

# **Core Strategy Submission**

# Christchurch New Neighbourhoods Delivery Risk Assessment

## FD3



Prepared by Christchurch Borough Council and East Dorset District Council

**June 2013** 

### **Inspectors Requirement:**

A paper is required to set out infrastructure requirements / project planning / programming / risks and contingencies.

## **Policy CN1: Christchurch Urban Extension**

Risk	Mitigation/Evidence					Sca	ale of	Risk	
Is there a land	Christchurch Borough Council own the land within the Urban	Un-mitigated		<b>1</b> Hiç		gh Medium		Low	
ownership constraint		IV.	litigated	<u> </u>	5	4	3	2	1
affecting delivery of the		_	High	5					
urban extension?	<ul> <li>ship constraint ng delivery of the extension?</li> <li>Meyrick Estates own the remaining land for the urban extension south of the railway line and north of the railway line where SANGs and minerals extraction are proposed (in Dorset and Hampshire)</li> <li>Taylor Wimpey have an option on the land within Meyrick Estate's ownership which demonstrates an intention to progress development</li> <li>Options for replacement allotments are all located on Meyrick Estates land</li> </ul>	8 %		4					
		lihoo risk	Med	3					
	extension where the Roeshot Hill Allotments are located  Meyrick Estates own the remaining land for the urban extension south of the railway line and north of the railway line where SANGs and minerals extraction are proposed (in Dorset and Hampshire)  Taylor Wimpey have an option on the land within Meyrick Estate's ownership which demonstrates an intention to progress development  Options for replacement allotments are all located on Meyrick Estates land  Sainsbury's have an option covering 2.4ha of land immediately to the north of their existing supermarket. The existing store is overtrading and Sainsbury's may seek to expand this store in the	Likelihood of risk		2					
	development	Low	Low	1					
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·								
	the north of their existing supermarket. The existing store is								

Risk	Mitigation/Evidence					Sca	ale of	Risk	
Is the housing	The joint housing trajectory sets out development commencing for	Un	-mitigat	ed	Hi	gh	Med	lium	Low
<ul> <li>The joint housing trajectory sets out development commencing for the arreduction of the christchurch Urban Extension in 2014/15. This has been informed by the master planning work for the urban extension which Meyrick Estates and Taylor Wimpey have been engaged in</li> </ul>		Mitigated			5	4	3	2	1
	High	5							
		% <del>X</del>		4					
	which Meyrick Estates and Taylor Wimpey have been engaged in the production of.	lis ris	Med	3					
			ike		2				
		_	Low	1					

Risk	Mitigation/Evidence					Sca	ale of	Risk	
Is there a SANGs	SANGs Strategy produced with Meyrick Estates and Natural	Un-	mitigat	ed	Hi	gh	Med	lium	Low
Strategy which is	<ul> <li>SANGs Strategy produced with Meyrick Estates and Natural England (See attached SANGs strategy)</li> <li>SANGs located on Meyrick Estate land and layout avoids conflict with proposed mineral extraction in Dorset and Hampshire.</li> <li>New Forest District Council, New Forest National Park Authority, Dorset County Council, Hampshire County Council, Natural England have been engaged in production of SANGs Strategy</li> <li>New Forest National Park not raising 'in principle' objections and planning application required for SANG</li> <li>Draft Statement of Common Ground produced between Dorset County Council, Christchurch Borough Council, Hampshire County</li> </ul>	M	litigated	1	5	4	3	2	1
deliverable alongside		5	High	5					
proposed minerals	· ·	lihood risk		4					
		kelih of ris	Med	3					
and Hampsnire?		Likel		2					
			Low	1					
	<ul> <li>planning application required for SANG</li> <li>Draft Statement of Common Ground produced between Dorset</li> </ul>								
	Council, Natural England, New Forest District Council and New Forest National Park Authority (See attached document)								
	<ul> <li>Delivery of permanent SANGs would be prior to occupation of the first phases of residential development</li> </ul>								
	<ul> <li>Schedule of meetings is set out in Examination Document SD5 and SD4 sets out Duty to Co-operate outcomes for SANGs</li> </ul>								

Risk	Mitigation/Evidence		Scale of						
Have suitable	4 deliverable site options identified on Meyrick Estate land (See	Un	Un-mitigated		High		Medium		Low
alternative sites been	attached document Christchurch New Neighbourhoods /	Mitigated			5	4	3	2	1
identified for replacing	Christchurch Urban Extension Delivery – SANGs Strategy /	-	High	5					
the Roeshot Hill	Allotments)	boo *		4					
Allotments?	Roeshot Hill Allotments Association engaged throughout	kelihoc of risk	Med	3					
	preparation of Core Strategy	ike of		2					
	<ul> <li>RHAA informally engaged on process of identifying deliverable options</li> </ul>		Low	1					
	<ul> <li>Formal engagement with RHAA on deliverable options before September 2013</li> </ul>								

