

Events: Core Strategy Pre-Submission Chapter 10 Ferndown and West Parley Housing, Employment and Town Centre

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
650107	Mr David Baxter		CSPS283	10							I am writing with regard to the aforementioned document (Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy Pre Submission). I have read it thoroughly and taken time to consider its implications for the local area and its residents. I have reached the conclusion that while some of the aims and conclusions reached in the document are laudable, there are significant parts of this document that are entirely lacking in common sense. Sections 10.1 through 10.5 provide an interesting overview of the area, and it is interesting to read the actual statistics.				454			
703944	Cllr John Little	Christchurch & East Dorset Conservative Association	CSPS459	10							<p>General comments. The effect of the proposed developments in Ferndown, West Parley and in Christchurch (Airport and Industrial estate) have not been recognised in the present proposals.</p> <p>The proposed housing developments will generate additional traffic to schools and medical services all located in Ferndown. There is already a rat run along Dudsbury Avenue and severe congestion in Church Road outside the schools as well as congestion at junctions on Ringwood Road and these developments will exacerbate that.</p> <p>The proposed development of a superstore at West Parley and additional retail units will require delivery vehicles to use Ringwood Road and New Road.</p> <p>Developments of industrial units in Ferndown and at Hurn will lead to increased traffic through Ferndown as will expansion of the airport.</p> <p>Summary. The strategy does not adequately recognise all the problems and issues in Ferndown and does not provide measurable and tangible solutions to resolve those that have been identified. It does not recognise the problems that will result from the proposed developments.</p> <p>No proposals are included for leisure and recreation needs - allotments, for example.</p> <p>The development of 200 homes on the west of West Parley - Policy FWP7 - is supported provided that the proposed link road is constructed.</p> <p>The developments at Coppins Nursery and Holmwood House are supported.</p> <p>The development of 30 hectares for employment is supported.</p> <p>The proposal to provide District Council offices in Wimborne Town Centre is not supported.</p>				454			
490823	Mr Ian Jones	Ferndown Town Council	CSPS2989	10.1	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes		<p>Ferndown Town Council would like to see a stronger commitment to improvements at Penny's Walk and Victoria Road, with an idea of a time frame for these to be achieved. Any plans should be consulted upon with the Ferndown Chamber of Trade, the town council and other stakeholders. We believe that the document should show a positive commitment to update the shopping area. Highway alterations and environmental enhancements will help to improve the pedestrians shopping experience, but</p>		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		455			

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											some businesses at least may not be happy with this proposal.						
360302	Mrs Hilary Chittenden	Environment TAG (East Dorset)	CSPS3306	10.2		Yes					Support in part We support the reasoning for inclusion of these two sites in the Green Belt. (PI see 2nd response)		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		456		
644337	Mr David Edwards		CSPS28	10.3	Yes	No			Yes	Yes	There is no provision for allotments in Ferndown.	The lack of allotments in Ferndown has been an issue for over 3 years and appears to be no nearer to resolution in spite of the efforts of Ferndown Town Council. I believe that the provision of allotments must be specifically included in this plan or a major amenity for the residents will not be provided.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		457		
360302	Mrs Hilary Chittenden	Environment TAG (East Dorset)	CSPS3307	10.3		Yes					Support in part We support the reasoning for inclusion of these two sites in the Green Belt. (PI see 2nd response)		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		457		
650107	Mr David Baxter		CSPS284	10.7							Where do you plan on building this "additional shopping"? Ferndown centre is not awash with vacant, undeveloped space. If you decide to build on the car parks then you will reduce the patronage of the shops as drivers decide to go to Ringwood or Wimborne town centres, both of which have adequate parking, or the Castlepoint shopping centre.				461		
652950	Mr Peter Holttum		CSPS528	10.7	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	Ferndown is already awash with charity shops etc. What evidence is there that more shopping and facilities would be used. If they were, planning applications would already have been submitted to satisfy such demand.		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		461		
490823	Mr Ian Jones	Ferndown Town Council	CSPS2990	10.7	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes		Ferndown Town Council would like to see a stronger commitment to improvements at Penny's Walk and Victoria Road, with an idea of a time frame for these to be achieved. Any plans should be consulted upon with the Ferndown Chamber of Trade, the town council and other stakeholders. We believe that the document should show a positive commitment to update the shopping area. Highway alterations and environmental enhancements will help to improve the pedestrians shopping experience, but some businesses at least may not be happy with this proposal.		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		461		
360271	Cllr Paul Timberlake		CSPS524	10.10	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Not quite correct: The doctors surgery in Glenmoor Road is just in West Parley, NOT Ferndown!	Amend typo error.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		464		
490823	Mr Ian Jones	Ferndown Town Council	CSPS2979	10.10	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes		Ferndown Town Council would like to see a stronger commitment to improvements at Penny's Walk and Victoria		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral		464		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											Road, with an idea of a time frame for these to be achieved. Any plans should be consulted upon with the Ferndown Chamber of Trade, the town council and other stakeholders. We believe that the document should show a positive commitment to update the shopping area. Highway alterations and environmental enhancements will help to improve the pedestrians shopping experience, but some businesses at least may not be happy with this proposal.		examination				
490823	Mr Ian Jones	Ferndown Town Council	CSPS2981	10.11	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes		Ferndown Town Council would like to see a stronger commitment to improvements at Penny's Walk and Victoria Road, with an idea of a time frame for these to be achieved. Any plans should be consulted upon with the Ferndown Chamber of Trade, the town council and other stakeholders. We believe that the document should show a positive commitment to update the shopping area. Highway alterations and environmental enhancements will help to improve the pedestrians shopping experience, but some businesses at least may not be happy with this proposal.		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		465		
495859	Mr Basil Barnett		CSPS2297	10.12		No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	The response forms provided on the Dorset for you website do not allow the type of submission that I wish to make. Hence, I am using this free-form document. In the remainder of this communication, CSD stands for the Core Strategy Documents. Conclusions 1 I understand that the top objective for the Core Strategy is that a planning document is required (and it must be approved by the Planning Inspector authorized by the Government) to replace the existing strategy which is about to expire. None of this is stated, neither in the Welcome introduction document, nor in the CSD. 2 The CSD has not been written so that residents can read it, follow the evidence, and support the conclusions. 3 The CSD does not meet its own stated requirements nor meet the requirements of the NPPF. 4 There are two important examples where the Core Strategy does not properly address the real problems of Ferndown and they have been almost passed over. The Core Strategy should make clear that, for Ferndown, the problems of traffic and care homes will not be resolved. Since there is no index to the evidence on which the Core Strategy is based, it is impossible to be convinced that the Positively prepared, Justified, Effective and Consistent with national policy.				466		
490823	Mr Ian Jones	Ferndown Town Council	CSPS2984	10.13	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes		Ferndown Town Council would like to see a stronger commitment to improvements at Penny's Walk and Victoria Road, with an idea of a time frame for these to be achieved. Any plans should be consulted upon with the Ferndown Chamber of Trade, the town council and other stakeholders. We believe that the document should show a positive commitment to update the shopping area. Highway alterations and environmental enhancements will		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		467		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											help to improve the pedestrians shopping experience, but some businesses at least may not be happy with this proposal.						
495859	Mr Basil Barnett		CSPS2298	10.15		No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	<p>The response forms provided on the Dorset for you website do not allow the type of submission that I wish to make. Hence, I am using this free-form document. In the remainder of this communication, CSD stands for the Core Strategy Documents.</p> <p>Conclusions</p> <p>1 I understand that the top objective for the Core Strategy is that a planning document is required (and it must be approved by the Planning Inspector authorized by the Government) to replace the existing strategy which is about to expire. None of this is stated, neither in the Welcome introduction document, nor in the CSD.</p> <p>2 The CSD has not been written so that residents can read it, follow the evidence, and support the conclusions.</p> <p>3 The CSD does not meet its own stated requirements nor meet the requirements of the NPPF.</p> <p>4 There are two important examples where the Core Strategy does not properly address the real problems of Ferndown and they have been almost passed over. The Core Strategy should make clear that, for Ferndown, the problems of traffic and care homes will not be resolved.</p> <p>Since there is no index to the evidence on which the Core Strategy is based, it is impossible to be convinced that the Positively prepared, Justified, Effective and Consistent with national policy.</p>				469		
645272	Mr Kenneth Frost		CSPS45	Policy FWP1		Yes					Totally agree	None at all			475		
650107	Mr David Baxter		CSPS285	Policy FWP1							<p>Public parking in Ferndown is lacking. Maintaining it alone is not enough, and despite the document's desire to reflect government and EU policy and push everyone onto a bus, there will still be people for whom driving and parking is the ONLY option.</p> <p>The absolute obsession that government has with forcing people onto buses takes no consideration at all for people's lifestyles and the availability of public transport in a given area. Central government assumes that every location in the country has a public transport provision that is as good as London's. This ignornat view, and pressure from the EU is the driving force behind so much policy involving drivers and road systems, and it is often entirely incompatible.</p> <p>Keeping traffic out of Ferndown is a laudable aim, however forcing the public onto buses is not an entirely suitable solution. My nearest bus stop is on Ringwood Road, close to Holmwood House. The number 37 bus runs along Ringwood Road. It is an hourly service that starts at about 9am going into Ferndown and finishes at 6:15pm. There is no Sunday service at all. Please explain to me how I am supposed to do my weekly shop and carry several bags home when I could be waiting for up to an hour, and when I cannot make the journey at all on a Sunday? Other routes are better served -</p>				475		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description					
											<p>the 13 bus (Bournemouth - Winton - Ferndown - Wimborne) is twice an hour up to 6.30pm, when it is then hourly until 10:30pm. Fine if you live along the route. The only bus that serves Ferndown's residential areas is the Yellow Buses number 4c, which starts in Bournemouth, and runs via Winton, Parelly Cross, Glenmoor Road, Ferndown Centre, terminating in West Moors. This bus runs from approximately 6am to 3pm.</p> <p>I would suggest to the council that forcing non-local traffic out of Ferndown Centre and Ringwood Road would, while costing more money, achieve greater results. Perhaps a congestion charge for using Ringwood Road from Bear Cross up to the Turbary Road estate would be an idea, with an exception for local residents or visitors who use Ferndown's shops?</p>											
360509	Miss Rose Freeman	The Theatres Trust	CSPS369	Policy FWP1	Yes	Yes					We support the document and find it to be Sound and are particularly pleased that the regent Theatre and Barrington Theatre are acknowledged in Polices CH1 for Christchurch and FWP1 for Ferndown.		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		475							
703944	Cllr John Little	Christchurch & East Dorset Conservative Association	CSPS448	Policy FWP1	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes		<p>No specific, measurable targets against which performance can be measured. Fails to recognise the desires and needs of the community. Lack of consultation with local residents and organisations. Fails to recognise the impact of neighbouring proposals on Ferndown, infrastructure in particular. Very idealistic and lacks realism.</p> <p>It is recognised that Ferndown and West Parley form the largest urban area in East Dorset and although section 10 is headed "Ferndown and West Parley Housing Employment and Town Centre" the proposals fail to take into account the combined effect on the individual policies of the area as a whole.</p> <p>The policies outlined for the three Town Centres - Ferndown, Verwood and Wimborne fail to recognise the individual needs of each. The statements are vague and lack specific targets on which the policies can be monitored.</p> <p>The following are specific issues which should be addressed within the document.</p> <p>Ferndown policy FWP1.</p> <p>Traffic - the continual increase in volume and weight of HGV's using the roads in Ferndown has not been adequately addressed. There is a vague statement "diversion of heavy goods vehicles" but no indication of how this might be achieved.</p> <p>There is also a reference to traffic management and calming measures without any evidence of where such measures may be required.</p> <p>Traffic is a major area of concern for residents and this document fails to recognise or address the problems.</p> <p>Town Centre. The Town Centre has shown a steady decline over the last decade and without some positive proposals the situation will continue. There are no specific proposals in the document to indicate how this deterioration will be addressed. How will the retail use be expanded? How will the townscape be improved?</p> <p>Development - Care Homes. There is no reference to the</p>	Consideration to be given to the effect of neighbouring proposals and the desires / needs of the local community and to provide more realistic and measurable proposals.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		475							

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
											increasing number of care homes that are being built and proposed in Ferndown. There should be a policy for such development based on needs of the local population. Leisure. No reference in the document to leisure and recreational needs of the community. As there is a known demand for allotments a suitable area should be identified.							
360271	Cllr Paul Timberlake		CSPS525	Policy FWP1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Pedestrian friendly town centre supported. As part of this, action will be needed to divert through traffic using Ringwood Road, onto the Ferndown Bypass	Ensure through traffic using Ringwood Road is made to use the Bypass instead and so help to improve Ferndown Town Centre for pedestrians.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		475			
507546	Mr Nigel Pugsley	BNP Paribas Real Estate	CSPS700	Policy FWP1							Royal Mail has a number of land holdings in the District of East Dorset and the Borough of Christchurch all of which are strategically important, these are as follows: Ferndown Delivery Office, 3 Queens Road, Ferndown, BH22 9RU As such should any of the land surrounding Royal Mail's sites be redeveloped, it would be vital that any new uses be designed and managed so that they are both cognisant and sensitive to Royal Mail's operations.		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		475			
654783	Mrs Lesley Wilson		CSPS812	Policy FWP1	Yes	No	No		No		The ambition to reduce traffic congestion through the middle of Ferndown by diverting Heavy Goods Vehicles away is laudable but the Strategy lacks details of how this can be achieved and to where the traffic will be diverted. HOW? The only effective way would be to reprogramme HGV Sat Navs requiring the co-operation of the British and Continental haulage industry, all the Sat Nav manufacturers and all the map making industry. There is no indication that this is a practical proposition in a sensible time frame. WHERE? Until the A31-Poole Link Road is built (2020 at the earliest) the HGVs will have to be diverted via Ham Lane, Longham or Gravel Hill, Poole. In either case the proposal will meet bitter resistance from the local people living close to those roads.	Provide evidence that an assessment has been made of alternative routes for HGVs and that these can be demonstrated to be deliverable.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		475			
538118	Mrs Christine Cullen		CSPS2785	Policy FWP1							Re: policy FWP1, FWP2, FWP3, FWP4, Ferndown & West Parley proposed developments. Unfortunately I was unable to visit the public exhibitions but I have spoken to those that did attend. Again I don't think that enough is being done to make the residents in Ferndown and West Parley aware of what an impact the developments proposed is going to have. I have spoken to friends and work colleagues and most are not aware as they have not received the Christchurch & East Dorset Core Strategy booklet. I thought that some of these areas are close to heathland so could not be built upon – or has that changed. Also what about the wild life that exists on these sites will it be moved like when the Camelias houses were built. We have already had to put up with the building of houses on woodland to accommodate the Camelias Estate of over 300 houses. Plus all of the changes of one property to blocks of				475			

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>flats around Ferndown!</p> <p>The building of the proposed number of houses which I assume is in the region of 600 is more that the area can cope with. Apparently nothing is going to be done to help with the capacity in schools as the “birth rate is dropping”, so no one will move into the area with children? Again this will bring more that 3000 people. Not to mention the amount of extra cars – the roads around Ferndown and West Paley are often at grid lock and the changes to Canford Bottom roundabout will probably not help as cars and massive lorries still prefer to go alone Ringwood Road through Ferndown! There is also the need for more doctors, as it is the surgeries cannot cope with the people already here. Neither can the hospitals. Where are the extra people going to work, will they all be commuters? The proposed development of another industrial area will not make any difference as there are units empty on the existing industrial estates – people cannot afford to run businesses as the rates are too high and people can’t afford to pay wages to run businesses.</p> <p>This should be made more open to everyone in the area and get a true vote on what we want. A supermarket (Waitrose which only the well off can afford to shop in) is being planned. Also a play area – which is pointless as there will be no extra children!! Plus the change of the road and yet again more traffic lights.</p> <p>The infra structure of the area has just been pushed to the limit with the attitude of build, build and build which provides nothing for the community with the proposed development of the Dormy Hotel site bringing more people. This would have been better used for something for the community rather than more for retired people. Just to hotel would have been even better.</p> <p>I understand there is a need for people to have houses but with the road system as it is, surely this has to be a serious problem. With the promise of affordable housing does this really mean that these will be for local young people to buy or just for social housing and people from the inner cities. Instead of houses why can’t we have amenities that everyone could use instead!</p> <p>There is nothing here for people – the Community Centre is out dated and Ferndown Leisure Centre was built in the 1970’s and despite changes is still not very nice.</p> <p>Everything that was lovely about Ferndown is being lost – the shops are closing because of high rents. There is still nothing for youngsters of any age to do! Why not have a decent centre for youngsters and adults to use – something on par with Tower Park you could have Bingo, Bowling, Swimming, ice rinks, cinemas and restaurants at Parley instead of MORE houses – this would be of use to everyone. If you can’t drive or afford to run a car you cannot travel to Bournemouth or Poole. Plus it isn’t cheap to go by bus which do not run that frequently around here. If we are going to have more cars let us have something that we can enjoy! Not the houses.</p> <p>It would be nice to think that Ferndown and Parley could be thought of more than just somewhere to build hundreds of</p>						

