy Issues and Options develops some of these matters. It acknowledges that the village has limited facilities, but that there is capacity to accommodate another retail store in the settlement. Paragraph 9.44 summarises the facilities required to support further development at Corfe Mullen:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More shops of all kinds, including banks and retain the existing Post Offices. • More health facilities, especially dentists and doctors. • Employment opportunities. • Facilities and entertainment for young people. <p>The plan reproduced on Page 169 of the Core Strategy identifies various sites within the northern 'Area of Search'. The accompanying text, in Paragraphs 9.68 – 9.71, describes landscape, environment / conservation, land use and other constraints to the development of six sites. Land west of Blandford Road is not one of these. Together with the three sites that have been identified as potential allocations, it is free from any impediment to development.</p> <p>It is therefore submitted that the site is suitable to accommodate a range of uses to compliment the residential development of 300+ dwellings at Lockyer's School, east of Violet Farm Close and at the eastern end of the recreation ground. The range of uses could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retail 			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

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"> • Medical surgery / health care facility, with pharmacy • Care Home • Residential (where in excess of 400 metres from Dorset heath land) <p>Options CM1 – CM3 will require an amendment to the boundary of the green belt around Corfe Mullen. It is submitted that a new boundary can also exclude land west of Blandford Road from the green belt so as to permit the development of the site with the range of uses set out above.</p>			
522396	Mr Keith Stannard		CSO1 8136	Option CM 3	Object					804
522444	Adrian Barker	Terence O'Rourke Ltd	CSO1 8150	Option CM 3	Object		<p>This representation has been prepared by Terence O'Rourke Ltd, on behalf of the Perry Family Trust, in response to the current consultation on the Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy. Specifically we refer to the options presented for the delivery of housing at Corfe Mullen. The Perry Family Trust is the owner of 4.4 hectares of land between Pardy's Hill and the B3074, Blandford Road in Corfe Mullen.</p> <p>Having reviewed the consultation document and the suggested housing sites for Corfe Mullen, we do not consider that they represent the most acceptable strategy for the community.</p> <p>Background and need for housing The draft regional strategy for the south west was subject to public examination in 2007 and consequential additional studies were being carried out when, in July 2010 the Coalition Government revoked all Regional Strategies, effectively halting the production of the strategy. The draft strategy has however informed work on the current Core Strategy, including the level of housing, which stands at 6,500 new houses across East Dorset. Furthermore, following a high court judgement in November 2010 Regional Strategies have been reinstated, for the time being and it is therefore appropriate to treat the emergent policies as a material consideration. The need to deliver housing in Corfe Mullen is also</p>			804