Risk					Scale of Ris				
Is the site viable when	<ul> <li>Viability work undertaken by Whiteleaf Consulting as part of 2010</li> </ul>	Un	-mitigat	ed	Hi	gh	Med	lium	Low
considering	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	Mitigated			5	4	3	2	1
•	, ,	75	High	5					
	<ul> <li>Viability work undertaken by Whiteleaf Consulting as part of 2010 master planning informed options taken forward to 'Options for Consideration' consultation (Oct 2010)</li> <li>Viability work undertaken by Whiteleaf Consulting assessed the Stage 2 masterplan option C935 dwellings and alternative option of retaining allotments. Site abnormals, developer contributions and affordable housing @ 35% considered viable (See Examination Document ED70 Christchurch Urban Extension Viability Reports 2011/12)</li> <li>Viability work undertaken by Peter Brett on behalf of the Council for CIL which has tested the impact of plan policies, site abnormals, S106 &amp; CIL and affordable housing @ 35% and considered viable (See Examination Document ED23)</li> <li>Viability work set out above has assessed the cost implications of</li> </ul>	8 %		4					
plan policies and CIL?		l isi	Med	3					
		Likelihood of risk		2					
	<ul> <li>Viability work undertaken by Whiteleaf Consulting assessed the Stage 2 masterplan option C935 dwellings and alternative option of retaining allotments. Site abnormals, developer contributions and affordable housing @ 35% considered viable (See Examination Document ED70 Christchurch Urban Extension Viability Reports 2011/12)</li> <li>Viability work undertaken by Peter Brett on behalf of the Council for CIL which has tested the impact of plan policies, site abnormals, S106 &amp; CIL and affordable housing @ 35% and considered viable</li> </ul>		Low	1					
	Document ED70 Christchurch Urban Extension Viability Reports 2011/12)  • Viability work undertaken by Peter Brett on behalf of the Council for CIL which has tested the impact of plan policies, site abnormals, S106 & CIL and affordable housing @ 35% and considered viable								
	. ,								
	1								
	S106 & CIL and affordable housing @ 35% and considered viable								
	,								
	,								
	undergrounding the overhead pylons								

Risk	Mitigation/Evidence					Sca	ale of	Risk	
Can the necessary transport	<ul> <li>Junction improvements for the A35 as set out in the Core Strategy IDP and Local Transport Plan 3 will be delivered through CIL and</li> </ul>		<mark>-mitigat</mark> Iitigated		Hi:	gh <b>4</b>	Med 3	dium 2	Low 1
improvements be implemented to bring forward the urban extension? (A35 improvements)	<ul> <li>DCC funding. Timing of delivery is set out in the IDP.</li> <li>DCC are satisfied that Junction improvements along the A35 will be delivered hand in hand with the progress of new development in the Borough</li> </ul>	ikelihood of risk	High Med	5 4 3 2					
improvements)	<ul> <li>Immediate site specific improvements will be delivered through \$106</li> <li>Further government funding will be secured by DCC</li> </ul>		Low	1					

Risk	Mitigation/Evidence					Sca	ale of	Risk								
How are issues of	Master planning for the urban extension locates development	Un	Un-mitigated			Un-mitigated		Un-mitigated		Un-mitigated		H	gh	Med	dium	Low
floodrisk addressed?	outside of the floodzone	I.	litigated	1	5	4	3	2	1							
		-	High	5												
		0 <del>x</del>		4												
		elihood f risk	Med	3												
		ikel		2												
			Low	1												

Risk	Mitigation/Evidence					Sca	ale of	Risk	
Is there a strategy in	The undergrounding of the overhead pylons has been considered	Un	-mitigat	ed	Hi	gh	Med	lium	Low
place for the overhead	as part of the council's master planning work and viability	Λ	litigated	1	5	4	3	2	1
pylons?	assessments (See Christchurch Urban Extension Master	_	High	5					
	Planning reports ED68/69 and Whiteleaf viability assessments	nood sk		4					
	ED70).	lih	Med	3					
	Meyrick Estates and Taylor Wimpey have been engaged in the	Likelih of ri		2					
	production of master planning for the Urban Extension (ED68/69)		Low	1					
	and have not raised an issue with deliverability.								