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
											houses – Ferndown and Parley were once communities. I understand the building will not be done by local builders either so not even providing work for locals. So maybe you could make more of an effort to get the people’s response on this before the decision is made.							
655064	Mr and Mrs K Cullen		CSPS2790	Policy FWP1							<p>Re: policy FWP1, FWP2, FWP3, FWP4, Ferndown & West Parley proposed developments.</p> <p>Unfortunately I was unable to visit the public exhibitions but I have spoken to those that did attend.</p> <p>Again I don’t think that enough is being done to make the residents in Ferndown and West Parley aware of what an impact the developments proposed is going to have. I have spoken to friends and work colleagues and most are not aware as they have not received the Christchurch & East Dorset Core Strategy booklet. I thought that some of these areas are close to heathland so could not be built upon – or has that changed. Also what about the wild life that exists on these sites will it be moved like when the Camelias houses were built.</p> <p>We have already had to put up with the building of houses on woodland to accommodate the Camelias Estate of over 300 houses. Plus all of the changes of one property to blocks of flats around Ferndown!</p> <p>The building of the proposed number of houses which I assume is in the region of 600 is more that the area can cope with. Apparently nothing is going to be done to help with the capacity in schools as the “birth rate is dropping”, so no one will move into the area with children? Again this will bring more that 3000 people. Not to mention the amount of extra cars – the roads around Ferndown and West Paley are often at grid lock and the changes to Canford Bottom roundabout will probably not help as cars and massive lorries still prefer to go alone Ringwood Road through Ferndown! There is also the need for more doctors, as it is the surgeries cannot cope with the people already here. Neither can the hospitals.</p> <p>Where are the extra people going to work, will they all be commuters? The proposed development of another industrial area will not make any difference as there are units empty on the existing industrial estates – people cannot afford to run businesses as the rates are too high and people can’t afford to pay wages to run businesses.</p> <p>This should be made more open to everyone in the area and get a true vote on what we want. A supermarket (Waitrose which only the well off can afford to shop in) is being planned. Also a play area – which is pointless as there will be no extra children!! Plus the change of the road and yet again more traffic lights.</p> <p>The infra structure of the area has just been pushed to the limit with the attitude of build, build and build which provides nothing for the community with the proposed development of the Dormy Hotel site bringing more people. This would have been better used for something for the community rather than more for retired people. Just to hotel would have been even better.</p>							

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>I understand there is a need for people to have houses but with the road system as it is, surely this has to be a serious problem. With the promise of affordable housing does this really mean that these will be for local young people to buy or just for social housing and people from the inner cities. Instead of houses why can't we have amenities that everyone could use instead!</p> <p>There is nothing here for people – the Community Centre is out dated and Ferndown Leisure Centre was built in the 1970's and despite changes is still not very nice.</p> <p>Everything that was lovely about Ferndown is being lost – the shops are closing because of high rents. There is still nothing for youngsters of any age to do! Why not have a decent centre for youngsters and adults to use – something on par with Tower Park you could have Bingo, Bowling, Swimming, ice rinks, cinemas and restaurants at Parley instead of MORE houses – this would be of use to everyone. If you can't drive or afford to run a car you cannot travel to Bournemouth or Poole. Plus it isn't cheap to go by bus which do not run that frequently around here. If we are going to have more cars let us have something that we can enjoy! Not the houses.</p> <p>It would be nice to think that Ferndown and Parley could be thought of more than just somewhere to build hundreds of houses – Ferndown and Parley were once communities. I understand the building will not be done by local builders either so not even providing work for locals.</p> <p>So maybe you could make more of an effort to get the people's response on this before the decision is made.</p>						
490823	Mr Ian Jones	Ferndown Town Council	CSPS2985	Policy FWP1	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes		<p>Ferndown Town Council would like to see a stronger commitment to improvements at Penny's Walk and Victoria Road, with an idea of a time frame for these to be achieved. Any plans should be consulted upon with the Ferndown Chamber of Trade, the town council and other stakeholders. We believe that the document should show a positive commitment to update the shopping area. Highway alterations and environmental enhancements will help to improve the pedestrians shopping experience, but some businesses at least may not be happy with this proposal.</p>		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		475		
490823	Mr Ian Jones	Ferndown Town Council	CSPS2986	Policy FWP1	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes		<p>(Sub para 7) Is there an opportunity to create a transport hub as part of the Penny's Walk / Victoria Road Improvement Plan?</p>		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		475		
490823	Mr Ian Jones	Ferndown Town Council	CSPS2992	Policy FWP1	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes		<p>Ferndown Town Council would like to see a stronger commitment to improvements at Penny's Walk and Victoria Road, with an idea of a time frame for these to be achieved. Any plans should be consulted upon with the Ferndown Chamber of Trade, the town council and other stakeholders. We believe that the document should show a positive commitment to update the shopping area. Highway alterations and environmental enhancements will help to improve the pedestrians shopping experience, but some businesses at least may not be happy with this proposal.</p>		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		475		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
360509	Miss Rose Freeman	The Theatres Trust	CSPS3478	Policy FWP1	Yes	Yes					We support the document and find it to be Sound and are particularly pleased that the Regent Theatre and Barrington Theatre are acknowledged in policies CH1 for Christchurch and FWP1 for Ferndown. We have a comment for Policy LN6 for general community facilities and services. Although there are examples of community facilities within Policy LN6, we suggest that as there is no Glossary to explain the term 'community facilities' that para.15.23 (or an additional paragraph) includes a full description for clarity such as community facilities provide for the health and wellbeing, social, educational, spiritual, recreational, leisure and cultural needs of the community.		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		475		
360302	Mrs Hilary Chittenden	Environment TAG (East Dorset)	CSPS3308	10.23		Yes					Support in part We support the reasoning for inclusion of these two sites in the Green Belt. (PI see 2nd response)		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		479		
360302	Mrs Hilary Chittenden	Environment TAG (East Dorset)	CSPS3309	10.24		Yes					Support in part We support the reasoning for inclusion of these two sites in the Green Belt. (PI see 2nd response)		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		480		
645005	Mrs Ablah Edmunds		CSPS40	Policy FWP2	Yes										481		
649339	Mrs Christine Molloy		CSPS231	Policy FWP2	Yes	Yes					I wish to support the legal compliance of the Council to change Woodland Walk, Ferndown from Housing Land to Green Belt.	I wish to support the change from Housing Land to Green Belt in Woodland Walk, Ferndown. It is heavily wooded with preservation orders on the trees. It is a special area of distinction, but the owner of the land is now clearing the area to build on, which should be investigated.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		481		
650107	Mr David Baxter		CSPS286	Policy FWP2							It seems incredulous that you can justify amending the green belt area here to cover this area, when at the same time you are declassifying a large area at West Parley to build on. Why not allow this area to be built on, allowing Forest View Drive to be extended south, then to branch around west to meet Award Road? That way you can provide a number of new houses, you provide a perimeter road for easy access, and you "square off" (in shape) the area, therefore making the best use of the space. Then enforce the Green Belt restrictions, so no further building can take place at this location.				481		
650426	Mrs Suzanne Faro		CSPS321	Policy FWP2							I would like to oppose any development of the woods.				481		
360271	Cllr Paul Timberlake		CSPS511	Policy FWP2	No	No	No	No	No	No	Whilst I understand why this land cannot be built on due to the 400m heathland exclusion zone policy, it is not acceptable to add two small areas to Green Belt land while, at the same time, proposing to build dwellings on four larger areas of	Any land being taken out of the Green Belt should be matched in size by new land	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		481		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											Green Belt at Longham and Parley. Any exchange has to be on like for like basis.	added to it.					
654962	Mr Christopher Chope		CSPS921	Policy FWP2	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	It does not comply with the National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 82 which says that 'new Green Belts should only be established in exceptional circumstances'. The exceptional circumstances have not been made out.	Removal of Policy FWP2 from the Plan.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	To ensure that national policy relating to the Green Belts is fully reflected in the Plan.	481		
359461	Mrs Nicola Brunt	Dorset Wildlife Trust	CSPS1339	Policy FWP2		Yes					Dorset Wildlife Trust supports the inclusion of Forest View Drive and Woodland Walk, Ferndown, in the Green Belt.				481		
656269	Kerry Pflieger	DPDS Consulting Group	CSPS1106	Policy FWP2	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Please refer to attached representation.	Please refer to attached representation	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	The NPPF makes it clear that the government attaches great importance to Green Belts and that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. Proposed alterations to the Green Belt underpin the Core Strategy Pre-submission and should therefore be discussed at a round table session with all parties present.	481	2253153_0_1.pdf	
359875	Dr Lesley Haskins		CSPS1606	Policy FWP2	Yes	Yes					SUPPORT - Inclusion of this site in the Green Belt as it is a remnant of heathland.	COMMENT - This site should be reconnected to Ferndown Common SSSI.			481		
650426	Mrs Suzanne Faro		CSPS1765	Policy FWP2							This is an amended response. I approve of Woodland Walk becoming an area included in the Green Belt. I oppose any development of the woods.				481		
475585	Mr Gordon Hodgson		CSPS1844	Policy FWP2	Yes	Yes					We strongly support the proposal in policy area FWP2 to transfer this land to green belt. This is important because: Woodland Walk is a recognised Special Character Area in an established sylvan setting. The woodland is unsuitable for development as access through the Walk is too narrow and wooded, many trees being protected by TPO's. An application for development at Marandor, at the entrance to Woodland Walk, was previously rejected by the Inspector at appeal for the reasons above.		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		481		
612430	Mr Nick Squirrell	Natural England, Dorset and Somerset Team	CSPS1922	Policy FWP2	Yes	Yes					Natural England supports FWP2. Land at Forest View Drive to be taken out of the Green Belt includes land of biodiversity value as it is an SNC and should also be afforded the protection of ME1.		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		481		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
657753	Mr John Wadey		CSPS1852	Policy FWP2	Yes	Yes					Woodland Walk is a designated area of Special Character, inclusion in the Green Belt will enhance that, and deter any future development which would only serve to destroy what is a unique and special environment.		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		481		
538118	Mrs Christine Cullen		CSPS2786	Policy FWP2							<p>Re: policy FWP1, FWP2, FWP3, FWP4, Ferndown & West Parley proposed developments.</p> <p>Unfortunately I was unable to visit the public exhibitions but I have spoken to those that did attend.</p> <p>Again I don't think that enough is being done to make the residents in Ferndown and West Parley aware of what an impact the developments proposed is going to have. I have spoken to friends and work colleagues and most are not aware as they have not received the Christchurch & East Dorset Core Strategy booklet. I thought that some of these areas are close to heathland so could not be built upon – or has that changed. Also what about the wild life that exists on these sites will it be moved like when the Camelias houses were built.</p> <p>We have already had to put up with the building of houses on woodland to accommodate the Camelias Estate of over 300 houses. Plus all of the changes of one property to blocks of flats around Ferndown!</p> <p>The building of the proposed number of houses which I assume is in the region of 600 is more that the area can cope with. Apparently nothing is going to be done to help with the capacity in schools as the “birth rate is dropping”, so no one will move into the area with children? Again this will bring more that 3000 people. Not to mention the amount of extra cars – the roads around Ferndown and West Paley are often at grid lock and the changes to Canford Bottom roundabout will probably not help as cars and massive lorries still prefer to go alone Ringwood Road through Ferndown! There is also the need for more doctors, as it is the surgeries cannot cope with the people already here. Neither can the hospitals.</p> <p>Where are the extra people going to work, will they all be commuters? The proposed development of another industrial area will not make any difference as there are units empty on the existing industrial estates – people cannot afford to run businesses as the rates are too high and people can't afford to pay wages to run businesses.</p> <p>This should be made more open to everyone in the area and get a true vote on what we want. A supermarket (Waitrose which only the well off can afford to shop in) is being planned. Also a play area – which is pointless as there will be no extra children!! Plus the change of the road and yet again more traffic lights.</p> <p>The infra structure of the area has just been pushed to the limit with the attitude of build, build and build which provides nothing for the community with the proposed development of the Dormy Hotel site bringing more people. This would have been better used for something for the community rather than more for retired people. Just to hotel would have been even better.</p> <p>I understand there is a need for people to have houses but</p>				481		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>with the road system as it is, surely this has to be a serious problem. With the promise of affordable housing does this really mean that these will be for local young people to buy or just for social housing and people from the inner cities. Instead of houses why can't we have amenities that everyone could use instead!</p> <p>There is nothing here for people – the Community Centre is out dated and Ferndown Leisure Centre was built in the 1970's and despite changes is still not very nice. Everything that was lovely about Ferndown is being lost – the shops are closing because of high rents. There is still nothing for youngsters of any age to do! Why not have a decent centre for youngsters and adults to use – something on par with Tower Park you could have Bingo, Bowling, Swimming, ice rinks, cinemas and restaurants at Parley instead of MORE houses – this would be of use to everyone. If you can't drive or afford to run a car you cannot travel to Bournemouth or Poole. Plus it isn't cheap to go by bus which do not run that frequently around here. If we are going to have more cars let us have something that we can enjoy! Not the houses. It would be nice to think that Ferndown and Parley could be thought of more than just somewhere to build hundreds of houses – Ferndown and Parley were once communities. I understand the building will not be done by local builders either so not even providing work for locals. So maybe you could make more of an effort to get the people's response on this before the decision is made.</p>						
655064	Mr and Mrs K Cullen		CSPS2791	Policy FWP2							<p>Re: policy FWP1, FWP2, FWP3, FWP4, Ferndown & West Parley proposed developments. Unfortunately I was unable to visit the public exhibitions but I have spoken to those that did attend. Again I don't think that enough is being done to make the residents in Ferndown and West Parley aware of what an impact the developments proposed is going to have. I have spoken to friends and work colleagues and most are not aware as they have not received the Christchurch & East Dorset Core Strategy booklet. I thought that some of these areas are close to heathland so could not be built upon – or has that changed. Also what about the wild life that exists on these sites will it be moved like when the Camelias houses were built.</p> <p>We have already had to put up with the building of houses on woodland to accommodate the Camelias Estate of over 300 houses. Plus all of the changes of one property to blocks of flats around Ferndown!</p> <p>The building of the proposed number of houses which I assume is in the region of 600 is more that the area can cope with. Apparently nothing is going to be done to help with the capacity in schools as the "birth rate is dropping", so no one will move into the area with children? Again this will bring more that 3000 people. Not to mention the amount of extra cars – the roads around Ferndown and West Paley are often at grid lock and the changes to Canford Bottom roundabout will probably not help as cars and massive lorries still prefer to</p>				481		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>go alone Ringwood Road through Ferndown! There is also the need for more doctors, as it is the surgeries cannot cope with the people already here. Neither can the hospitals. Where are the extra people going to work, will they all be commuters? The proposed development of another industrial area will not make any difference as there are units empty on the existing industrial estates – people cannot afford to run businesses as the rates are too high and people can't afford to pay wages to run businesses.</p> <p>This should be made more open to everyone in the area and get a true vote on what we want. A supermarket (Waitrose which only the well off can afford to shop in) is being planned. Also a play area – which is pointless as there will be no extra children!! Plus the change of the road and yet again more traffic lights.</p> <p>The infra structure of the area has just been pushed to the limit with the attitude of build, build and build which provides nothing for the community with the proposed development of the Dormy Hotel site bringing more people. This would have been better used for something for the community rather than more for retired people. Just to hotel would have been even better.</p> <p>I understand there is a need for people to have houses but with the road system as it is, surely this has to be a serious problem. With the promise of affordable housing does this really mean that these will be for local young people to buy or just for social housing and people from the inner cities. Instead of houses why can't we have amenities that everyone could use instead!</p> <p>There is nothing here for people – the Community Centre is out dated and Ferndown Leisure Centre was built in the 1970's and despite changes is still not very nice.</p> <p>Everything that was lovely about Ferndown is being lost – the shops are closing because of high rents. There is still nothing for youngsters of any age to do! Why not have a decent centre for youngsters and adults to use – something on par with Tower Park you could have Bingo, Bowling, Swimming, ice rinks, cinemas and restaurants at Parley instead of MORE houses – this would be of use to everyone. If you can't drive or afford to run a car you cannot travel to Bournemouth or Poole. Plus it isn't cheap to go by bus which do not run that frequently around here. If we are going to have more cars let us have something that we can enjoy! Not the houses.</p> <p>It would be nice to think that Ferndown and Parley could be thought of more than just somewhere to build hundreds of houses – Ferndown and Parley were once communities. I understand the building will not be done by local builders either so not even providing work for locals.</p> <p>So maybe you could make more of an effort to get the people's response on this before the decision is made.</p>						
656488	Canford Estate		CSPS2932	Policy FWP2	No		No	No			Policy FWP2 in the Pre-submission Core Strategy proposes that the Green Belt will be redrawn to include land at Forest View Drive, Stapehill. This site was designated under Policy HSUP3 of the adopted Local Plan as a site originally intended	Delete the reference within Policy FWP2 to redrawing the Green Belt boundary to	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	Savills are acting on behalf of the Canford Estate and Harry J Palmer Ltd in relation	481		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
											for residential development, but not to be developed prior to a review of the Plan. At the time of the Local Plan Review, a substantial area of nearby land (17.5ha) was proposed for heathland restoration as part of a strategy agreed with conservation bodies to mitigate the impact of residential development. Whilst the site is within 400m of an internationally protected heathland, and therefore residential development would not be considered appropriate under current policies, we consider that there are other potential uses, such as healthcare, that may be acceptable. The land for heathland restoration remains potentially available as part of a mitigation strategy. We are not aware that any assessment of the suitability of the site for alternative uses has been made by the Council in the process of preparing the draft Core Strategy. We believe that there are potential uses for the site that are compatible with its location, for which there are unmet needs, such as C2 healthcare, care home, or other suitable non-residential use. The Dorset Heathlands Planning Framework 2012-2014 Supplementary Planning Document indicates that such use class C2 proposals can be acceptable within 400m of protected heathland. We therefore request that the existing Green Belt boundary in the vicinity of the site is retained.	include land at Forest View Drive. Delete accompanying Map 10.2		to their landholdings on the edge of Corfe Mullen that form part of the CM1 allocation in the Pre-submission Draft Core Strategy. We are seeking participation at the oral part of the examination in order to help ensure that the plan is sound and deliverable.				
360302	Mrs Hilary Chittenden	Environment TAG (East Dorset)	CSPS3310	Policy FWP2		Yes					Support in part We support the reasoning for inclusion of these two sites in the Green Belt. (PI see 2nd response)		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		481			
490823	Mr Ian Jones	Ferndown Town Council	CSPS2993	Policy FWP2	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	The Town Council would support the Green Belt boundary being redrawn to include land at Forest View Drive and Woodland Walk.		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		481			
656488	Canford Estate		CSPS2933	Map 10.2		No		No	No		Policy FWP2 in the Pre-submission Core Strategy proposes that the Green Belt will be redrawn to include land at Forest View Drive, Stapehill. This site was designated under Policy HSUP3 of the adopted Local Plan as a site originally intended for residential development, but not to be developed prior to a review of the Plan. At the time of the Local Plan Review, a substantial area of nearby land (17.5ha) was proposed for heathland restoration as part of a strategy agreed with conservation bodies to mitigate the impact of residential development. Whilst the site is within 400m of an internationally protected heathland, and therefore residential development would not be considered appropriate under current policies, we consider that there are other potential uses, such as healthcare, that may be acceptable. The land for heathland restoration remains potentially available as part of a mitigation strategy. We are not aware that any assessment of the suitability of the site for alternative uses has been made by the Council in the process of preparing the draft Core Strategy. We believe that there are potential uses for the site that are compatible with its location, for which there are unmet needs, such as C2 healthcare, care home, or other suitable non-residential use. The Dorset Heathlands Planning Framework 2012-2014	Delete the reference within Policy FWP2 to redrawing the Green Belt boundary to include land at Forest View Drive. Delete accompanying Map 10.2	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	Savills are acting on behalf of the Canford Estate and Harry J Palmer Ltd in relation to their landholdings on the edge of Corfe Mullen that form part of the CM1 allocation in the Pre-submission Draft Core Strategy. We are seeking participation at the oral part of the examination in order to help ensure that the plan is sound and deliverable.		483		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											Supplementary Planning Document indicates that such use class C2 proposals can be acceptable within 400m of protected heathland. We therefore request that the existing Green Belt boundary in the vicinity of the site is retained.						
360302	Mrs Hilary Chittenden	Environment TAG (East Dorset)	CSPS3311	Map 10.2		No		No			Map 10.3 shows a small area of woodland with dense tree canopy immediately to the east of the identified new Green Belt boundary. In addition to the land being incapable of development because of heathland policies, this area has a blanket TPO. It would therefore appear logical to include it in the revised area of Green Belt.	Amend Map 10.3 Woodland Walk Green Belt Boundaries to include the area of woodland to the east.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		483		
656269	Kerry Pflieger	DPDS Consulting Group	CSPS3207	Map 10.3	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Please refer to attached representation.	Please refer to attached representation	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	The NPPF makes it clear that the government attaches great importance to Green Belts and that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. Proposed alterations to the Green Belt underpin the Core Strategy Pre-submission and should therefore be discussed at a round table session with all parties present.	484	2253153_0_1.pdf	
644337	Mr David Edwards		CSPS550	10.25	Yes	No	Yes		Yes		The document does not include mention of the provision of allotments which would be an ideal use of part of this space to maintain some open space whilst creating a valuable local amenity. Ferndown currently has no allotment provision and there is a waiting list of over 90 people.		Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	Ferndown Allotment Association were given very limited time in which to make their case at the public meeting to discuss the core strategy and they should be given the chance to make their case fully to any inspector.	485		
644337	Mr David Edwards		CSPS551	10.26	Yes	No				Yes	Ferndown town council have a legal requirement to provide allotments and the waiting list for plots has now grown to nearly 100 people with zero provision in the town apart from a privately owned site at Longham (which does not contribute to the town council's provision). Nowhere in this core strategy document is there mention of allotment provision. This site would possibly provide some plots and this should be included in the plan. The town council are working with the Allotment Association to come up with a solution to this all too common problem but it needs to be included in the plan to give it more weight.		Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	Ferndown Allotment Association (of which I am chairman) have had little input into the core strategy consultation and were given a paltry 1 minute at the public meeting in which to put their case. They should be given a longer time in	486		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
														which to make their case.			
359264	Mr Peter Atfield	Goadsby Ltd	CSPS3587	10.26	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	<p>In principle the allocation of land at Holmwood Park for residential development, as set out in Policy FWP 3 of the Core Strategy (CS) can be supported. However, it is submitted that the site has the potential to deliver a greater quantum of housing so as to meet the identified need for market and affordable housing. This would assist in meeting the objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), in particular Paragraph 47.</p> <p>In our representations on the Core Strategy Options for Consideration, October 2010, we identified the potential of the site to accommodate more than the 85 dwellings that were proposed at that time. Whilst the Core Strategy now assesses the site capacity at 110, we believe that there is still scope for this to be increased further.</p> <p>Libra Homes has approached this issue by commissioning a study to assess the site and its context in terms of its historic and landscape character. This study accompanies these representations. From an assessment of the Development Concept Plan (DCP), it is estimated that the site can accommodate up to 140 dwellings on a development site of 4.5 hectares. We believe that there is potential for this to be increased slightly by way of additional development in the area just to the east of the Longham Business Centre. The following opportunities and features are also indicated on the DCP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A range of development densities for housing radiating out from a focal space adjoining the historic walled garden area. • The stables and walled garden area are valuable features. Retaining them as part of the scheme has merit in that they could create a valuable gateway and community focus within the site. • There is potential to create a Sustainable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANGS) extending to approximately 6.4 hectares. This is sufficient to meet the standards set out in Policy ME 3 of the CS. It can incorporate attractive features, including ponds, to encourage use by local residents and those from further afield. • The SANGS can link to surrounding areas of public open space, in particular Belle Vue Plantation, which is a popular and well used informal recreational area. • A network of footpaths can help to create circular walks linking to the proposed housing as well as the existing surrounding residential areas. • A car park can be constructed in association with the SANGS. This can be approached from the existing entrance, which can also be used to serve some of the housing. As such, potential users of the open space can be attracted to the site from further afield, thus reducing pressure on the more ecologically sensitive areas of heathland open space. The approach set out in the DCP justifies an amendment to the policy. It will make it more efficient in helping to deliver the required housing for the district. 	<p>Amend the text of Policy FWP 3 as follows:</p> <p>“A new neighbourhood is allocated adjacent to Holmwood House, south of Ferndown, to provide up to 150 homes and large areas of informal open space. To enable this, the Green Belt boundary will be amended to exclude the land identified for new housing.</p> <p>Layout and Design</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The new neighbourhood will be set out through the development of the principles of the masterplan reports. • A design code will be agreed with the council, setting out the required standards. <p>Green Infrastructure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space strategy is to be implemented as part of the provision of the new housing; as required by Policy ME 3. This includes open space to be provided south of the allocated housing which will enhance the existing open space at Poor Common and protect the green belt gap between Ferndown and Longham. <p>Transport & Access</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vehicular access to the housing will be from Ringwood Road. The existing entrance can provide access to the public open space. 	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	To critically analyse the potential of the proposed urban extension to deliver a level of development above that set out in the Core Strategy.	486	2260626_0_1.pdf	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											We consider that the recent study undertaken to support the emerging development proposals can also be used to refine Policy FWP 3, as set out in the next section of this form of representation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dedicated pedestrian and cycling links are to be provided throughout the housing area connecting to the existing networks to the north, east and west." Map 10.4 should be amended to reflect the boundary of the development area and the SANGS as suggested in the DCP. 					
602666	Mr Ian Smith		CSPS11	Policy FWP3		No			No		The Ringwood Road to the Longham Roundabouts is always busy but in the holiday season between May and September it is often grid locked. The last thing we need is another 100-200 cars trying to gain access to the Ringwood Road close to Longham.	This is not a good place to build an estate off the Ringwood Road but if it does go ahead, access would be better from Christchurch Road due to the traffic problems mentioned above.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		487		
496473	Mr Brian Morgan		CSPS31	Policy FWP3	No	No		Yes		Yes	The reasons are for the most part set out in my attached copy letter to Christopher Chope MP dated 17th February 2012 (actual letter dated 8th February), in addition to which I consider there to be little or no need (as opposed to demand) for new housing here, and certainly not enough to override green belt protection.	Complete deletion of FWP5, FWP6 and FWP7. Exactly the same comments as those in 3, 4, 5 and 6 above apply to many other policies in the document with similar deletion considered necessary - these include:- FWP3 and 4, WMC3 and 5, and VTSW4 and 5. The only proviso to this is that it in so far as any of these sites are not now green belt, then that factor would obviously not apply to those sites.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	1. I consider a well-argued oral and public presentation of the case outlined above would be much more effective than mere written argument. 2. The opportunities for open public debate on this matter have so far been far too limited, having regard especially to the long term importance of the Green Belt heritage, as opposed to the short term 'needs' to promote economic growth, both locally and nationally.	487	2158985_0_1.pdf 2158987_0_1.pdf 2158984_0_1.pdf	
512477	Mr DJ Budden		CSPS156	Policy FWP3	Yes	Yes					Whilst I regret the further erosion of green space (a huge amount lost when Camilias estate / Poor common developed). I understand the need, I would only support this plan provided guarantees are forthcoming on maintaining remainder green space to north of Christchurch Road. It is essential that mature trees on north edge of Christchurch Road is protected and that south edge of development is similarly screened. This new development is in an elevated position and will become an eyesore unless suitably screened		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		487		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
											from Christchurch Road viewpoint. The entrance from A348 must have dedicated right turning lane when approaching from southern direction - not traffic lights. Why have number of homes increased from 85 to 110?							
648124	Mrs Lesley Eve		CSPS139	Policy FWP3	Yes	No	No	No	No		Because it only suggests a minimum of 50%. I think it should be 100%, and no more permission should be granted until the great need for low cost homes has been met. If you as a council are not able to meet that need you should let builders put up log cabins or park homes on common land or the edge of green belt land. Young people and those on low incomes have no hope of ever getting a home. My generation was lucky - today people are desperate.	Free up land - brownfield sites / edges green belt / farm land (farmers would sell land a bit cheaper I suspect). Keep cost low - alternative building? Timber / pre fab, frames - quick set up. Lend the purchasers 1/4 or 1/3 cost to enable them to get a mortgage - they repay as rent or when they sell - ringfence the money for future low cost.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		487			
650107	Mr David Baxter		CSPS287	Policy FWP3							In principle, this is fine. However if you are planning to put traffic lights on Ringwood Road for access to the newly developed area, then they must be programmed appropriately. By this I mean that Ringwood Road takes priority. As you have stated in 10.13, there is considerable traffic using this road. The traffic lights must be programmed to give this traffic priority, and ONLY stop this flow of traffic when there is a vehicle approaching the junction from the new development, to allow it to join the traffic on Ringwood Road. The traffic lights must NOT, under ANY circumstances, stop the flow of traffic on Ringwood Road, when there is no one joining from the new development, simply because they are programmed to do so. This would be entirely unacceptable, and would exacerbate the existing traffic problems in the area. On the subject of the amount of traffic using this area. When Ringwood Road was closed to through traffic (access only) in Ferndown Centre to allow maintenance to take place to the road furniture, the amount of traffic dropped significantly. This leads me to believe that a large percentage of the traffic travelling along Ringwood Road, through Longham and Ferndown is not local, but is made up of traffic heading either to Poole Port or up to the M27. Surely the council should be making an effort to not just encourage, but force this traffic onto the bypass routes and spend some money on enhancing and widening these roads so they can handle the increased load? The document talks about improving air quality and environmental conditions but does not mention this subject once. It is missing the wood for the trees.					487		
650667	Mr A D Blakely		CSPS343	Policy FWP3							I write strongly to protest against the building and development as proposed by policies FWP3, FWP4, FWP6				487			