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>recognised at a local level. At the recent meeting of Corfe Mullen Parish Council, on 6 December 2010, 10 out of 14 voting councillors agreed that 200 or more new dwellings would be required to adequately serve the community over the plan period, with only a single councillor arguing that no new housing should be delivered. Enclosed is a copy of the minutes of that meeting, for your information.</p> <p>The recently published Localism Bill will remove Regional Spatial Strategies from the development plan, whilst at the same time removing the need for local planning authorities to address regional housing targets. However there is likely to remain a local need for housing land even it at a lower level than previously identified. The need for local planning policies to be tested for soundness will also remain. With the publication of the Localism Bill it is clear that local views have growing significance in shaping planning policies. In this context the views of local groups and parish councils will have increased significance. In the context of the current consultation the parish council's position of recognising the need for new housing, but opposing the currently suggested strategy for delivery of that growth is significant.</p> <p>The need for soundness Planning Policy Statement 12: Creating strong safe and prosperous communities through Local Spatial Planning (PPS12) sets out the steps that Local Planning Authorities must take when preparing Local Development Frameworks. It also sets out the standards against which Development Plan Documents are judged, in order to be considered sound. Namely, the policies must be justified, effective and consistent with national policy. In order to fulfil these criteria, development plan documents and, by extension, strategic land allocations emerging through them must be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Justified <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Founded on a robust and credible evidence base – Represent the most appropriate strategy when considered against the reasonable alternatives • Effective <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Deliverable 			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>– Flexible – Able to be monitored • Consistent with national policy Paragraph 4.44 of PPS12 establishes that the deliverability of a strategy is predicated on there being no regulatory or national policy barriers to the delivery of the strategy, such as the presence of protected wildlife sites and landscapes or sites of historic or cultural importance. Paragraph 4.45 goes on to highlight that deliverability also requires those partners essential to the delivery of the plan such as landowners and developers to be signed up to it. Planning Policy Statement 3: Housing (PPS3) stipulates that in order for housing sites to be considered deliverable, they must be Available, Suitable and Achievable The Draft Core Strategy The approach to the delivery of housing, which has emerged through the draft Core Strategy, is to provide housing through a series of modest extensions to existing settlements. In this context, three contiguous sites have been identified as options for housing growth within Corfe Mullen, at Lockyers School, land off Violet Farm Close and the eastern part of the recreation ground. Overall, we consider it important that all potential sites for housing delivery are considered so that the most appropriate strategy for the village can be developed. The individual sites should therefore be considered in the context of the PPS3 and PPS12 tests set out above. In the first instance, we would highlight that significantly no alternatives have been presented with regard to providing replacement sites for the facilities which would be lost as a result of the suggested strategic allocations. This casts doubt over the effectiveness of the strategy as a whole, in terms of its deliverability, its flexibility and its suitability. We consider that in its current form, there is a risk of the strategy being found unsound, when the above tests are applied. Corfe Mullen Parish Council has objected to the identification of the sports pitches (CM3) and allotments (CM2). The Corfe Mullen Sports Association, which operates the recreation ground</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>has echoed the objection to site CM3, both sets of comments are enclosed. While the principle of development of the Lockyers School site (CM1) is not considered unacceptable, the availability of the site is uncertain. The suitability of each of the suggested sites is discussed below. There cannot be certainty about them until all uses have been found an appropriate location. The current strategy relies on a chain of events which cannot, at this time, be guaranteed.</p> <p>Eastern part of the Recreation Ground (CM3) – 150 dwellings</p> <p>The eastern part of the recreation ground has been identified as an option for delivering housing and is the largest of the identified sites. We consider that the inclusion of this site is not adequately justified and is not the most appropriate strategy, when considered against reasonable alternatives.</p> <p>The site has been included with the justification that it is under-utilised and that the sports pitches that will be lost can be re-provided elsewhere in Corfe Mullen. We consider that this argument is fundamentally flawed, it does not recognise the intrinsic value of the site for both formal and informal recreation and fails to acknowledge that the additional area of playing fields was established in a response to pressure on the original fields, to the west. This argument also fails to recognise the operational difficulties that would arise were the recreation ground to be provided over two separate sites. The eastern part of the recreation ground is the main area for laying out full-size football pitches, which cannot easily be accommodated on the western part of the ground. While the intensity of the site's use may not be as high as other parts of the recreation ground, it is still used on a regular basis for both formal and informal sports and recreation. A relocation of the sports facilities would lead to an unnecessary duplication of facilities such as changing rooms and pavilions with associated cost implications. There are few areas of extensive level ground within Corfe Mullen which would be suitable for playing fields. In any case it is illogical to suggest the replacement of recreation facilities with housing which would generate</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
							additional demand for the facilities it has replaced, when alternative sites are available. In terms of the impact of any potential development on this site, there is also a risk that the site would be visible from areas to the north, increasing the visual impact of the village as a whole.			
522650	Mrs H C Wheeler		CSO1 8161	Option CM 3	Object					804
523300	Mr Trevor Abbott		CSO1 8287	Option CM 3	Object					804
523319	Mr Ryan Johnson	Turley Associates	CSO1 8331	Option CM 3	Object		As stated above, the uncertainty surrounding the delivery of such options calls into question their eligibility as either deliverable or developable sites within the terms of PPS3. In the absence of robust housing land supply evidence to the contrary, Taylor Wimpey also considers the reduction of housing requirements at Corfe Mullen from 700 to 310 homes is unsound. Taylor Wimpey maintains that discounted area 3 should therefore be retained as a deliverable alternative or addition to the Council's options to meet the strategic housing requirements directed to Corfe Mullen. Taylor Wimpey is willing to work in partnership with the Council, landowners and the local community to deliver the most suitable and deliverable options for growth north/north west of Corfe Mullen within this context. Further evidence will be provided to elaborate on these representations through subsequent consultation stages of this DPD. Taylor Wimpey supports the need to identify the new neighbourhoods and SANG land on the Key Diagram and has land available to contribute towards such provision. Taylor Wimpey is willing to work with the Council to identify the most suitable and deliverable options for housing and SANG provision north / north west of Corfe Mullen. Further evidence will be provided to elaborate on these representations through subsequent consultation stages of this DPD. See attachment			804