## **Policy CN2 Land South of Burton Village**

Risk	Mitigation/Evidence					Scale	of R	isk N/	Α
Is there a land	Land is within the ownership of Meyrick Estates who are supportive of development in this location	Un-mitigated		High		High Medium		Low	
ownership constraint		Mitigated			5	4	3	2	1
affecting delivery of		ъ	High	5					
land to the South of Burton?		900 X		4					
		= =	Med	3					
		ike of		2					
		_	Low	1					

Risk					Scale of Risk						
Is there a SANGs	SANGs Strategy produced with Meyrick Estates and Natural		-mitigat		Hi	gh	Med	dium	Low		
<ul> <li>Is there a SANGs</li> <li>Strategy which is deliverable alongside proposed minerals</li> <li>SANGs Strategy produced with MEDICAL England for the Christchurch Urbantached SANGs Strategy)</li> <li>SANGs provision for the Christched</li> </ul>	England for the Christchurch Urban Extension (Policy CN1) (See	Mitigated		5	4	3	2	1			
_	attached SANGs Strategy)	70	High	5							
1	SANGs provision for the Christchurch Urban Extension (Policy	ikelihood of risk		4							
	CN1) will have sufficient capacity to mitigate the development	rie isi	Med	3							
and Hampsnire?	proposed South of Burton Village	ike of		2							
			Low	1							

Risk	Mitigation/Evidence					Sca	ale of	Risk	
How are issues of floodrisk addressed?	A flood management strategy will be prepared to address on site		<mark>-mitigat</mark> ed Iitigated		Hi	gh 4	Med	lium	Low
Hoodisk addressed?	<ul> <li>Meyrick Estates has undertaken a site specific flood risk assessment for the land south of Burton (submitted as part of their representations at Pre Submission) which identifies a flood management strategy to accommodate a development of 90 dwellings over a larger site than proposed in the Core Strategy</li> </ul>	Likelihood of risk	High  Med  Low	5 4 3 2 1	3	4	3		

Risk	Mitigation/Evidence				Sca	ale of				
How will transport improvements be delivered at the appropriate time?	Proposed development to the South of Burton would have an	Un-mitigated		Un-mitigated		Un-mitigated		mitigated		High Medium Low
	impact on the A35 and CIL would be used proportionately towards junction improvements along the A35	Λ	litigated	1	High Medium 5 4 3 2			2	1	
		1	High	5						
		) 50d		4						
		ikelihoo of risk	Med	3						
		of ike	<b>b c 2</b>							
		Low 1								

### **Bournemouth Airport & Business Park**

### Inspector's Requirement

Confirmation that management flood risk has been addressed on all allocation sites. Project planning information is required.

Risk	Mitigation/Evidence			Scale of Risk					
How is the issue of floodrisk managed for the airport?	Manchester Airports Group are producing a flood management	Un	Un-mitigated		High		Medium		Low
	strategy in consultation with the Environment Agency as part of a reserved matters application following approval of outline planning consent (8/11/0329)	N	litigated		5	4	3	2	1
		pood ik	High	5					
				4					
		ikelihoo of risk	Med	3					
		Like		2					
			Low	1					

Risk	Mitigation/Evidence	Scale of Risk N/A							
Risk  How is development phasing for the Airport & Business Park determined?	Development phasing is determined by the timing of transport	Un-ı	In-mitigated		High		Medium		Low
	improvements for the B3073 / A338.	M	litigated	1	5	4	3	2	1
	<ul> <li>The timing of transport improvements for the B3073 / A338 is set out in the Core Strategy IDP and Local Transport Plan 3.</li> </ul>	0	High	5					
		8 S		4					
	<ul> <li>Outline planning permission has been granted for 15ha of</li> </ul>	Un-mitigated High Medium  Mitigated 5 4 3 2  High 5	Med	3					
	employment development at the business park which forms 50% of								
	the 30ha of the employment development planned for in the Core Strategy.		Low	1					
	<ul> <li>The Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Workspace Study (2012) sets out the current envisaged development phasing based on the existing programme of transport improvements</li> </ul>								
	<ul> <li>Bournemouth Airport and Business Park forms part of a City Deal expression of interest that has been successful. Bournemouth LEP</li> </ul>								

- are currently producing a detailed bid which could secure funding to enable transport improvements to be delivered sooner and may affect the current programme of development phasing
- Manchester Airports Group is currently in the process of updating their master plans for the operational airport and Business Park and consultation is scheduled for autumn 2013 on the updated master plan. No documentation is currently available but MAG have confirmed no conflicts with the Core Strategy.