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
											and FWP7. FWP3 is already 'open space' so how can you enhance it if you build on it? And yet more traffic onto an already a very busy road.							
652816	Mr Clive Narrainen		CSPS508	Policy FWP3	Yes	Yes					This is not a good place to build an estate off the Ringwood Road but if it does go ahead, access would be better from Christchurch Road due to the traffic problems mentioned above. The Ringwood Road to the Longham Roundabouts is always busy but in the holiday season between May and September it is often grid locked. The last thing we need is another 100-200 cars trying to gain access to the Ringwood Road close to Longham.		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		487			
703944	Cllr John Little	Christchurch & East Dorset Conservative Association	CSPS453	Policy FWP3							The need for affordable / social housing is recognised and the above sites will provide for this. Why are the SANG area greater than the developed area? Part of the SANG associated with these developments could be allocated for allotment use.				487			
360235	Mr Christopher Undery	Christopher D Undery	CSPS745	Policy FWP3		Yes					Housing proposals in particular FWP4 fail to take account of the benefit that could accrue to the established but disjointed settlement of Longham where employment and community facilities exist but where little or no development is envisaged.	The Core strategy should be amended to utilise and enhance the settlement of Longham in conjunction with the need for affordable housing.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	To draw attention to the existing settlement of Longham	487			
496749	Mr J S Davidson		CSPS691	Policy FWP3							I have been given to understand that you are prepared to accept written personal submissions in the above connection. Before dealing with specific aspects of the EDDC proposals for West Parley I wish to offer general comment pertaining to the political, economic and social circumstances, which appear to have given rise to the centrally imposed obligation to provide housing on the scale indicated. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We are told that additional housing is vital. Why? – Because there are more people. Why? – Because of natural increase and immigrants. Population pressure has been exacerbated by successive Governments not having had a 'common sense' immigration policy. Natural increase would see a steady, manageable demand for housing not the current mad dash to concrete over the countryside to meet Government targets, which targets have a national dynamic as well as a local one. We can, as a nation, have EITHER a Welfare State OR a permeable Immigration Policy but we cannot have both. We cannot ignore the root of the problem. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I have the uncomfortable feeling that many of the proposals were formulated by the planners without adequate consultation with the communities affected. Perhaps the current exercise will go some way to dispelling that impression and confirm the effectiveness of local democracy, particularly in regard to the Parish Plan, which did receive reasonably comprehensive circulation. The Plan was firmly against more than 100 houses being built in West Parley. • New housing on the scale suggested will irretrievably alter 				487			