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

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	CSO1 8386	Option CM 3	Object		<p>Lack of research relating to the Recreation Ground 2.8 Moving to the Corfe Mullen sites and in particular CM3 which seeks to provide 150 dwellings on the eastern part of the recreation ground. Page 255 of the Masterplan Report proposes that the loss of the recreation ground could be offset by the installation of a second recreation ground to the south of the village off Wareham Road. This is surely not feasible given the fact that this proposed area is in very close proximity to a landfill site (less than 100 metres) and would not be a suitable neighbouring use.</p> <p>2.9 In addition, the Masterplan Report states that the area of the recreation ground proposed for housing does not contain the majority of the football pitches and is 'less formal' and therefore 'less valuable' when in fact this is the complete opposite with the majority of the facilities football pitches being located in the east. The recreation ground is also a valuable resource for non-sports related recreation such as family picnics and activities particularly on the lower slopes and it is an integral part of annual events such as the Corfe Mullen carnival. Dog walkers, boy scouts and girl guides also make best use of the area.</p> <p>2.10 Such oversights portray a lack of local knowledge and demonstrate a poor level of investigation by the authors of the Report. Paragraph 4.37 of Planning Policy Statement 12 (PPS12 – Local Spatial Planning) submits that there should be a strong evidence base during the preparation of each core strategy under the heading 'Research/fact finding' which states that there should be 'evidence that the choices made by the plan are backed up by background facts'. The proposed 'second' recreation ground at Wareham Road would likely be most used in the summer months (although it is used year-round) which is precisely the time when the landfill site emits a strong aroma of methane and local residents complain about excessive flies and insects. This re-iterates what a bad neighbour a landfill site and recreation ground would be in planning terms. It is acknowledged that the south of the village needs additional recreational facilities but to effectively halve the size of the provided in the north of the village is not the answer.</p>			804