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
											<p>the landscape, destroy the residual semi-rural nature of the area and put intolerable pressure on services, roads and other amenities. There is more than just a whiff of reliance, ultimately, on central government and some thought has to be given to future funding (roads etc) with all the obligations such funding would bring. West Parley is already being pressured into accepting a disproportionate share of the housing burden.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Besides the information and views from the planners it is vital that all parties who have a vested interest in any of the proposals be named so that transparency and accountability are established. The position of the present owners of the development land; of the likely commercial enterprises involved/approached; contractors, developers etc has to be declared as soon as possible. The channels through which the proposals are being driven and personalities (MP's, public servants et al) involved in whatever capacity must be identified. Presumably our local MP and the MEP are being kept apprised of developments. (Cc sent). FWP3 and FWP4 <p>The numbers of houses do not seem excessive although it is not clear whether the 'new build' will, at least, be up to average European standards. There are many examples, in the country, of housing box-like and pokey in design constructed of inferior materials.</p>							
654688	Mr Paul Newman	Paul Newman Property Consultants Limited	CSPS781	Policy FWP3	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	<p>I do not feel that the LPA has taken into account when assessing housing demand and need in the district the actual true level of development that is required to meet the identified housing need. Further allocation of land is required which will involve the need to roll back the green belt further to ensure that a sufficient supply of housing land is to be provided. The evidence base is not sound nor is it robust in this respect. A continued reliance of a policy of urban area regeneration will not deliver the affordable housing the district requires.</p>	<p>The additional allocation of land is required to meet the identified housing need and this should be done by allowing the extension of the current proposed housing allocations, in particular those at Wimborne and Ferndown have and hold potential for a natural expansion and continuation of the development which will bring additional housing to the district. The land at Holmwood House should also be included as part of the overall development proposals for the allocation at FWP3, as this represents a natural extension which due to its size would contribute to the overall site and increase the level of</p>	<p>Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination</p>	<p>I would like to make the Inspector fully aware of the Council's appalling record in the delivery of affordable housing and to point out how a continued reliance on a policy of urban regeneration will not work and will produce any affordable housing, and how a policy of increasing the size of the allocation at FWP will help meet the affordable housing needs without having any detrimental impact on either the green belt or the separation of the site and Longham.</p>	487	2274440_0_1.pdf		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
												affordable housing by virtue of its development. Access should also be taken from Christchurch Road as a regular user of Ringwood Road any further traffic generation on to this will only further increase the existing highways issues going through Longham.					
654830	Mr & Mrs Alan Barton		CSPS847	Policy FWP3	Yes			No			We are writing this in response to FWP3. It would appear to us that this Core Strategy is agreeing to allow a Green Belt area to be used for housing because it is easier and more profitable for a developer to utilise than originally agreed areas eg FWP2. This strategy adds the enticement to develop FWP3 by offering to enhance this existing open space. How can you enhance Green Belt open space by building 110 houses on the land? Creating an unbroken urban sprawl from Bournemouth to Ferndown by building on this land would not represent good practice. Also, we do not feel adequate consideration has been given to the impact of further vehicular access created by 110 new homes onto an already highly congested Ringwood Road.		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		487		
654962	Mr Christopher Choape		CSPS925	Policy FWP3	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	It removes designated Green Belt land without justification.	Removal of Policy FWP3 from the Plan.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	In order to represent constituents' concerns about the integrity of the Green Belt.	487		
359461	Mrs Nicola Brunt	Dorset Wildlife Trust	CSPS1340	Policy FWP3		No		No		No	Ecological survey information for this site is not available therefore it is not possible to assess the potential environmental impacts of development on this site and the suitability of the land identified as potential SANG. NPPF (165) states that planning policies and decisions should be based on up-to-date information about the natural environment. Should this site be determined as of low ecological value, Dorset Wildlife Trust has no objection to the allocation of this site and supports the need for Green Infrastructure in line with ME3. We recommend that a SANG should provided habitats complementary to the adjacent areas and welcome the need to enhance the existing open space at Poor Common, which has biodiversity interest, with Holm Wood SNCI (SZ09/19) to the east.	DWT hold an objection until ecological survey information is provided for this site to assess whether the environmental strand of sustainability is satisfied and the allocation is deliverable. We recommend that existing areas of open space are identified on map 10.4, with rights of way and environmental designations to the east to set the allocation in context and draw attention to the need to consider	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		487		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
												these matters in design.					
656249	Ms Gemma Care	Barton Willmore LLP	CSPS1079	Policy FWP3	Yes	Yes					<p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on the Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy (JCS) Pre-Submission document. On behalf of our client, Stour Valley Properties (Dorset) Ltd., we are pleased to provide the following response, which should be read in conjunction with the accompanying Consultation Response Forms.</p> <p>Background Barton Willmore LLP has been instructed to make representations to this document, on behalf of Stour Valley Properties (Dorset) Ltd. ('SVP')</p> <p>SVP have land interests within East Dorset and welcome the opportunity to contribute to the emerging Core Strategy (JCS). SVP are currently promoting the release of their land to the south of Wimborne for housing.</p> <p>Fundamentally, SVP have serious concerns over the level of overall housing provision identified within the draft JCS and the degree to which that which is proposed is sufficient to meet identified needs within the East Dorset and Christchurch locality. We submit, having regard to the evidence base material available that the level of housing proposed for East Dorset within the draft JCS is inappropriate and inconsistent with national planning policy, which states that each local planning authority should ensure that the Local Plan is based on adequate up-to-date and relevant evidence about the economic, social and environmental characteristics and prospects of the area. Local planning authorities are expected to ensure that their assessment of and strategies for housing, employment and other uses are integrated, and that they take full account of relevant market and economic signals.</p> <p>Consideration is given within the submitted representations to the strategic site allocations for Wimborne and Colehill identified within the JCS and the extent to which the proposed allocations fulfil the overall objectives and spatial vision for East Dorset and Christchurch. On the premise that insufficient housing requirements are identified in the Pre-Submission JCS we submit that additional strategic allocations or an increase in the specified number of required new dwellings are required in order to plan positively for the further housing growth we consider necessary in light of our appraisal of the Council's published JCS evidence base.</p> <p>In accordance with section 20 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended) local plans must be 'sound': i.e. they must be positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy. We suggest that the housing strategy adopted within the JCS as it stands is (a) not the most appropriate (on the basis that it is not considered fully justified) and (b) it is not 'positively prepared' – i.e. it is not based on a strategy which in our view genuinely seeks to meet objectively assessed needs.</p> <p>Within these representations we do not comment on every aspect of the JCS; our intention is to comment on those sections where we non-compliance with tests of soundness is</p>		Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	To ensure our case is presented in full and to be party to discussions.	487		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>apparent, or where we are particularly supportive. To be clear, our primary concern in this instance is the content and justification of Policy KS4 and the proposed housing allocations for Wimborne and Colehill – specifically Policy WMC6.</p> <p>An alternative proposal for housing to the south of Wimborne is considered with specific reference to the SVP land shown on the concept plan attached at Appendix 1 to these submissions.</p> <p>Comments are also provided on a number of other policies within the JCS, on individual response forms, as requested. The full list of policies to which these representations respond are:</p> <p>Policy KS1, KS4, KS5, KS10 Policy WMC3, WMC6 Policy FWP3, FWP4, FWP6, FWP7, FWP8 Policy ME3 Policy HE4</p> <p>Copies of all Core Strategy Response Forms relating to each policy addressed within these representations are contained at Appendix 4.</p> <p>Appendices 1 – 3 to this cover letter are those referred to in the various consultation forms.</p> <p>I trust that all of the enclosed is clear and in order and we look forward to engaging with you further in the consultation process.</p> <p>We broadly support these allocations.</p>						
508601	Mr KA Cook		CSPS1830	Policy FWP3	No				Yes		<p>It is stated that a network of pedestrian and cycle routes must be provided throughout the neighbourhood to connect into the existing network - there is no existing network in close proximity to these two sites.</p>	<p>The present wording can be retained, but with the addition of - 'which will be extended to provide safe connection: viz - West Parley-Longham/Hampreston-Longham/Ringwood Rd.-Longham</p>	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		487		
612430	Mr Nick Squirrel	Natural England, Dorset and Somerset Team	CSPS1941	Policy FWP3	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	No	<p>Policies; CN 1, CN 2, CN 3, WMC 3, WMC 4, WMC 5, WMC 6, FWP 3, FWP 4, FWP 6, FWP 7, FWP 8, VTSW 2, VTSW3, VTSW 4, VTSW 8 etc are all proposing development and or mitigation in the form of SANGs on greenfield locations. In order to avoid a conflict with policy ME1 at a later stage in the planning process Natural England advise the authorities to bring to the attention of those with an interest in these locations the need to carry out a basic biodiversity survey eg Phase 1 habitat survey including assessment of the likely presence or evidence of other features likely to restrict or delay development eg badger setts, priority species such as reptiles, water voles etc in time for consideration at the EIP. In many cases this will simply be a statement as the proposer has already engaged an ecological advisor.</p> <p>These policies appear to have been brought forward in an absence of adequate information and assessment on the biodiversity features held by the policy land. There is reason</p>	<p>The policies may need to include specific paragraphs about features of biodiversity importance which are to be secured or enhanced.</p>	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	<p>Natural England has provided extensive advice to a number of the parties concerned with these policies and may be able to offer advice and reassurance to the Inspector about the reliance he may have on the effectiveness of the policy and any modification proposed.</p>	487		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
											to suspect that on some there may be a significant biodiversity interest owing to close proximity with designated sites and or other biodiversity sites. The NPPF requires that planning policies should be based on up-to date information on the natural environment (paragraph 165). These policies are not shown to be compliant with this requirement. Thus, irrespective of the above matters concerning other nearby designated sites, it is not possible to identify whether the policies are compliant with policy considerations in the NPPF on sustainable development for the sites alone, especially the aspect on sustainable development set out in paragraph 9 of moving from a net loss of biodiversity to achieving net gains (for example on priory habitats and species).							
538118	Mrs Christine Cullen		CSPS2787	Policy FWP3							<p>Re: policy FWP1, FWP2, FWP3, FWP4, Ferndown & West Parley proposed developments.</p> <p>Unfortunately I was unable to visit the public exhibitions but I have spoken to those that did attend.</p> <p>Again I don't think that enough is being done to make the residents in Ferndown and West Parley aware of what an impact the developments proposed is going to have. I have spoken to friends and work colleagues and most are not aware as they have not received the Christchurch & East Dorset Core Strategy booklet. I thought that some of these areas are close to heathland so could not be built upon – or has that changed. Also what about the wild life that exists on these sites will it be moved like when the Camelias houses were built.</p> <p>We have already had to put up with the building of houses on woodland to accommodate the Camelias Estate of over 300 houses. Plus all of the changes of one property to blocks of flats around Ferndown!</p> <p>The building of the proposed number of houses which I assume is in the region of 600 is more that the area can cope with. Apparently nothing is going to be done to help with the capacity in schools as the “birth rate is dropping”, so no one will move into the area with children? Again this will bring more that 3000 people. Not to mention the amount of extra cars – the roads around Ferndown and West Paley are often at grid lock and the changes to Canford Bottom roundabout will probably not help as cars and massive lorries still prefer to go alone Ringwood Road through Ferndown! There is also the need for more doctors, as it is the surgeries cannot cope with the people already here. Neither can the hospitals.</p> <p>Where are the extra people going to work, will they all be commuters? The proposed development of another industrial area will not make any difference as there are units empty on the existing industrial estates – people cannot afford to run businesses as the rates are too high and people can't afford to pay wages to run businesses.</p> <p>This should be made more open to everyone in the area and get a true vote on what we want. A supermarket (Waitrose which only the well off can afford to shop in) is being planned. Also a play area – which is pointless as there will be no extra children!! Plus the change of the road and yet again more</p>					487		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>traffic lights.</p> <p>The infra structure of the area has just been pushed to the limit with the attitude of build, build and build which provides nothing for the community with the proposed development of the Dormy Hotel site bringing more people. This would have been better used for something for the community rather than more for retired people. Just to hotel would have been even better.</p> <p>I understand there is a need for people to have houses but with the road system as it is, surely this has to be a serious problem. With the promise of affordable housing does this really mean that these will be for local young people to buy or just for social housing and people from the inner cities. Instead of houses why can't we have amenities that everyone could use instead!</p> <p>There is nothing here for people – the Community Centre is out dated and Ferndown Leisure Centre was built in the 1970's and despite changes is still not very nice.</p> <p>Everything that was lovely about Ferndown is being lost – the shops are closing because of high rents. There is still nothing for youngsters of any age to do! Why not have a decent centre for youngsters and adults to use – something on par with Tower Park you could have Bingo, Bowling, Swimming, ice rinks, cinemas and restaurants at Parley instead of MORE houses – this would be of use to everyone. If you can't drive or afford to run a car you cannot travel to Bournemouth or Poole. Plus it isn't cheap to go by bus which do not run that frequently around here. If we are going to have more cars let us have something that we can enjoy! Not the houses.</p> <p>It would be nice to think that Ferndown and Parley could be thought of more than just somewhere to build hundreds of houses – Ferndown and Parley were once communities. I understand the building will not be done by local builders either so not even providing work for locals.</p> <p>So maybe you could make more of an effort to get the people's response on this before the decision is made.</p>						
655064	Mr and Mrs K Cullen		CSPS2792	Policy FWP3							<p>Re: policy FWP1, FWP2, FWP3, FWP4, Ferndown & West Parley proposed developments.</p> <p>Unfortunately I was unable to visit the public exhibitions but I have spoken to those that did attend.</p> <p>Again I don't think that enough is being done to make the residents in Ferndown and West Parley aware of what an impact the developments proposed is going to have. I have spoken to friends and work colleagues and most are not aware as they have not received the Christchurch & East Dorset Core Strategy booklet. I thought that some of these areas are close to heathland so could not be built upon – or has that changed. Also what about the wild life that exists on these sites will it be moved like when the Camelias houses were built.</p> <p>We have already had to put up with the building of houses on woodland to accommodate the Camelias Estate of over 300 houses. Plus all of the changes of one property to blocks of flats around Ferndown!</p>				487		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>The building of the proposed number of houses which I assume is in the region of 600 is more that the area can cope with. Apparently nothing is going to be done to help with the capacity in schools as the “birth rate is dropping”, so no one will move into the area with children? Again this will bring more that 3000 people. Not to mention the amount of extra cars – the roads around Ferndown and West Paley are often at grid lock and the changes to Canford Bottom roundabout will probably not help as cars and massive lorries still prefer to go alone Ringwood Road through Ferndown! There is also the need for more doctors, as it is the surgeries cannot cope with the people already here. Neither can the hospitals. Where are the extra people going to work, will they all be commuters? The proposed development of another industrial area will not make any difference as there are units empty on the existing industrial estates – people cannot afford to run businesses as the rates are too high and people can’t afford to pay wages to run businesses.</p> <p>This should be made more open to everyone in the area and get a true vote on what we want. A supermarket (Waitrose which only the well off can afford to shop in) is being planned. Also a play area – which is pointless as there will be no extra children!! Plus the change of the road and yet again more traffic lights.</p> <p>The infra structure of the area has just been pushed to the limit with the attitude of build, build and build which provides nothing for the community with the proposed development of the Dormy Hotel site bringing more people. This would have been better used for something for the community rather than more for retired people. Just to hotel would have been even better.</p> <p>I understand there is a need for people to have houses but with the road system as it is, surely this has to be a serious problem. With the promise of affordable housing does this really mean that these will be for local young people to buy or just for social housing and people from the inner cities. Instead of houses why can’t we have amenities that everyone could use instead!</p> <p>There is nothing here for people – the Community Centre is out dated and Ferndown Leisure Centre was built in the 1970’s and despite changes is still not very nice.</p> <p>Everything that was lovely about Ferndown is being lost – the shops are closing because of high rents. There is still nothing for youngsters of any age to do! Why not have a decent centre for youngsters and adults to use – something on par with Tower Park you could have Bingo, Bowling, Swimming, ice rinks, cinemas and restaurants at Parley instead of MORE houses – this would be of use to everyone. If you can’t drive or afford to run a car you cannot travel to Bournemouth or Poole. Plus it isn’t cheap to go by bus which do not run that frequently around here. If we are going to have more cars let us have something that we can enjoy! Not the houses.</p> <p>It would be nice to think that Ferndown and Parley could be thought of more than just somewhere to build hundreds of houses – Ferndown and Parley were once communities. I</p>						

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											understand the building will not be done by local builders either so not even providing work for locals. So maybe you could make more of an effort to get the people's response on this before the decision is made.						
360302	Mrs Hilary Chittenden	Environment TAG (East Dorset)	CSPS3312	Policy FWP3	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	<p>The biodiversity interest of this site is uncertain because of close cropping by horses but it has been relatively well managed so potentially there is good biodiversity interest: there is evidence of a good range of species and numbers of birds. In the absence of biological survey there is no evidence on which to base assessment of the damage/loss that would be caused by development or the location of SANG and its management to mitigate that loss or damage.</p> <p>It is unclear from the proposals map what land is currently publicly accessible or where there are existing public rights of way. Given the extent of the native woodland across the area there may be opportunities to enhance that which exists, possibly including the area to the SE of the proposed SANG (NPPF para 109).</p> <p>The original BroadwayMalyan report identified drainage as a major consideration for this site and recommended the provision of 2000cu metres of surface water attenuation storage. Assuming that the site design is as shown in Map 10.4, surface flooding could preclude use of some areas of SANG in which case additional area should be provided. At the southern entrance to the area, deep ditches have been culverted under the existing driveway indicating at least seasonally large volumes of surface water drainage which would be exacerbated by building. No proposals for SUDs have been included.</p> <p>It would be helpful if existing RoW and public access land were shown on all proposals maps. The people and wildlife links to FWP 4 should be clarified.</p> <p>Sustainability Appraisal SA Objective 1 Protect, enhance and expand habitats and protected species In the absence of survey, impact is unknown. Policy should identify possible linkages to meet objective.</p>	We recommend that existing Rights of Way and public access land should be shown on the proposals map. The potential for enhancing ecological networks should be identified following biological survey. Some of the SANG may not be deliverable if surface water is a problem: additional land should be identified to compensate.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		487		
490823	Mr Ian Jones	Ferndown Town Council	CSPS2995	Policy FWP3	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	<p>The Town Council submit that this is a reasonably sustainable development; close to services and shops in Ferndown and Glenmoor Road. Is the target of 50% affordable (social) dwellings achievable.</p> <p>The creation of a large SANG for recreation is supported as it can be used in conjunction with Poor Common and in formal open space at Coppins site (FWP4). It is considered that vehicular access / egress at Ringwood Road would not be a problem.</p>		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		487		
359571	Mr Renny Henderson	Royal Society for the Protection of Birds	CSPS3731	Policy FWP3							<p>Policy Allocation Dwellings/land area Comment WMC3 Cuthbury allotments and St Margaret's Close New Neighbourhood, Wimborne</p>		Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	we would like to confirm that we wish to reserve the right to appear at the Examination into the Core Strategy, on the grounds the Core	487		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											260 SANG to be provided in accordance with policy ME3 WMC4 Stone Lane 90 SANG to be provided in accordance with policy ME3 6 WMC5 Cranborne Road New Neighbourhood, Wimborne 600 SANG to be provided in accordance with policy ME3 WMC6 South of Leigh Road New Neighbourhood and Sports Village, Wimborne 75 ha SANG to be provided in accordance with policy ME3 CM1 Lockyer's School and Land North of Corfe Mullen New Neighbourhood 250 SANG to be provided in accordance with policy ME3 FWP3 Holmwood House New Neighbourhood, Ferndown 110 SANG to be provided in accordance with policy ME3 FWP4 Coppins new Neighbourhood, Ferndown 30 SANG to be provided in accordance with policy ME3 FWP6 Land East of New Road New Neighbourhood, West Parley 320 SANG to be provided in accordance with policy ME3 FWP7 West of New Road New Neighbourhood, West Parley 200 SANG to be provided in accordance with policy ME3 VTSW4 North West Verwood New Neighbourhood 230 SANG to be provided in accordance with policy ME3 FWP8 Blunt's Farm Employment Allocation, Ferndown 30ha A mitigation strategy to be agreed to avoid harm to European sites and SSSI VTSW5 North Eastern Verwood New Neighbourhood 50 SANG to be provided in accordance with policy ME3 VTSW6 Woolsbridge Employment Allocation, Three Legged Cross 9.7ha A mitigation strategy to be agreed to SSSI The RSPB does not, in principle, object to the residential			Strategy raises significant issues relating to the protection of internationally important wildlife sites (as highlighted in the HRA) and that there remains uncertainty over the delivery of appropriate and effective mitigation measures.			

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>allocations above. However, the table does illustrate the heavy reliance on SANGs as a mitigation measure. The Councils will be aware of the relatively untested nature of SANGs as effective mitigation, albeit in the context of available measures, it is clear that SANGs offer perhaps the best opportunity of addressing potential adverse impacts on the European sites. SANGs are a principal component of the approach taken by the Dorset Heathlands Interim Planning Framework (IPF), and are used as a mitigation vehicle elsewhere in England, notably in the Thames Basin Heaths. Research continues on the effectiveness of SANGs, and it is imperative that this research informs SANGs development anticipated under the Core Strategy. Long-term management and monitoring is also critical (as is identified in policy CN1). Testing of the suitability of SANGs as a mitigation measure for the above policies is essential and has not yet been undertaken. We are concerned that some of the SANGs proposed may be ineffective, particularly SANGs associated with smaller allocations.</p> <p>With respect to employment allocations FWP8 (Blunt's Farm) and VTSW6 (Woolsbridge), we are not familiar with these locations. We do not object to these policies subject to receiving clarification from Natural England of the issues pertinent to these sites, and the likely efficacy of mitigation strategies anticipated by these policies.</p>						
359264	Mr Peter Atfield	Goadsby Ltd	CSPS3585	Policy FWP3	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	<p>In principle the allocation of land at Holmwood Park for residential development, as set out in Policy FWP 3 of the Core Strategy (CS) can be supported. However, it is submitted that the site has the potential to deliver a greater quantum of housing so as to meet the identified need for market and affordable housing. This would assist in meeting the objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), in particular Paragraph 47.</p> <p>In our representations on the Core Strategy Options for Consideration, October 2010, we identified the potential of the site to accommodate more than the 85 dwellings that were proposed at that time. Whilst the Core Strategy now assesses the site capacity at 110, we believe that there is still scope for this to be increased further.</p> <p>Libra Homes has approached this issue by commissioning a study to assess the site and its context in terms of its historic and landscape character. This study accompanies these representations. From an assessment of the Development Concept Plan (DCP), it is estimated that the site can accommodate up to 140 dwellings on a development site of 4.5 hectares. We believe that there is potential for this to be increased slightly by way of additional development in the area just to the east of the Longham Business Centre. The following opportunities and features are also indicated on the DCP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A range of development densities for housing radiating out from a focal space adjoining the historic walled garden area. • The stables and walled garden area are valuable features. Retaining them as part of the scheme has merit in that they 	<p>Amend the text of Policy FWP 3 as follows: "A new neighbourhood is allocated adjacent to Holmwood House, south of Ferndown, to provide up to 150 homes and large areas of informal open space. To enable this, the Green Belt boundary will be amended to exclude the land identified for new housing. Layout and Design</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The new neighbourhood will be set out through the development of the principles of the masterplan reports. • A design code will be agreed with the council, setting out the required standards. Green Infrastructure • A Suitable Alternative 	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	To critically analyse the potential of the proposed urban extension to deliver a level of development above that set out in the Core Strategy.	487	2260626_0_1.pdf	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
											<p>could create a valuable gateway and community focus within the site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is potential to create a Sustainable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANGS) extending to approximately 6.4 hectares. This is sufficient to meet the standards set out in Policy ME 3 of the CS. It can incorporate attractive features, including ponds, to encourage use by local residents and those from further afield. • The SANGS can link to surrounding areas of public open space, in particular Belle Vue Plantation, which is a popular and well used informal recreational area. • A network of footpaths can help to create circular walks linking to the proposed housing as well as the existing surrounding residential areas. • A car park can be constructed in association with the SANGS. This can be approached from the existing entrance, which can also be used to serve some of the housing. As such, potential users of the open space can be attracted to the site from further afield, thus reducing pressure on the more ecologically sensitive areas of heathland open space. The approach set out in the DCP justifies an amendment to the policy. It will make it more efficient in helping to deliver the required housing for the district. <p>We consider that the recent study undertaken to support the emerging development proposals can also be used to refine Policy FWP 3, as set out in the next section of this form of representation.</p>	<p>Natural Green Space strategy is to be implemented as part of the provision of the new housing; as required by Policy ME 3. This includes open space to be provided south of the allocated housing which will enhance the existing open space at Poor Common and protect the green belt gap between Ferndown and Longham.</p> <p>Transport & Access</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vehicular access to the housing will be from Ringwood Road. The existing entrance can provide access to the public open space. • Dedicated pedestrian and cycling links are to be provided throughout the housing area connecting to the existing networks to the north, east and west." <p>Map 10.4 should be amended to reflect the boundary of the development area and the SANGS as suggested in the DCP.</p>						
359461	Mrs Nicola Brunt	Dorset Wildlife Trust	CSPS1342	Map 10.4		No		No		No	<p>Ecological survey information for this site is not available therefore it is not possible to assess the potential environmental impacts of development on this site and the suitability of the land identified as potential SANG. NPPF (165) states that planning policies and decisions should be based on up-to-date information about the natural environment.</p> <p>Should this site be determined as of low ecological value, Dorset Wildlife Trust has no objection to the allocation of this site and supports the need for Green Infrastructure in line with ME3. We recommend that a SANG should provided habitats complementary to the adjacent areas and welcome the need to enhance the existing open space at Poor Common, which has biodiversity interest, with Holm Wood SNCI (SZ09/19) to the east.</p>	<p>DWT hold an objection until ecological survey information is provided for this site to assess whether the environmental strand of sustainability is satisfied and the allocation is deliverable.</p> <p>We recommend that existing areas of open space are identified on map 10.4, with rights of way and environmental designations to the</p>	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		488			

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
												east to set the allocation in context and draw attention to the need to consider these matters in design.					
360302	Mrs Hilary Chittenden	Environment TAG (East Dorset)	CSPS3313	Map 10.4	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	<p>The biodiversity interest of this site is uncertain because of close cropping by horses but it has been relatively well managed so potentially there is good biodiversity interest: there is evidence of a good range of species and numbers of birds. In the absence of biological survey there is no evidence on which to base assessment of the damage/loss that would be caused by development or the location of SANG and its management to mitigate that loss or damage.</p> <p>It is unclear from the proposals map what land is currently publicly accessible or where there are existing public rights of way. Given the extent of the native woodland across the area there may be opportunities to enhance that which exists, possibly including the area to the SE of the proposed SANG (NPPF para 109).</p> <p>The original BroadwayMalyan report identified drainage as a major consideration for this site and recommended the provision of 2000cu metres of surface water attenuation storage. Assuming that the site design is as shown in Map 10.4, surface flooding could preclude use of some areas of SANG in which case additional area should be provided. At the southern entrance to the area, deep ditches have been culverted under the existing driveway indicating at least seasonally large volumes of surface water drainage which would be exacerbated by building. No proposals for SUDs have been included.</p> <p>It would be helpful if existing RoW and public access land were shown on all proposals maps. The people and wildlife links to FWP 4 should be clarified.</p> <p>Sustainability Appraisal SA Objective 1 Protect, enhance and expand habitats and protected species In the absence of survey, impact is unknown. Policy should identify possible linkages to meet objective.</p>	We recommend that existing Rights of Way and public access land should be shown on the proposals map. The potential for enhancing ecological networks should be identified following biological survey. Some of the SANG may not be deliverable if surface water is a problem: additional land should be identified to compensate.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		488		
359264	Mr Peter Atfield	Goadsby Ltd	CSPS3590	Map 10.4	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	<p>In principle the allocation of land at Holmwood Park for residential development, as set out in Policy FWP 3 of the Core Strategy (CS) can be supported. However, it is submitted that the site has the potential to deliver a greater quantum of housing so as to meet the identified need for market and affordable housing. This would assist in meeting the objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), in particular Paragraph 47.</p> <p>In our representations on the Core Strategy Options for Consideration, October 2010, we identified the potential of the site to accommodate more than the 85 dwellings that were proposed at that time. Whilst the Core Strategy now assesses the site capacity at 110, we believe that there is still scope for this to be increased further.</p> <p>Libra Homes has approached this issue by commissioning a</p>	Amend the text of Policy FWP 3 as follows: "A new neighbourhood is allocated adjacent to Holmwood House, south of Ferndown, to provide up to 150 homes and large areas of informal open space. To enable this, the Green Belt boundary will be amended to exclude the land identified for	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	To critically analyse the potential of the proposed urban extension to deliver a level of development above that set out in the Core Strategy.	488	2260626_0_1.pdf	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
											<p>study to assess the site and its context in terms of its historic and landscape character. This study accompanies these representations. From an assessment of the Development Concept Plan (DCP), it is estimated that the site can accommodate up to 140 dwellings on a development site of 4.5 hectares. We believe that there is potential for this to be increased slightly by way of additional development in the area just to the east of the Longham Business Centre. The following opportunities and features are also indicated on the DCP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A range of development densities for housing radiating out from a focal space adjoining the historic walled garden area. • The stables and walled garden area are valuable features. Retaining them as part of the scheme has merit in that they could create a valuable gateway and community focus within the site. • There is potential to create a Sustainable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANGS) extending to approximately 6.4 hectares. This is sufficient to meet the standards set out in Policy ME 3 of the CS. It can incorporate attractive features, including ponds, to encourage use by local residents and those from further afield. • The SANGS can link to surrounding areas of public open space, in particular Belle Vue Plantation, which is a popular and well used informal recreational area. • A network of footpaths can help to create circular walks linking to the proposed housing as well as the existing surrounding residential areas. • A car park can be constructed in association with the SANGS. This can be approached from the existing entrance, which can also be used to serve some of the housing. As such, potential users of the open space can be attracted to the site from further afield, thus reducing pressure on the more ecologically sensitive areas of heathland open space. The approach set out in the DCP justifies an amendment to the policy. It will make it more efficient in helping to deliver the required housing for the district. <p>We consider that the recent study undertaken to support the emerging development proposals can also be used to refine Policy FWP 3, as set out in the next section of this form of representation.</p>	<p>new housing. Layout and Design</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The new neighbourhood will be set out through the development of the principles of the masterplan reports. • A design code will be agreed with the council, setting out the required standards. <p>Green Infrastructure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space strategy is to be implemented as part of the provision of the new housing; as required by Policy ME 3. This includes open space to be provided south of the allocated housing which will enhance the existing open space at Poor Common and protect the green belt gap between Ferndown and Longham. <p>Transport & Access</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vehicular access to the housing will be from Ringwood Road. The existing entrance can provide access to the public open space. • Dedicated pedestrian and cycling links are to be provided throughout the housing area connecting to the existing networks to the north, east and west.” <p>Map 10.4 should be amended to reflect the boundary of the development area and the SANGS as suggested in the DCP.</p>						
359264	Mr Peter Atfield	Goadsby Ltd	CSPS3588	10.27	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	In principle the allocation of land at Holmwood Park for residential development, as set out in Policy FWP 3 of the Core Strategy (CS) can be supported. However, it is	Amend the text of Policy FWP 3 as follows:	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	To critically analyse the potential of the proposed urban	489	2260626_0_1.pdf		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
											<p>submitted that the site has the potential to deliver a greater quantum of housing so as to meet the identified need for market and affordable housing. This would assist in meeting the objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), in particular Paragraph 47.</p> <p>In our representations on the Core Strategy Options for Consideration, October 2010, we identified the potential of the site to accommodate more than the 85 dwellings that were proposed at that time. Whilst the Core Strategy now assesses the site capacity at 110, we believe that there is still scope for this to be increased further.</p> <p>Libra Homes has approached this issue by commissioning a study to assess the site and its context in terms of its historic and landscape character. This study accompanies these representations. From an assessment of the Development Concept Plan (DCP), it is estimated that the site can accommodate up to 140 dwellings on a development site of 4.5 hectares. We believe that there is potential for this to be increased slightly by way of additional development in the area just to the east of the Longham Business Centre. The following opportunities and features are also indicated on the DCP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A range of development densities for housing radiating out from a focal space adjoining the historic walled garden area. • The stables and walled garden area are valuable features. Retaining them as part of the scheme has merit in that they could create a valuable gateway and community focus within the site. • There is potential to create a Sustainable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANGS) extending to approximately 6.4 hectares. This is sufficient to meet the standards set out in Policy ME 3 of the CS. It can incorporate attractive features, including ponds, to encourage use by local residents and those from further afield. • The SANGS can link to surrounding areas of public open space, in particular Belle Vue Plantation, which is a popular and well used informal recreational area. • A network of footpaths can help to create circular walks linking to the proposed housing as well as the existing surrounding residential areas. • A car park can be constructed in association with the SANGS. This can be approached from the existing entrance, which can also be used to serve some of the housing. As such, potential users of the open space can be attracted to the site from further afield, thus reducing pressure on the more ecologically sensitive areas of heathland open space. The approach set out in the DCP justifies an amendment to the policy. It will make it more efficient in helping to deliver the required housing for the district. <p>We consider that the recent study undertaken to support the emerging development proposals can also be used to refine Policy FWP 3, as set out in the next section of this form of representation.</p>	<p>“A new neighbourhood is allocated adjacent to Holmwood House, south of Ferndown, to provide up to 150 homes and large areas of informal open space. To enable this, the Green Belt boundary will be amended to exclude the land identified for new housing.</p> <p>Layout and Design</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The new neighbourhood will be set out through the development of the principles of the masterplan reports. • A design code will be agreed with the council, setting out the required standards. <p>Green Infrastructure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space strategy is to be implemented as part of the provision of the new housing; as required by Policy ME 3. This includes open space to be provided south of the allocated housing which will enhance the existing open space at Poor Common and protect the green belt gap between Ferndown and Longham. <p>Transport & Access</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vehicular access to the housing will be from Ringwood Road. The existing entrance can provide access to the public open space. • Dedicated pedestrian and cycling links are to be provided throughout the housing area connecting to the existing networks to 		extension to deliver a level of development above that set out in the Core Strategy.				

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
												the north, east and west.” Map 10.4 should be amended to reflect the boundary of the development area and the SANGS as suggested in the DCP.						
359264	Mr Peter Atfield	Goadsby Ltd	CSPS3589	10.28	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	<p>In principle the allocation of land at Holmwood Park for residential development, as set out in Policy FWP 3 of the Core Strategy (CS) can be supported. However, it is submitted that the site has the potential to deliver a greater quantum of housing so as to meet the identified need for market and affordable housing. This would assist in meeting the objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), in particular Paragraph 47.</p> <p>In our representations on the Core Strategy Options for Consideration, October 2010, we identified the potential of the site to accommodate more than the 85 dwellings that were proposed at that time. Whilst the Core Strategy now assesses the site capacity at 110, we believe that there is still scope for this to be increased further.</p> <p>Libra Homes has approached this issue by commissioning a study to assess the site and its context in terms of its historic and landscape character. This study accompanies these representations. From an assessment of the Development Concept Plan (DCP), it is estimated that the site can accommodate up to 140 dwellings on a development site of 4.5 hectares. We believe that there is potential for this to be increased slightly by way of additional development in the area just to the east of the Longham Business Centre. The following opportunities and features are also indicated on the DCP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A range of development densities for housing radiating out from a focal space adjoining the historic walled garden area. • The stables and walled garden area are valuable features. Retaining them as part of the scheme has merit in that they could create a valuable gateway and community focus within the site. • There is potential to create a Sustainable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANGS) extending to approximately 6.4 hectares. This is sufficient to meet the standards set out in Policy ME 3 of the CS. It can incorporate attractive features, including ponds, to encourage use by local residents and those from further afield. • The SANGS can link to surrounding areas of public open space, in particular Belle Vue Plantation, which is a popular and well used informal recreational area. • A network of footpaths can help to create circular walks linking to the proposed housing as well as the existing surrounding residential areas. • A car park can be constructed in association with the SANGS. This can be approached from the existing entrance, which can also be used to serve some of the housing. As 	<p>Amend the text of Policy FWP 3 as follows: “A new neighbourhood is allocated adjacent to Holmwood House, south of Ferndown, to provide up to 150 homes and large areas of informal open space. To enable this, the Green Belt boundary will be amended to exclude the land identified for new housing.</p> <p>Layout and Design</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The new neighbourhood will be set out through the development of the principles of the masterplan reports. • A design code will be agreed with the council, setting out the required standards. <p>Green Infrastructure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space strategy is to be implemented as part of the provision of the new housing; as required by Policy ME 3. This includes open space to be provided south of the allocated housing which will enhance the existing open space at Poor Common and protect the green belt gap between Ferndown and Longham. <p>Transport & Access</p>	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	To critically analyse the potential of the proposed urban extension to deliver a level of development above that set out in the Core Strategy.	490	2260626_0_1.pdf		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
											such, potential users of the open space can be attracted to the site from further afield, thus reducing pressure on the more ecologically sensitive areas of heathland open space. The approach set out in the DCP justifies an amendment to the policy. It will make it more efficient in helping to deliver the required housing for the district. We consider that the recent study undertaken to support the emerging development proposals can also be used to refine Policy FWP 3, as set out in the next section of this form of representation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vehicular access to the housing will be from Ringwood Road. The existing entrance can provide access to the public open space. • Dedicated pedestrian and cycling links are to be provided throughout the housing area connecting to the existing networks to the north, east and west.” Map 10.4 should be amended to reflect the boundary of the development area and the SANGS as suggested in the DCP.						
496473	Mr Brian Morgan		CSPS32	Policy FWP4	No	No		Yes		Yes	The reasons are for the most part set out in my attached copy letter to Christopher Chope MP dated 17th February 2012 (actual letter dated 8th February), in addition to which I consider there to be little or no need (as opposed to demand) for new housing here, and certainly not enough to override green belt protection.	Complete deletion of FWP5, FWP6 and FWP7. Exactly the same comments as those in 3, 4, 5 and 6 above apply to many other policies in the document with similar deletion considered necessary - these include:- FWP3 and 4, WMC3 and 5, and VTSW4 and 5. The only proviso to this is that it in so far as any of these sites are not now green belt, then that factor would obviously not apply to those sites.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	1. I consider a well-argued oral and public presentation of the case outlined above would be much more effective than mere written argument. 2. The opportunities for open public debate on this matter have so far been far too limited, having regard especially to the long term importance of the Green Belt heritage, as opposed to the short term 'needs' to promote economic growth, both locally and nationally.	492	2158984_0_1.pdf 2158985_0_1.pdf 2158987_0_1.pdf		
512363	Mr T Meads		CSPS135	Policy FWP4							I would like to bring to your attention the footpath shown green from Coppins Nursery, this would appear to be across my land - 95 Christchurch Road. The plot extends not only behind my house but also for roughly the same width behind the nursery. There is no current footpath there, and no one has approached me on the subject therefore please amend your plan. Also could you inform the appropriate department that blue paint has appeared on various trees and shrubs in Bell Vue Plantation immediately bordering my plot. If they are proposing to remove them this will leave my fencing vulnerable to attack as happened to the rear fencing when the footpath was built. According to plans sent to me this was				492			