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>2.11 In addition, the topography of the land at Wareham Road is undulating and a large degree of financial and engineering investment would be required to be inputted to any scheme for a second recreation ground at this location in order to provide a flat recreation ground.</p> <p>2.12 Furthermore, page 76 of the Report describes that the existing recreation facility 'has some value'. This is very much an understatement as the recreation ground caters for more than 40 youth and adult football teams. Indeed, Sharon Bargewell of the Corfe Mullen Sports Association has confirmed that no-one from the Sports Association had been consulted with by the authors of the report at any stage prior to or during the compilation of the Report.</p> <p>2.13 Economically, the costs associated with supporting two recreation grounds as well as building the infrastructure required for the second recreation ground such as a new pavilion, showers and other associated facilities would be far in excess of the potential income that could be generated. The costs of repair and maintenance of two recreation grounds which would obviously be increased compared with the repair and maintenance of the existing ground would not be covered as there would be no tangible increase in the income stream as the number of clubs that use the facilities would not increase.</p> <p>2.16 The Bournemouth, Poole and Dorset Local Transport Plan 3 (2011-2026) is due to be implemented in March 2011. This document will set out a long term strategy for travel and transport within the area during the plan period. Paragraph 6.2.9 of the consultation document concerns strategic network improvements and in particular the A31 improvements and the Bournemouth Airport Access Scheme. The Plan states the implementation of both schemes 'will be essential for residential development at West Parley to go ahead'.</p> <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</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>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>CM3 – Corfe Mullen</p> <p>3.21 Turning now to the site within the Corfe Mullen search area 'CM3 – Eastern part of the Recreation Ground'. Much of the same objections to the West Parley site are relevant to CM3 – most importantly the fact that alternatives exist for smaller scale developments within Corfe Mullen and on its periphery which should be investigated thoroughly before large scale building on the Green Belt is even looked at. This will serve to protect the Green Belt from an unnecessary loss and preserve the character of Corfe Mullen.</p> <p>3.22 The fact that CM3 will see the loss of a valuable community asset exacerbates the ludicrous reasoning to propose to build 150 homes on this land. The Masterplan Report proposes to provide additional recreational land elsewhere in Corfe Mullen in order to maintain provision. However, in reality (see paras 2.11 to 2.15 of this Objection Statement) there are no definitive plans for where the displaced recreational facilities would be relocated to and how this would be economically viable, especially as two recreation grounds would effectively need to be maintained. Therefore, the CM3 proposal will actually reduce the level of provision of open space in Corfe Mullen when a critical element of the Masterplan Report is that this provision will be at least maintained.</p> <p>3.23 The decision to include the Recreation ground as a development site is even more spurious when the EDDC Local Plan (adopted 2002) states (p135) 'although additional sports pitches have been provided on the northern side of Corfe Mullen in recent years, there remains a shortfall measured against national standards'.</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>3.24 The Masterplan Report gives insufficient weight to the role that the existing facility is playing in the community and even though it is a valuable resource it needs further investment as evidenced above and not to be carved up.</p> <p>3.25 The Recreation ground is used all year-round by all ages and backgrounds. At winter weekends there are numerous football matches being played by local teams often taking on opposing teams from all over Dorset. In the summer, football and cricket are played and of course local children utilise the fields during their summer holidays.</p> <p>3.26 It appears from the minutes of Corfe Mullen Parish Council meetings that the proposal to build on the Recreation ground is not acceptable to the majority of councillors and that more funds should be put into the existing facilities and not have them taken away.</p> <p>3.27 The Report also is remiss in suggesting precisely what level of infrastructure improvements will take place to deal with this sudden explosion of dwelling numbers. It is clear that a proposal for 150 new homes to the north of the village would increase traffic exponentially in the local area in what is an area that already suffers from serious congestion.</p> <p>3.28 In much the same way as West Parley, a significant large scale development on the fringe of the village will bring into question Corfe Mullen's status as a village and there will be an undoubted loss of identity as Corfe Mullen will become more of a residential suburb.</p> <p>3.29 In terms of Green Belt issues, CM3 should be afforded great protection. The Green Belt Review concluded that there would be encroachment into the countryside should this area be developed that would also lead to loss of views out from Corfe Mullen in what is an area of high landscape value. It is considered important to stress that the views from CM3 are far-reaching across the extent of the Stour Valley from Badbury Rings through to Wimborne. This is confirmed in the EDDC Landscape Character Assessment (June 2009) which indicates the exact location of 'significant views' into and out of the site.</p> <p>3.30 However, from the landscape sensitivity grid 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>page 76 of the Masterplan Report it appears that the Recreation ground site has been given a 'low' score both in terms of cultural factors (totally ignoring the role that the recreation facility plays to the community), natural factors (ignoring the significant views afforded and recognised high landscape value) and landscape quality.</p> <p>3.31 If these sections were marked only marginally higher as they should at the very least have been then CM3 would have afforded a higher landscape 'rating' and may therefore have not been progressed with until this stage of the process. EDDC needs to revisit the scores on pages 76 and 77 of the Masterplan Report itself and weight them accordingly before progressing with CM3.</p> <p>3.32 In terms of flooding, all Corfe Mullen sites to the north west of the village are within Fluvial Flood Zone 1, whereas the majority of the built-up area of the village is not. In the same way as the West Parley sites, some small scale ribbon developments closer to the village centre would contribute towards the housing requirement in a more sustainable manner whilst preserving the Green Belt.</p>			
527750	Mr Colin MacNee		CSO1 8914	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
527818	Mr Nigel Lester	Synergy Housing Association	CSO1 8963	Option CM 3	Support		Having looked at the proposals for each of the geographical areas and the proposed sites within those areas we can see no reason to disagree with the Local Authorities assessment and findings in each case, and would be very keen to become involved in the provision of affordable housing on any of these sites.			804
527849	Miss Kate Tunks	Transport Planning Officer Dorset County Council	CSO1 9037	Option CM 3		General Comment	Options CM2 and CM3 These options are largely dependant on the provision of a significant local service centre as outlined in CM1. If this is not provided then the developments would be likely to follow the same, car dependent, pattern as the rest of Corfe Mullen. Vehicular access to, from and through the site from Wimborne Road needs to be carefully designed for option CM2.			804

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

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		CSO1 9203	Option CM 3	Support					804
534820	Mr Paul Batten		CSO1 9429	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
534837	Mrs P Martin		CSO1 9492	Option CM 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.			804
534875	Mr Brian Lane		CSO1 9535	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
534914	Mrs P Froud		CSO1 9652	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
535070	Mr Alan Reade		CSO1 9625	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
535112	Mr Jack Tindall		CSO1 9700	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
535167	Mrs Lynda Lake		CSO1 9752	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
535209	Mr P Webster		CSO1 9791	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
535349	P Thomas		CSO1 9819	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
535368	Mr Andrew Evans		CSO1 9871	Option CM 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			804