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description			
											supposed to be 30m from my boundary when in fact it is only 2m.									
644715	Mrs Barbara Ralph		CSPS179	Policy FWP4	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	<p>Unsound - not positively prepared. Why do we need a Coppins Nursery development as well as two further developments in Parley. FWP7 and FWP6 Christchurch Road will be surrounded by more development and huge traffic. The slip road through FWP7 will only make traffic on Christchurch Road more congested and backed up.</p> <p>Not effective - The plan isnt deliverable as well as FWP7 and FWP6.</p> <p>Not consistent with national policy - Green Belt land is being used for some shared ownership and the remainder for older property tycoons.</p> <p>Not justified - The young people wont be able to afford them. We know Councils recieve an incentive payment from Central Government. So we have to have not one but 3 large developments plus a pointless extra road from FWP7. This road will cause more bottlenecks on Christchurch Road as traffic turn right and again where it joins up with New Road so backing traffic back even more from Parley Cross Roads. Dont do it.</p>					492				
650107	Mr David Baxter		CSPS289	Policy FWP4							<p>This is valuable space in a prime location. However the proposed implementation of how this area should be redeveloped is nonsensical. The closed Coppins Nursery occupies approximatley half of this site. Surely re-developing this side of the site would make much more sense than building on the green field, then turning the developed half back into green field? The question also needs to be asked, why not just develop the entire site? While I am extremely adverse to building on Green Belt land, the fact remains that Green Belt land is only Green Belt until the government or council wants to build on it, at which time it is conveniently declassified and built on. So, given that this area will only be built on anyway in 10-15 years time, why not bite the bullet and develop it now? Surely it is better to have a surplus of housing than a deficit? If not, then don't waste the money on switching around the uses of the two halves of the site.</p>							492		
650667	Mr A D Blakely		CSPS344	Policy FWP4							<p>It is already difficult for vehicles to enter Christchurch Road from the existing side roads along this stretch of a very busy main road. By intending to add 30 extra homes will only make the situation worse and dangerous.</p> <p>No doubt, in time you would eventually install traffic lights, adding more chaos to the flow of traffic.</p>							492		
703944	Cllr John Little	Christchurch & East Dorset Conservative Association	CSPS454	Policy FWP4							<p>The need for affordable / social housing is recognised and the above sites will provide for this. Why are the SANG area greater than the developed area? Part of the SANG associated with these developments could be allocated for allotment use.</p>							492		
360235	Mr Christopher Undery	Christopher D Undery	CSPS746	Policy FWP4		Yes					<p>Housing proposals in particular FWP4 fail to take account of the benefit that could accrue to the established but disjointed settlement of Longham where employment and community facilities exist but where little or no development is envisaged.</p>	The Core strategy should be amended to utilise and enhance the settlement of Longham	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	To draw attention to the existing settlement of Longham	492					

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
												in conjunction with the need for affordable housing.						
496749	Mr J S Davidson		CSPS695	Policy FWP4							<p>I have been given to understand that you are prepared to accept written personal submissions in the above connection. Before dealing with specific aspects of the EDDC proposals for West Parley I wish to offer general comment pertaining to the political, economic and social circumstances, which appear to have given rise to the centrally imposed obligation to provide housing on the scale indicated.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We are told that additional housing is vital. Why? – Because there are more people. Why? – Because of natural increase and immigrants. Population pressure has been exacerbated by successive Governments not having had a ‘common sense’ immigration policy. <p>Natural increase would see a steady, manageable demand for housing not the current mad dash to concrete over the countryside to meet Government targets, which targets have a national dynamic as well as a local one.</p> <p>We can, as a nation, have EITHER a Welfare State OR a permeable Immigration Policy but we cannot have both. We cannot ignore the root of the problem.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I have the uncomfortable feeling that many of the proposals were formulated by the planners without adequate consultation with the communities affected. Perhaps the current exercise will go some way to dispelling that impression and confirm the effectiveness of local democracy, particularly in regard to the Parish Plan, which did receive reasonably comprehensive circulation. The Plan was firmly against more than 100 houses being built in West Parley. • New housing on the scale suggested will irretrievably alter the landscape, destroy the residual semi-rural nature of the area and put intolerable pressure on services, roads and other amenities. There is more than just a whiff of reliance, ultimately, on central government and some thought has to be given to future funding (roads etc) with all the obligations such funding would bring. West Parley is already being pressured into accepting a disproportionate share of the housing burden. • Besides the information and views from the planners it is vital that all parties who have a vested interest in any of the proposals be named so that transparency and accountability are established. The position of the present owners of the development land; of the likely commercial enterprises involved/approached; contractors, developers etc has to be declared as soon as possible. The channels through which the proposals are being driven and personalities (MP’s, public servants et al) involved in whatever capacity must be identified. Presumably our local MP and the MEP are being kept apprised of developments. (Cc sent). <p>FWP3 and FWP4</p> <p>The numbers of houses do not seem excessive although it is not clear whether the ‘new build’ will, at least, be up to average European standards. There are many examples, in the country, of housing box-like and pokey in design</p>					492		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											constructed of inferior materials.						
654962	Mr Christopher Chope		CSPS922	Policy FWP4	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Because it involves the removal of designated Green Belt without justification.	Removal of Policy FWP4 from the Plan.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	To speak on behalf of my constituents on this issue.	492		
359461	Mrs Nicola Brunt	Dorset Wildlife Trust	CSPS1344	Policy FWP4		No				No	<p>Ecological survey information for this site is not available therefore it is not possible to assess the potential environmental impacts of development on this site. NPPF (165) states that planning policies and decisions should be based on up-to-date information about the natural environment.</p> <p>Should this site be determined as of low ecological value, Dorset Wildlife Trust has no objection to the allocation of this site and supports the need for a Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace strategy to be implemented in line with ME3. We welcome the need for open space provision to enhance the existing open space at Poor Common. Holm Wood SNCI (SZ09/19), of dry heath/grass mosaic lies to the north-east and is already under urban pressure, thus the provision of open space should be designed to avoid undue additional pressure on the SNCI.</p>	<p>DWT hold an objection until ecological survey information is provided for this site to assess whether the environmental strand of sustainability is satisfied and the allocation is deliverable.</p> <p>We recommend that existing areas of open space are identified on Map 10.5, with rights of way and environmental designations to set the allocation in context and draw attention to the need to consider these matters in design.</p> <p>We seek additional wording under Green Infrastructure: Open space is to be provided to enhance the existing open space at Poor Common, protecting the Site of Nature Conservation Interest from additional urban pressures and providing green links along the southern fringe of the urban area.</p>	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		492		
656249	Ms Gemma Care	Barton Willmore LLP	CSPS1080	Policy FWP4	Yes	Yes					<p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on the Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy (JCS) Pre-Submission document. On behalf of our client, Stour Valley Properties (Dorset) Ltd., we are pleased to provide the following response, which should be read in conjunction with the accompanying Consultation Response Forms.</p> <p>Background Barton Willmore LLP has been instructed to make representations to this document, on behalf of Stour Valley Properties (Dorset) Ltd. ('SVP') SVP have land interests within East Dorset and welcome the</p>		Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	To ensure our case is presented in full and to be party to discussions.	492		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>opportunity to contribute to the emerging Core Strategy (JCS). SVP are currently promoting the release of their land to the south of Wimborne for housing.</p> <p>Fundamentally, SVP have serious concerns over the level of overall housing provision identified within the draft JCS and the degree to which that which is proposed is sufficient to meet identified needs within the East Dorset and Christchurch locality. We submit, having regard to the evidence base material available that the level of housing proposed for East Dorset within the draft JCS is inappropriate and inconsistent with national planning policy, which states that each local planning authority should ensure that the Local Plan is based on adequate up-to-date and relevant evidence about the economic, social and environmental characteristics and prospects of the area. Local planning authorities are expected to ensure that their assessment of and strategies for housing, employment and other uses are integrated, and that they take full account of relevant market and economic signals.</p> <p>Consideration is given within the submitted representations to the strategic site allocations for Wimborne and Colehill identified within the JCS and the extent to which the proposed allocations fulfil the overall objectives and spatial vision for East Dorset and Christchurch. On the premise that insufficient housing requirements are identified in the Pre-Submission JCS we submit that additional strategic allocations or an increase in the specified number of required new dwellings are required in order to plan positively for the further housing growth we consider necessary in light of our appraisal of the Council's published JCS evidence base.</p> <p>In accordance with section 20 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended) local plans must be 'sound': i.e. they must be positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy. We suggest that the housing strategy adopted within the JCS as it stands is (a) not the most appropriate (on the basis that it is not considered fully justified) and (b) it is not 'positively prepared' – i.e. it is not based on a strategy which in our view genuinely seeks to meet objectively assessed needs.</p> <p>Within these representations we do not comment on every aspect of the JCS; our intention is to comment on those sections where we non-compliance with tests of soundness is apparent, or where we are particularly supportive. To be clear, our primary concern in this instance is the content and justification of Policy KS4 and the proposed housing allocations for Wimborne and Colehill – specifically Policy WMC6.</p> <p>An alternative proposal for housing to the south of Wimborne is considered with specific reference to the SVP land shown on the concept plan attached at Appendix 1 to these submissions.</p> <p>Comments are also provided on a number of other policies within the JCS, on individual response forms, as requested. The full list of policies to which these representations respond are: Policy KS1, KS4, KS5, KS10</p>						

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
											<p>Policy WMC3, WMC6 Policy FWP3, FWP4, FWP6, FWP7, FWP8 Policy ME3 Policy HE4 Copies of all Core Strategy Response Forms relating to each policy addressed within these representations are contained at Appendix 4. Appendices 1 – 3 to this cover letter are those referred to in the various consultation forms. I trust that all of the enclosed is clear and in order and we look forward to engaging with you further in the consultation process. We broadly support these allocations.</p>							
508601	Mr KA Cook		CSPS1841	Policy FWP4		No			Yes		<p>It is stated that a network of pedestrian and cycle routes must be provided throughout the neighbourhood to connect into the existing network - there is no existing network in close proximity to these two sites.</p>	<p>The present wording can be retained, but with the addition of - 'which will be extended to provide safe connection: viz - West Parley-Longham/Hampreston-Longham/Ringwood Rd.-Longham</p>	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		492			
612430	Mr Nick Squirrel	Natural England, Dorset and Somerset Team	CSPS1942	Policy FWP4	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	No	<p>Policies; CN 1, CN 2, CN 3, WMC 3, WMC 4, WMC 5, WMC 6, FWP 3, FWP 4, FWP 6, FWP 7, FWP 8, VTSW 2, VTSW3, VTSW 4, VTSW 8 etc are all proposing development and or mitigation in the form of SANGs on greenfield locations. In order to avoid a conflict with policy ME1 at a later stage in the planning process Natural England advise the authorities to bring to the attention of those with an interest in these locations the need to carry out a basic biodiversity survey eg Phase 1 habitat survey including assessment of the likely presence or evidence of other features likely to restrict or delay development eg badger setts, priority species such as reptiles, water voles etc in time for consideration at the EIP. In many cases this will simply be a statement as the proposer has already engaged an ecological advisor. These policies appear to have been brought forward in an absence of adequate information and assessment on the biodiversity features held by the policy land. There is reason to suspect that on some there may be a significant biodiversity interest owing to close proximity with designated sites and or other biodiversity sites. The NPPF requires that planning policies should be based on up-to date information on the natural environment (paragraph 165). These policies are not shown to be compliant with this requirement. Thus, irrespective of the above matters concerning other nearby designated sites, it is not possible to identify whether the policies are compliant with policy considerations in the NPPF on sustainable development for the sites alone, especially the aspect on sustainable development set out in paragraph 9 of moving from a net loss of biodiversity to achieving net gains (for example on priory habitats and species).</p>	<p>The policies may need to include specific paragraphs about features of biodiversity importance which are to be secured or enhanced.</p>	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	<p>Natural England has provided extensive advice to a number of the parties concerned with these policies and may be able to offer advice and reassurance to the Inspector about the reliance he may have on the effectiveness of the policy and any modification proposed.</p>		492		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
494600	Mrs Audrey Russell										<p>Initially I would like to state that this the first time that these plans have been made available to local residents, and the proposals that have been put forward in them show that comments made by the public to previous plans appear, in the main, to have been ignored.</p> <p>I live in the area between two of the proposed areas of redevelopment – Coppins Nursery (FWP4) and West Parley crossroads (FWP5, 6 and 7).</p> <p>My concerns regarding the 30 proposed houses at Coppins is that you could, potentially, have 60 vehicles entering and leaving this area via the Christchurch Road. This is a road that is already carrying more traffic than it was designed for, and where it is the norm for the traffic to be travelling in excess of the speed limit. There have been a number of deaths and 'near misses' on this stretch of road, and adding another busy junction will only exacerbate this situation.</p> <p>West Parley is a village, but you are suggesting increasing its housing stock by one third. This will change the whole character of the area and I do not believe that the need for this scale of development in the village has been proved.</p> <p>Green Belt was put in place to prevent 'urban sprawl', and yet you are planning to redefine its boundaries to allow just that. An increase in the number of houses in West Parley by 520 will result in an increase in the number of cars – possibly by 1000. New Link roads may appear to ease the flow of traffic through the Parley crossroad junction, but the traffic on the entry roads to the village (Christchurch Road – west and east, and New Road – north and south) will be carrying even more traffic that they do currently. You are just moving the current congestion further away from the junction but not resolving the problem.</p> <p>With the proposed increase in population in the village, I feel that there will be an increased need for medical services (doctors and dentists), and for schools. These do not appear to have been considered in the proposed plan,.</p> <p>I would appreciate you taking these points into consideration before a final decision is made regarding the future of our area</p>					492		
535574	Mr and Mrs Ralph Williams										<p>I write to registry my formal objection to the building of 200 houses on the FWP 7, 320 houses and 33,000 sq.ft Foodstore on FWP 6 and to Major Enhancements to the West Parley Village Centre FWP 5 sites for the following under mentioned reasons, some of the points below also apply to Coppins Nursery FWP 6 (corrected to FWP4 by F.P. officer) which is more suited to an elderly care facility. The points raised below are by no means extensive and having read the councils proposals and accompanying documents which are contradicting and lack robust evidence as a result The Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy Plan is therefore Unsound and Non-Compliant.</p> <p>The Consultation process is unsatisfactory.</p> <p>The Planning system is there to enable Sustainable Development to ensure the right development takes place in the right locations. It is there to protect Green Belt Land and</p>	<p>The site is not suitable for Family Housing being to far from amenities and schools. More suited to a Care Facility that requires less Traffic movements.</p>	<p>Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination</p>	<p>. To express concerns about the propose side use as Family housing due to its lack of sustainability. Argue the case for not releasing the land from Green Belt and the dangerous of access to the proposed development from the Christchurch Road.</p>	492			

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>ensure homes are provided on the right sites to meet the needs of both the established community and the people who are likely to live in the proposed new homes. Local Plans must take account of local concerns and wishes of the local population as required by the new Localism legislation. No account has been taken to current Government legislation that requires any L.A. to consult fully with local communities before setting out proposals. EDDC planners have ignored this legislation and failed to consult.</p> <p>West Parley P.C. has produced, following a lengthy consultation with residents, a well publicised Parish Plan, copies of which were sent to EDDC. In this Plan residents are overwhelmingly against having no more than about 100 houses built in West Parley. This information, contrary to new legislation, has been ignored by EDDC planners and the results have not been represented in any of the draft reports. To build more than 100 houses in the Village of West Parley would create an unbroken urban sprawl from Bournemouth to Ferndown with West Parley losing its unique identity and become just another small part of a very large conurbation.</p> <p>Green Belt Considerations.</p> <p>These proposals are in direct conflict with current green belt national planning policy CSIDE1, indeed the L.A. has itself successfully used that policy at planning appeals which has been upheld the planning inspectorate, if challenge is the L.A. expecting that given past decisions the planning inspectorate will change this view on green belt policy. Certainly it will be a major consideration if these proposals are called in by the Secretary of State.</p> <p>No tree survey has been carried out particularly in relation to FWP7 or considerations given to the habitat of many protected species of animals which inhabit this site that has established trees, hedge rows and stream that have remained unaltered for 100 of years. Also this area contains public footpaths with associated rights of way. English Nature do not appear to have been consulted in regard to this site nor it would seem have the Rivers Authority. Dudsbury Rings is an important heritage site and this proposed development is too close to this monument not for it to have an impact on protected heritage site. There is no evidence that English Heritage has been consulted in this regard.</p> <p>Sustainability</p> <p>Sustainability should be the mainstay of any planning policy and on FWP5, FWP6, FWP7 and FWP4 the proposals fails to demonstrate that any of these sites are sustainable.</p> <p>To include a un-needed 3300 sp ft supermarket in the plans for FWP6 will not make this site appropriate for housing. It will add considerably to traffic congestion.</p> <p>Lack of consideration for families that will live in these proposed house and their children's education needs are not address, Parley First School has little or no capacity is over 1.5 miles from these sites and no mention is made of middle or upper schools both in Ferndown and over 2.5 miles away with little or no public transport, putting aside the danger of the number of main roads to be negotiated the increase in car</p>						

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
											<p>usage will again add to traffic congestion.</p> <p>Transport Transport seems largely to be ignored and no full traffic survey has been conducted to support or refute these plans. The B3073 crossing New Road from the Airport to Longham at peak times is already operating way beyond its capacity as is New Road. No amount of improvements to Parley Cross will improve the situation. To add 560 new Homes to these roads plus a super market with 22 car space when also adding the proposed increase in traffic at the airport the potential to add in the region of 1000 new cars to this junction is totally un- sustainable and unpractical for both the existing and the would be residents of these proposed developments. The 2 new roads proposed around the proposed building sites will only move congestion from one point to another and do not address the underlying problems of the current over capacity of New Road and the B3073. The industrial estate at the Airport supports over 2000 workers the majority of which in the main commute by car, most with single occupancy and this number is set to increase. This already causes major congestion at peck times The two proposed new roads will not alleviate the problem.</p> <p>With regard to the proposed road too the West from New Road and part of FWP7 this appears to cut across an existing Flood Plain and this issue has not been addressed by way of a Flood Risk Assessment, discussions with the Rivers Authority or an Environmental Report. This site is know to flood in winger and with the changes in climate the situation is unlikely to improve. No evidence that the Environmental Agency has been consulted on this matter. Covering more of this land with a large scale development will only compound the situation.</p> <p>Infrastructure. No evidence is supplied to support on how Surface and Foul Drainage will be accommodated or Gas, Water and Electricity and if the existing local infrastructure can support this addition 560 homes and a new Food Store.</p> <p>Site FWP 6 Another Supermarket in the area is not needed and will only bring in as mentioned much more traffic and delivers to the already overcrowded roads of West Parley. Sufficient supermarkets already exist within 3 mile radius of West Parley and 3 Tesco Express shops exist in a radius of 1 mile of Parley Cross. Also there appears no demand for allotments or orchards. Adequate public open space is already available in the village.</p> <p>Environmental Issues No consideration appears of have been given to the impact that noise will have on these proposed sites due to the location in relation to the flight path to and from Bournemouth Airport. There is no evidence that any sound test have been carried or other environmental issues have been addressed in having large developments close to an expanding airport. Needs Survey and consideration for alternative Brownfield sites</p>							

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description		
											<p>There seems little or no evidence that these number of homes are needed in this location and no supporting evidence to justify 50% affordable. Many undeveloped sites are available in the Ferndown area much closer to schools and local amenities some are Brownfield sites these have the potential to deliver hundreds of homes and that is without the windfall sites that will certainly occur. No consideration has been given to alternatives sites.</p> <p>All the sites above in there present form are totally Unsustainable please I would urge both the elected members and the officers of the council not to dismiss the local residents of the Village of West Parley and deny us our democratic right to have a say in plans that will have a impact massively on the environment in which we live.</p> <p>. Lack of detail on sustainability.</p> <p>No consideration in Transport and Access on to Christchurch Road.</p> <p>No need to alter Green Belt Policy</p> <p>Not suitable for Family or Affordable Housing</p> <p>Failure to Consult.</p>								
538118	Mrs Christine Cullen		CSPS2789	Policy FWP4							<p>Re: policy FWP1, FWP2, FWP3, FWP4, Ferndown & West Parley proposed developments.</p> <p>Unfortunately I was unable to visit the public exhibitions but I have spoken to those that did attend.</p> <p>Again I don't think that enough is being done to make the residents in Ferndown and West Parley aware of what an impact the developments proposed is going to have. I have spoken to friends and work colleagues and most are not aware as they have not received the Christchurch & East Dorset Core Strategy booklet. I thought that some of these areas are close to heathland so could not be built upon – or has that changed. Also what about the wild life that exists on these sites will it be moved like when the Camelias houses were built.</p> <p>We have already had to put up with the building of houses on woodland to accommodate the Camelias Estate of over 300 houses. Plus all of the changes of one property to blocks of flats around Ferndown!</p> <p>The building of the proposed number of houses which I assume is in the region of 600 is more that the area can cope with. Apparently nothing is going to be done to help with the capacity in schools as the “birth rate is dropping”, so no one will move into the area with children? Again this will bring more that 3000 people. Not to mention the amount of extra cars – the roads around Ferndown and West Paley are often at grid lock and the changes to Canford Bottom roundabout will probably not help as cars and massive lorries still prefer to go alone Ringwood Road through Ferndown! There is also the need for more doctors, as it is the surgeries cannot cope with the people already here. Neither can the hospitals.</p> <p>Where are the extra people going to work, will they all be commuters? The proposed development of another industrial area will not make any difference as there are units empty on the existing industrial estates – people cannot afford to run</p>					492			

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>businesses as the rates are too high and people can't afford to pay wages to run businesses.</p> <p>This should be made more open to everyone in the area and get a true vote on what we want. A supermarket (Waitrose which only the well off can afford to shop in) is being planned. Also a play area – which is pointless as there will be no extra children!! Plus the change of the road and yet again more traffic lights.</p> <p>The infra structure of the area has just been pushed to the limit with the attitude of build, build and build which provides nothing for the community with the proposed development of the Dormy Hotel site bringing more people. This would have been better used for something for the community rather than more for retired people. Just to hotel would have been even better.</p> <p>I understand there is a need for people to have houses but with the road system as it is, surely this has to be a serious problem. With the promise of affordable housing does this really mean that these will be for local young people to buy or just for social housing and people from the inner cities. Instead of houses why can't we have amenities that everyone could use instead!</p> <p>There is nothing here for people – the Community Centre is out dated and Ferndown Leisure Centre was built in the 1970's and despite changes is still not very nice.</p> <p>Everything that was lovely about Ferndown is being lost – the shops are closing because of high rents. There is still nothing for youngsters of any age to do! Why not have a decent centre for youngsters and adults to use – something on par with Tower Park you could have Bingo, Bowling, Swimming, ice rinks, cinemas and restaurants at Parley instead of MORE houses – this would be of use to everyone. If you can't drive or afford to run a car you cannot travel to Bournemouth or Poole. Plus it isn't cheap to go by bus which do not run that frequently around here. If we are going to have more cars let us have something that we can enjoy! Not the houses.</p> <p>It would be nice to think that Ferndown and Parley could be thought of more than just somewhere to build hundreds of houses – Ferndown and Parley were once communities. I understand the building will not be done by local builders either so not even providing work for locals.</p> <p>So maybe you could make more of an effort to get the people's response on this before the decision is made.</p>						
655064	Mr and Mrs K Cullen		CSPS2793	Policy FWP4							<p>Re: policy FWP1, FWP2, FWP3, FWP4, Ferndown & West Parley proposed developments.</p> <p>Unfortunately I was unable to visit the public exhibitions but I have spoken to those that did attend.</p> <p>Again I don't think that enough is being done to make the residents in Ferndown and West Parley aware of what an impact the developments proposed is going to have. I have spoken to friends and work colleagues and most are not aware as they have not received the Christchurch & East Dorset Core Strategy booklet. I thought that some of these areas are close to heathland so could not be built upon – or</p>				492		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>has that changed. Also what about the wild life that exists on these sites will it be moved like when the Camelias houses were built.</p> <p>We have already had to put up with the building of houses on woodland to accommodate the Camelias Estate of over 300 houses. Plus all of the changes of one property to blocks of flats around Ferndown!</p> <p>The building of the proposed number of houses which I assume is in the region of 600 is more that the area can cope with. Apparently nothing is going to be done to help with the capacity in schools as the "birth rate is dropping", so no one will move into the area with children? Again this will bring more that 3000 people. Not to mention the amount of extra cars – the roads around Ferndown and West Paley are often at grid lock and the changes to Canford Bottom roundabout will probably not help as cars and massive lorries still prefer to go alone Ringwood Road through Ferndown! There is also the need for more doctors, as it is the surgeries cannot cope with the people already here. Neither can the hospitals.</p> <p>Where are the extra people going to work, will they all be commuters? The proposed development of another industrial area will not make any difference as there are units empty on the existing industrial estates – people cannot afford to run businesses as the rates are too high and people can't afford to pay wages to run businesses.</p> <p>This should be made more open to everyone in the area and get a true vote on what we want. A supermarket (Waitrose which only the well off can afford to shop in) is being planned. Also a play area – which is pointless as there will be no extra children!! Plus the change of the road and yet again more traffic lights.</p> <p>The infra structure of the area has just been pushed to the limit with the attitude of build, build and build which provides nothing for the community with the proposed development of the Dormy Hotel site bringing more people. This would have been better used for something for the community rather than more for retired people. Just to hotel would have been even better.</p> <p>I understand there is a need for people to have houses but with the road system as it is, surely this has to be a serious problem. With the promise of affordable housing does this really mean that these will be for local young people to buy or just for social housing and people from the inner cities. Instead of houses why can't we have amenities that everyone could use instead!</p> <p>There is nothing here for people – the Community Centre is out dated and Ferndown Leisure Centre was built in the 1970's and despite changes is still not very nice.</p> <p>Everything that was lovely about Ferndown is being lost – the shops are closing because of high rents. There is still nothing for youngsters of any age to do! Why not have a decent centre for youngsters and adults to use – something on par with Tower Park you could have Bingo, Bowling, Swimming, ice rinks, cinemas and restaurants at Parley instead of MORE houses – this would be of use to everyone. If you can't drive</p>						

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description		
											or afford to run a car you cannot travel to Bournemouth or Poole. Plus it isn't cheap to go by bus which do not run that frequently around here. If we are going to have more cars let us have something that we can enjoy! Not the houses. It would be nice to think that Ferndown and Parley could be thought of more than just somewhere to build hundreds of houses – Ferndown and Parley were once communities. I understand the building will not be done by local builders either so not even providing work for locals. So maybe you could make more of an effort to get the people's response on this before the decision is made.								
360302	Mrs Hilary Chittenden	Environment TAG (East Dorset)	CSPS3314	Policy FWP4		No	No	No			In the absence of biological survey there is no evidence on which to base assessment of the damage/loss that would be caused by development or the location of SANG and its management to mitigate that loss or damage. While supporting the application of the SANG strategy to the site, the area identified is no more than public open space. The exact suitability of the informal recreational opportunities cannot be assessed as it is unclear from the proposals map what land is currently publicly accessible or where there are existing public rights of way. It would be helpful if existing RoW and public access land were shown on all proposals maps. The people and wildlife links to FWP4 and Poor Common should be clarified. Horse riding is popular in the area and the need for safe bridleways with longer distance links should be considered.	Rights of Way, Open Access land and habitat data (type and designation) should be shown on the proposals map.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		492				
490823	Mr Ian Jones	Ferndown Town Council	CSPS2996	Policy FWP4	Yes	Yes	No	No	No		The Town Council would support the proposals for the Coppins site.		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		492				
523531	Mr Tim Hoskinson	Savills	CSPS3197	Policy FWP4		No		No	No		The allocation of land at Coppins Nursery for housing development within Policy FWP4 is supported in principle as a logical site to select through the LDF process for the delivery of housing in a sustainable manner. However, we have concerns in relation to the wording of Policy FWP4 and in order to be more effective and soundly justified the policy should be amended as set out below. The Land to the north of Christchurch Road, West Parley – development concept document submitted in support of these representations sets out proposals for the development of the site based on a comprehensive set of technical studies covering landscape, ecology, archaeology, transport, drainage, utilities, trees, noise, and air quality. The studies undertaken and summarised in this report have highlighted that the site is relatively level, free from physical and environmental constraints and has the potential to accommodate a well contained and clearly defined housing development without compromising the key purpose, functions and role of the Green Belt. The site is well placed to contribute to meeting the housing needs of East Dorset by providing a mix of dwelling types, styles and tenures including family homes at a location that is well related to existing services and facilities. The benefits of the site can be summarised as follows:	Amend Policy FWP4 as set out below, and amend Map 10.5 to reflect the layout set out in Figure 4.1 of the Land to the north of Christchurch Road Development Concept document submitted alongside these representations. Proposed amendments to Policy FWP4: Coppins New Neighbourhood, Ferndown A New Neighbourhood is allocated at Coppins Nursery, south of Ferndown to provide up to 45 homes. To enable this the Green Belt boundary will be	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	Savills are acting on behalf of Barratt David Wilson Homes in relation to land to the north of Christchurch Road, West Parley that forms the FWP4 allocation in the Pre-submission Draft Core Strategy. We are seeking participation at the oral part of the examination in order to help ensure that the plan is sound and deliverable	492	2249912_0_1.pdf 2249910_0_1.pdf 2249911_0_1.pdf			

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
											<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Single ownership site, available now • Certainty of delivery • A self contained, easily and quickly developed site • Limited infrastructure requirements and short lead-in to development • Well located in relation to West Parley and Ferndown, which provide a wide range of shops, services, facilities and employment opportunities • Free from environmental constraints • Development of the scale proposed will not compromise the role and function of the Green Belt <p>This site therefore represents a sustainable, viable, well located and deliverable opportunity for high quality development to meet identified housing needs and should be phased to come forward at an early stage in the LDF timeframe.</p> <p>Capacity of the site and Green Belt considerations</p> <p>The Core Strategy Options consultation originally identified the site for the provision of about 45 homes, with a small proportion of the site identified for greenspace along the eastern edge of the site. The Pre-Submission Core Strategy allocates the site for about 30 homes, with at least half of the site set out as informal open space. The reason given for this at paragraph 10.29 of the Pre-Submission Core Strategy is to protect the Green Belt Gap between Longham and Ferndown. There is nothing in the evidence base to justify this change. The Land to the north of Christchurch Road, West Parley – development concept document submitted on behalf of Barratt David Wilson Homes in support of these representations sets out a proposed layout for the site which can accommodate up to 45 dwellings. This is based on a detailed, site specific evidence base, and is considered to represent the most appropriate design and development response for the Coppins Nursery site, taking account of all relevant considerations.</p> <p>The Barratt David Wilson Homes proposals for the site are supported by a Landscape and Visual Appraisal and a Review of Green Belt Considerations, which are also submitted alongside these representations.</p> <p>The Landscape and Visual Appraisal concludes that with appropriate layout and building design, and landscape spaces and planting, the proposed residential development on this site, which is located adjacent to the existing settlement, would not have negative effects on existing townscape character or the wider landscape setting of West Parley.</p> <p>The Review of Green Belt Considerations considers the site against the five purposes for including land in the Green Belts as set out in the NPPF and against the Green Belt considerations set out in the South East Dorset Green Belt Review. The report demonstrates that the development of the site for 45 houses in the manner proposed in the Core Strategy options consultation would not compromise any of the purposes of the Green Belt in this area.</p> <p>The Review of Green Belt Considerations notes that the Dorset Landscape Character Assessment identifies the site</p>	<p>amended to exclude the site.</p> <p>Green Infrastructure</p> <p>Open space is to be provided to enhance the existing open space at Poor Common, providing green links along the southern fringe of the urban area. This should extend to at least 50% of the identified site.</p> <p>Transport and access</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vehicular access is to be provided from Christchurch Road. • Dedicated pedestrian and cycling links are to be provided throughout the housing area and link into the existing networks to the north, east and west. 						

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
											<p>as lying within the 'urban' landscape character area. Due to the topography of the site and surrounding area, adjoining residential development to the east and west, and mature vegetation associated with the woodlands to the north and golf course to the south, the development of the site would not affect the openness or any of the functions of the South East Dorset Green Belt.</p> <p>These documents clearly demonstrate that the whole of the site can be developed without adverse impact on the Green Belt or on the townscape character or wider landscape setting of West Parley and Ferndown, and provide a compelling evidence base for a policy allocating the whole of the site for development of up to 45 dwellings.</p> <p>Layout and design</p> <p>Policy FWP4 as currently worded includes the following criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The New Neighbourhood to be set out according to the principles of the Masterplan Reports • A design code will be agreed by the Council, setting out the required high standard. <p>These criteria were not included in the previous options consultation, and we would question their addition to Policy FWP4. It is not clear what the principles of the Masterplan Reports referred to in Policy FWP4 are. The illustration in Map 10.5 is a reproduction of the concept masterplan from the New Neighbourhoods Masterplan Report (January 2012), this does not itself set the principles of the masterplan, but represents an illustration of how the site could come forward. The brief for the New Neighbourhoods Masterplan Report was to help support the Council's emerging planning policy, with the intention that it could become a Supplementary Planning Document to guide development control decisions, and form the basis for negotiations with prospective developers in each location. We would therefore seriously question the weight afforded to the masterplan in Policy CM1, which unnecessarily restricts the flexibility of Policy FWP4. The concept masterplan illustrated in Map 10.5 has not been subject to consultation or detailed testing through the design process, and there are alternative, equally valid options for the scheme. For example the Land to the north of Christchurch Road, West Parley - development concept document submitted in support of these representations includes a proposed layout plan, which is based on a suite of site-specific evidence base studies, makes better use of the site, and would deliver a scheme more in keeping with the surrounding area.</p> <p>It is therefore considered more appropriate for the reference to the design guidance provided in the New Neighbourhoods Masterplan Report to be made in the supporting text to Policy CM1, at it should be clearly stated that the figures showing the New Neighbourhoods (including Map 10.5) are illustrative only.</p> <p>The need for high quality design is fully supported, however the requirement within Policy FWP4 for a design code to be agreed with the Council is considered unnecessary given the</p>							

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>scale of the site and the protection provided by Policy HE2, and the guidance provided in the New Neighbourhoods Masterplan Report, particularly if this is adopted as a Supplementary Planning Document.</p> <p>Green Infrastructure</p> <p>The site is located adjoining Poor Common, an informal area of open space that serves as a strategic SANG. The site is also within easy walking distance of the Stour Valley, another large scale area of open space that serves a strategic SANGS function. The site has the potential to accommodate up to 45 dwellings, this is below the 50 dwellings dwelling threshold for SANGS provision referred to in Policies ME2 and ME3. The benefits of full on-site SANGS provision in this location are therefore questioned, and a more flexible approach with a combination of informal open space provision on-site in combination with improvements to linkages to adjoining SANGS and off-site improvements are proposed as the most appropriate solution, as indicated in the Land to the north of Christchurch Road, West Parley – development concept document submitted alongside these representations.</p>						
359571	Mr Renny Henderson	Royal Society for the Protection of Birds	CSPS3732	Policy FWP4							<p>Policy Allocation Dwellings/land area Comment WMC3 Cuthbury allotments and St Margaret's Close New Neighbourhood, Wimborne 260 SANG to be provided in accordance with policy ME3 WMC4 Stone Lane 90 SANG to be provided in accordance with policy ME3 6 WMC5 Cranborne Road New Neighbourhood, Wimborne 600 SANG to be provided in accordance with policy ME3 WMC6 South of Leigh Road New Neighbourhood and Sports Village, Wimborne 75 ha SANG to be provided in accordance with policy ME3 CM1 Lockyer's School and Land North of Corfe Mullen New Neighbourhood 250 SANG to be provided in accordance with policy ME3 FWP3 Holmwood House New Neighbourhood, Ferndown 110 SANG to be provided in accordance with policy ME3 FWP4</p>		Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	we would like to confirm that we wish to reserve the right to appear at the Examination into the Core Strategy, on the grounds the Core Strategy raises significant issues relating to the protection of internationally important wildlife sites (as highlighted in the HRA) and that there remains uncertainty over the delivery of appropriate and effective mitigation measures.	492		