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

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 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.			
535387	Mr Brian Cox		CSO1 9946	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
535393	Mr Jeremy Berg		CSO1 9897	Option CM 3	Support		ROADS, ROADS, ROADS, BEFORE YOU BUILD ANYWHERE & DESTROY EVERYONES WAY OF LIFE FOREVER, BUILD ROADS & BY PASSES.			804
535421	Mr Roland Andrews		CSO2 0611	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
535457	Mr Matthew Newman		CSO1 9957	Option CM 3	Support		As a life long resident of Wimborne I feel the need for a sizable housing development is greatly needed for families & young professionals as the town is seriously lacking in affordable private ownership family & starter homes. Family sized properties in the Wimborne area are very over priced (as demand is high) and I am aware of many families living in inadequate sized dwellings that are unable to bridge the price gap to buy a home that is suitable for their needs. In recent years the majority of development that has taken place in the area has been small scale and is usually aimed at the executive high end market. A larger housing development would cater for a wider range of housing stock which is greatly needed by the residents of the town.			804
535500	David Veevers		CSO2 0008	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
361024	Mr & Mrs Kenny Pearce		CSO2 2093	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
361288	Mrs Ruth		CSO2 1500	Option CM 3	Object		Objections to CM3: 1. It is VERY well used & amenities & grounds have been well-established at			804

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	DOLLERSON						great expense - don't waste this input! 2. vital for recreation for all to enjoy & use. The Rec is beautiful & well equipped for all in CM - why waste money paying to do this again elsewhere. 3. Protects Green Belt & open spaces 4. Do we need 150 houses so far from potential work & with limited transport possibilities? (either public or private)			
482494	Mrs Yvette Jones		CSO2 1875	Option CM 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 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.			804
498211	Mrs J Auckland		CSO2 1726	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
498402	Mrs T Hughes		CSO2 2233	Option CM 3	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			804

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

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 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.			
508735	Mr Peter Barham		CSO2 2266	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
535504	Mr Michael Beer		CSO2 0064	Option CM 3	Object					804
535509	Mrs S Durant		CSO2 0074	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
535517	Mr Roy Rich		CSO2 0089	Option CM 3	Object					804
535550	Mrs D Mogg		CSO2 0169	Option CM 3	Object					804
535566	Mrs L Cook		CSO2 0215	Option CM 3	Object					804
535567	Ms Judy McMath		CSO2 0226	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
535574	Mr and Mrs Ralph Williams		CSO2 0242	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
535591	A Walker		CSO2 0288	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
535610	Mr Stewart Bullen		CSO2 0357	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
535662	Dianne Trevett		CSO2 0396	Option CM 3	Object		c) The recreation ground (CM3) is a vital facility for the residents of Corfe Mullen with no obvious alternative and therefore strongly object to any building on this land d) The Waterloo Valley/Pardy's Hill area of green belt land has been correctly excluded from the options as it is not appropriate to build on due to geographical & infrastructure problems as well as being green belt land.			804
535670	Mr Dave Allen		CSO2 0407	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
535678	Mr Andrew Bryant		CSO2 0435	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
535688	Mrs Susan Hobbs		CSO2 0525	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
535698	Mr John Stone		CSO2 0473	Option CM 3	Object		CM3 Why relocate the recreation ground when it is perfect as it is?			804
535701	Mr Andy Skeats		CSO2 0482	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
535815	Mrs C M Davies		CSO2 0552	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
535836	Mr Peter Parsons		CSO2 0579	Option CM 3	Support					804
535865	Mr D.C Bryson		CSO2 0642	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
535875	Mr John Kitchenside		CSO2 0672	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
535907	Mr Christopher Baxendale		CSO2 0714	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
535935	Mr Peter J Medler		CSO2 0831	Option CM 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.			804
535940	Mrs Linda Medler		CSO2 0774	Option CM 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 extra traffic this will bring. I thought we were trying to bring about a greener environment to Dorset county?			804
536014	Mrs Dawn Tindall		CSO2 0868	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
536129	Mr Peter Houghton		CSO2 0964	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
536169	Mr		CSO2	Option		No Opinion				804

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Tony Trewiss-Bell		1014	CM 3						
536267	Trish Wheeler		CSO2 1152	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
536282	Mrs Doreen Kingaby		CSO2 1183	Option CM 3	Object					804
536324	Paul Sumner		CSO2 1269	Option CM 3	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 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 sites and they will all destroy habitat for local wildlife; VWM4 will also see ssi sites reed beds ancient hedgerows etc. severely disrupted. Did you know that there is a flood plain? What about the scientific report on the River Crane and fishing lakes down there?. Common-sense please.			804
536330	A Aylmore		CSO2 1262	Option CM 3	Object					804
536335	S Aylmore		CSO2 1281	Option CM 3	Object					804
536341	Mr		CSO2	Option		No Opinion				804

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

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 Bowyer		1304	CM 3						
536346	Mr Ben Richards		CSO2 1346	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
536349	Mrs C Bowyer		CSO2 1372	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
536449	Mr Dave Isaacs		CSO2 1447	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
536543	Mrs Samantha Fysh		CSO2 1518	Option CM 3	Support		NO MORE HOUSES IN VERWOOD.. ENOUGH IS ENOUGH!!!!			804
536572	Mr Roger Fysh		CSO2 1577	Option CM 3	Support		I strongly object to the proposal to increase the housing in and around Verwood. Verwood has been extensively developed over the years and there are 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			804
536576	Mrs Valerie Green		CSO2 1582	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
536628	Mr C.A Wills		CSO2 1643	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
536699	Ms Kathryn D'Arcy		CSO2 1774	Option CM 3	Support		Ensure that all existing unoccupied homes are utilised. Look at infill in a positive way- Ensure that all infrastructure REALLY supports proposed development Do not build homes if the occupants are			804

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							unable to find work locally. This leads to juvenile problems and a group of unemployed within the community. There is not enough employment in Wimborne for the number of homes proposed.			
536771	Mr B Lusher		CSO2 1842	Option CM 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 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.			804
536790	David Steadman		CSO2 1895	Option CM 3	Object					804
536802	Mrs Anida Griffiths		CSO2 1949	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

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		CSO2 1990	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
536812	Mr R H Barker		CSO2 1982	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
536830	Mrs Janet Sutcliffe		CSO2 2050	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
536838	Ms Anita Pearman		CSO2 2056	Option CM 3	Object		We consider that Corfe Mullen cannot cope with this amount of rapid housing increase, it will have a detrimental effect on the lives of all the current residents of Corfe Mullen, and will create overdevelopment to what is currently a semi-rural location. For example 150 new family homes could create another 300 plus cars all trying to make the morning commute which is already at breaking point.			804
536848	Ola Steadman		CSO2 2133	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
536850	Mr Michael Hird		CSO2 2129	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
536860	Mrs Sparks		CSO2 2183	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
536866	Ms Emma Huns		CSO2 2208	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
536932	Mr Paul Bason		CSO2 2299	Option CM 3	Object					804
537050	Diane Fletcher		CSO2 2407	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
359419	Mrs K.	Clerk Corfe Mullen	CSO2 2951	Option CM 3	Object		More recreational facilities are required in the south of the village. More facilities required for all ages			804

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Blee	Parish Council					particularly older teenagers. The county field at the current recreation ground should be retained as an integral part of the recreation ground under the management of the Parish Council.			
361342	Mr Graham Clarke	Spatial Planning Officer Dorset County Council	CSO2 2831	Option CM 3		General Comment	Notwithstanding the difficulties of finding housing sites in a highly constrained area, housing sites CM1 (Lockyers School) and CM3 (the Recreation Ground) in Corfe Mullen are undeliverable. The sites in question are currently in use for school and recreational purposes, and there are no current proposals to discontinue these uses, or relocate them elsewhere. There are no proposals to close Lockyers School. The Recreation Ground is a popular and well used local facility, the proposed discontinuance of which would be likely to provoke strong opposition from local residents and users of the sports pitches. It would also be difficult to replace the playing fields locally.			804
537075	Mrs Elaine Holt		CSO2 2441	Option CM 3	Object					804
537106	Mrs C Hebditch		CSO2 2472	Option CM 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 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			804

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

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 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			
537362	Mr Peter Constable		CSO2 2530	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
537435	Ms Pauline Burton		CSO2 2558	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
537529	Mrs C White		CSO2 2585	Option CM 3	Object					804
537571	Mr and Mrs N Leatherdale		CSO2 2637	Option CM 3		No Opinion				804
538210	Mr and Mrs Peter Griffiths		CSO2 2715	Option CM 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, and work and will alleviate pressure on rural communities with no facilities to provide affordable housing in the Green Belt.			804