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

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
360271	Cllr Paul Timberlake		CSPS512	Map 10.5	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No objection to this land being used for housing.		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		493		
654506	Mr John Showell		CSPS988	Map 10.5		No		Yes	Yes	Yes	The housing content of Policy FWP4 seems to rely on encouraging land owners to leave land derelict so that they can be rewarded with high value development opportunities. This site provides an important visual break between Parley and Longham and should revert to farm land if the nurse is no longer financially viable.	Remove the housing content from the policy.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		493		
523531	Mr Tim Hoskinson	Savills	CSPS3201	Map 10.5		No		No	No		<p>The allocation of land at Coppins Nursery for housing development within Policy FWP4 is supported in principle as a logical site to select through the LDF process for the delivery of housing in a sustainable manner. However, we have concerns in relation to the wording of Policy FWP4 and in order to be more effective and soundly justified the policy should be amended as set out below.</p> <p>The Land to the north of Christchurch Road, West Parley – development concept document submitted in support of these representations sets out proposals for the development of the site based on a comprehensive set of technical studies covering landscape, ecology, archaeology, transport, drainage, utilities, trees, noise, and air quality. The studies undertaken and summarised in this report have highlighted that the site is relatively level, free from physical and environmental constraints and has the potential to accommodate a well contained and clearly defined housing development without compromising the key purpose, functions and role of the Green Belt.</p> <p>The site is well placed to contribute to meeting the housing needs of East Dorset by providing a mix of dwelling types, styles and tenures including family homes at a location that is well related to existing services and facilities.</p> <p>The benefits of the site can be summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Single ownership site, available now • Certainty of delivery • A self contained, easily and quickly developed site • Limited infrastructure requirements and short lead-in to development • Well located in relation to West Parley and Ferndown, which provide a wide range of shops, services, facilities and employment opportunities • Free from environmental constraints • Development of the scale proposed will not compromise the role and function of the Green Belt <p>This site therefore represents a sustainable, viable, well located and deliverable opportunity for high quality development to meet identified housing needs and should be phased to come forward at an early stage in the LDF timeframe.</p> <p>Capacity of the site and Green Belt considerations</p> <p>The Core Strategy Options consultation originally identified the site for the provision of about 45 homes, with a small proportion of the site identified for greenspace along the eastern edge of the site. The Pre-Submission Core Strategy</p>	<p>Amend Policy FWP4 as set out below, and amend Map 10.5 to reflect the layout set out in Figure 4.1 of the Land to the north of Christchurch Road Development Concept document submitted alongside these representations.</p> <p>Proposed amendments to Policy FWP4:</p> <p>Coppins New Neighbourhood, Ferndown</p> <p>A New Neighbourhood is allocated at Coppins Nursery, south of Ferndown to provide up to 45 homes. To enable this the Green Belt boundary will be amended to exclude the site.</p> <p>Green Infrastructure</p> <p>Open space is to be provided to enhance the existing open space at Poor Common, providing green links along the southern fringe of the urban area. This should extend to at least 50% of the identified site.</p> <p>Transport and access</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vehicular access is to be provided from Christchurch Road. • Dedicated pedestrian and cycling links are to be provided throughout 	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	Savills are acting on behalf of Barratt David Wilson Homes in relation to land to the north of Christchurch Road, West Parley that forms the FWP4 allocation in the Pre-submission Draft Core Strategy. We are seeking participation at the oral part of the examination in order to help ensure that the plan is sound and deliverable	493	2249911_0_1.pdf 2249910_0_1.pdf 2249912_0_1.pdf	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
											<p>allocates the site for about 30 homes, with at least half of the site set out as informal open space. The reason given for this at paragraph 10.29 of the Pre-Submission Core Strategy is to protect the Green Belt Gap between Longham and Ferndown. There is nothing in the evidence base to justify this change. The Land to the north of Christchurch Road, West Parley – development concept document submitted on behalf of Barratt David Wilson Homes in support of these representations sets out a proposed layout for the site which can accommodate up to 45 dwellings. This is based on a detailed, site specific evidence base, and is considered to represent the most appropriate design and development response for the Coppins Nursery site, taking account of all relevant considerations.</p> <p>The Barratt David Wilson Homes proposals for the site are supported by a Landscape and Visual Appraisal and a Review of Green Belt Considerations, which are also submitted alongside these representations.</p> <p>The Landscape and Visual Appraisal concludes that with appropriate layout and building design, and landscape spaces and planting, the proposed residential development on this site, which is located adjacent to the existing settlement, would not have negative effects on existing townscape character or the wider landscape setting of West Parley.</p> <p>The Review of Green Belt Considerations considers the site against the five purposes for including land in the Green Belts as set out in the NPPF and against the Green Belt considerations set out in the South East Dorset Green Belt Review. The report demonstrates that the development of the site for 45 houses in the manner proposed in the Core Strategy options consultation would not compromise any of the purposes of the Green Belt in this area.</p> <p>The Review of Green Belt Considerations notes that the Dorset Landscape Character Assessment identifies the site as lying within the ‘urban’ landscape character area. Due to the topography of the site and surrounding area, adjoining residential development to the east and west, and mature vegetation associated with the woodlands to the north and golf course to the south, the development of the site would not affect the openness or any of the functions of the South East Dorset Green Belt.</p> <p>These documents clearly demonstrate that the whole of the site can be developed without adverse impact on the Green Belt or on the townscape character or wider landscape setting of West Parley and Ferndown, and provide a compelling evidence base for a policy allocating the whole of the site for development of up to 45 dwellings.</p> <p>Layout and design Policy FWP4 as currently worded includes the following criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The New Neighbourhood to be set out according to the principles of the Masterplan Reports • A design code will be agreed by the Council, setting out the required high standard. <p>These criteria were not included in the previous options</p>	the housing area and link into the existing networks to the north, east and west.						

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
											<p>consultation, and we would question their addition to Policy FWP4. It is not clear what the principles of the Masterplan Reports referred to in Policy FWP4 are. The illustration in Map 10.5 is a reproduction of the concept masterplan from the New Neighbourhoods Masterplan Report (January 2012), this does not itself set the principles of the masterplan, but represents an illustration of how the site could come forward. The brief for the New Neighbourhoods Masterplan Report was to help support the Council's emerging planning policy, with the intention that it could become a Supplementary Planning Document to guide development control decisions, and form the basis for negotiations with prospective developers in each location. We would therefore seriously question the weight afforded to the masterplan in Policy CM1, which unnecessarily restricts the flexibility of Policy FWP4. The concept masterplan illustrated in Map 10.5 has not been subject to consultation or detailed testing through the design process, and there are alternative, equally valid options for the scheme. For example the Land to the north of Christchurch Road, West Parley - development concept document submitted in support of these representations includes a proposed layout plan, which is based on a suite of site-specific evidence base studies, makes better use of the site, and would deliver a scheme more in keeping with the surrounding area.</p> <p>It is therefore considered more appropriate for the reference to the design guidance provided in the New Neighbourhoods Masterplan Report to be made in the supporting text to Policy CM1, at it should be clearly stated that the figures showing the New Neighbourhoods (including Map 10.5) are illustrative only.</p> <p>The need for high quality design is fully supported, however the requirement within Policy FWP4 for a design code to be agreed with the Council is considered unnecessary given the scale of the site and the protection provided by Policy HE2, and the guidance provided in the New Neighbourhoods Masterplan Report, particularly if this is adopted as a Supplementary Planning Document.</p> <p>Green Infrastructure</p> <p>The site is located adjoining Poor Common, an informal area of open space that serves as a strategic SANG. The site is also within easy walking distance of the Stour Valley, another large scale area of open space that serves a strategic SANGS function. The site has the potential to accommodate up to 45 dwellings, this is below the 50 dwellings dwelling threshold for SANGS provision referred to in Policies ME2 and ME3. The benefits of full on-site SANGS provision in this location are therefore questioned, and a more flexible approach with a combination of informal open space provision on-site in combination with improvements to linkages to adjoining SANGS and off-site improvements are proposed as the most appropriate solution, as indicated in the Land to the north of Christchurch Road, West Parley – development concept document submitted alongside these representations.</p>							

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
650107	Mr David Baxter		CSPS290	10.32							<p>This whole section gave me a headache. I quote, "it is now the case that well over 1 hectare of tarmac covers the area around the Crossroads and shopping service roads." I completely fail to see the point of mentioning this. It's a developed built-up area. Of course there will be tarmac. What was the council expecting - gravel tracks and cobblestone roadways? It seems that the document is raising this point to show the development of roads in a negative light - it might as well be saying "Oh, isn't it so terrible that our society has built this network of roads that cover green spaces with tarmac - we're all horrible people, go and say twenty Hail Marys as penance." If we want to live in a built up area, then tarmac or concrete roads are a necessity. Perhaps the West Parley area does not meet some hidden EU or government target for road / green area ratio?</p> <p>I quote, "Such engineering solutions have maximised the effectiveness of the Crossroads in terms of traffic movement, but this is clearly not enough as severe congestion is common...". Parley Cross was redeveloped in the late 1990's. I can remember the massive queues that plagued the junction from every approach before the development, and I also remember how clear it seemed after, and how much time was saved by not having to queue for anywhere near as long as prior to the redevelopment. "Maximised" is something of an understatement. The quote is quite damning about the road system. It has not been noted, and should be noted, that there are more vehicles on the road now than at any time before. It is not a case that the redevelopment was inadequate or poorly executed. It is a case that the volume of traffic has increased to such a point that the junction is no longer able to cope during peak times.</p>				496			
650107	Mr David Baxter		CSPS291	10.33							<p>What on earth was the point of including this illustration? There is no key to the colours, no explanation, nothing. The only information I can gather is that some roads would be constructed across a field. Perhaps the yellow areas are tunnels, so the field above would not be built on? Is the blue area a lake?</p>				498			
650107	Mr David Baxter		CSPS292	10.35							<p>Quote: "Policies FWP6 and FWP7... (remove) 30% of traffic movements..."</p> <p>Did anyone actually consider that the reason those traffic movements are there is because people use those roads for the very purpose they were built - to get from A to B in the most efficient way possible? People don't tend to go out of their way to go a long route just because they feel like it. Removing those traffic movements mean that 30% of people will have to find alternative, possibly longer or slower routes to get to their destination, which will increase traffic on other roads, increase emissions, and make the journey longer and more stressful. Simply cutting out road movements is a pretty awful and short-sighted solution, and is worse than the road system proposed in 10.33.</p> <p>Additionally, what happens when the road traffic increases to such a level that the roads used instead of Parley Cross reach capacity and queues begin? Tjose 30% of traffic</p>				501			

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
											moevements will then have to be reinstated to create additional capacity, which completely defeats the point of removing them in the first place. To repeat myself, this is very short sighted. The aim here should be to increase road capacity as much as possible, not force people off main roads, into residential areas and other routes. Instead of addressing the problem, this simply moves it elsewhere so the council can say "We solved the congestion problem at Parley Cross! (We just moved it elseweher, but don't tell anyone!)".							
650257	Mr Ian King		CSPS438	10.35	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> West Parley already experiences serious traffic congestion from all directions in and out of Parley lights and through Longham due to the inadequate size of the A348 to Bear Cross. This is a major trunk road and needs to be upgraded to relieve the congestion on the Christchurch Road and New Road. The proposed changes to the layout at Parley lights will offer limited or no improvement; whereas the proposed link roads will cause additional tailbacks and traffic problems for all traffic trying to join the New Road just before the New Road Bridge. It is the volume of traffic that is the issue and unless all the connecting roads and junctions are factored into the infrastructure plans; it will do nothing more than push the gridlock further up or down New Road or Christchurch Road. 	. A more viable solution could be a roundabout on the Parley Crossroads, making use of the garage site which is available to be used, and part of the field opposite. This would enable the flow of traffic to be better managed and without the expense of 2 new roads being built through residential areas or taking over Green Belt land.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		501			
496473	Mr Brian Morgan		CSPS25	Policy FWP5	No	No		Yes		Yes	The reasons are for the most part set out in my attached copy letter to Christopher Chope MP dated 17th February 2012 (actual letter dated 8th February), in addition to which I consider there to be little or no need (as opposed to demand) for new housing here, and certainly not enough to override green belt protection.	Complete deletion of FWP5, FWP6 and FWP7. Exactly the same comments as those in 3, 4, 5 and 6 above apply to many other policies in the document with similar deletion considered necessary - these include:- FWP3 and 4, WMC3 and 5, and VTSW4 and 5. The only proviso to this is that it in so far as any of these sites are not now green belt, then that factor would obviously not apply to those sites.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	1. I consider a well-argued oral and public presentation of the case outlined above would be much more effective than mere written argument. 2. The opportunities for open public debate on this matter have so far been far too limited, having regard especially to the long term importance of the Green Belt heritage, as opposed to the short term 'needs' to promote economic growth, both locally and nationally.	502	2158984_0_1.pdf 2158985_0_1.pdf 2158987_0_1.pdf		
496575	Mrs Gillian Sewell		CSPS62	Policy FWP5	No	No		No			Our local community is satisfied with our shops, services and public spaces, we are lucky. We do not want wholesale change or large numbers of houses forming a new neighbourhood. Our present community will be spoiled and split up.	None. We have enough footpaths and natural open spaces already. We are a vital, viable community. It is	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		502			

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
												sheer hypocrisy to state otherwise! We live in a lovely area with historic walks and SSSIs which should be protected against this awful development.					
496597	Mr Colin Sewell		CSPS52	Policy FWP5	No	No		Yes	Yes		Present shops are adequate. West Parley does not need enhancing. It is a lovely green area with shops, services, schools, local walks, trees, greens and history.	None, this wholesale change will spoil riverside areas and or community and village area. The proposed shops and public spaces necessary for large numbers of new housing will ruin our present village.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		502		
501234	Dr A Grieve		CSPS41	Policy FWP5	Yes	Yes									502		
508605	Miss Janet Ames		CSPS65	Policy FWP5	No	No		No	No	No	We voted against large scale development. We in West Parley or even Ferndown do not have large numbers of homeless. Where are these people coming from? Are we building for Bournemouth, Poole or London? There is a consistent 'Dump problems in Parley or Hurn'. Where is the transport? We have none in Dudsbury.	That you listen to the locals. I also hope that Iford and Christchurch will sue if water levels rise as flood water will be drained into the river.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	See above.	502		
503864	Heather Freeman		CSPS127	Policy FWP5		Yes			No		I believe that traffic is being re-routed and New Road will become a 1 way. This would have a massive effect on current residents and also restrict access to airport for fire and medical services.	Reduce the number of homes proposed, so reducing the population and road traffic. Consider introducing a roundabout instead of cross roads at Parley Cross.			502		
503869	Mrs Jean Khan		CSPS131	Policy FWP5	No	No		No	No	No	1. Movement of Green Belt to suit development plans. Contrasting to legislation covering preservation - maintenance of Green Belt land. 2. New shops will affect existing businesses. 3. New link road going through high density housing.	Major traffic improvements before any building takes place. Compensation to properties affected by changes in West Parley, eg. Housing estate instead of open views. Value of some properties will be reduced.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		502		
650107	Mr David Baxter		CSPS293	Policy FWP5							Parley Cross Junction. Banned movements: Right turn from New Road South to Christchurch Road East Right turn from Christchurch Road West to New Road South				502		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description		
											Left turn from Christchurch Road East to New Road South Hello? Perhaps the council should fund a day out for council members to sit on a grassy verge and observe the traffic, and the amount of traffic that make those turns. I'm sure the Tesco Express will be able to provide enough sustenance for the council to spend an entire day out. While banning those turns will reduce traffic flow, it will do so by forcing people to use alternative routes as I have previously discussed. Not a solution at all - go back to the drawing board and try again. I understand that alternative routes have been proposed to compensate. Unfortunately they are entirely unsatisfactory, and I will discuss these later in this letter.								
501766	Mr D E Anderton		CSPS417	Policy FWP5							We welcome the proposals to smarten up our 'shops'. However, we do have concerns with regard to the proposals for the Parley Cross junction and the impact of the link roads. We deduced from our discussion with council staff at a road-show that the specifications for the new road system have yet to be drafted, so we make the following comments based on the information given. 1. Will the traffic controls required at the junctions with the main roads and the link roads at best cancel out any benefit achieved by 'streamlining' Parley Cross? Yesterday evening the traffic was queued from Ferndown to Northbourne. What impact will a significant number of vehicles have entering that line of traffic from FWP6 and FWP7? 2. There needs to be careful consideration of the impact of the potential for increased levels of traffic on local roads, which will be a greater problem if as expected the road developments are not completed before housing development starts. As an example, Chine Walk is already a dangerous rush hour rat run. Yesterday evening we counted 10 cars waiting to exit Chine Walk to travel back towards the traffic lights, presumably to avoid the traffic backed up towards Ferndown on New Road. 3. Even with the link roads in place Chine Walk could be used as a link from Christchurch Road to New Road to travel back towards Bournemouth across Parley Cross. 4. The Core Strategy should require that all major road developments should be completed before any housing development is started. We have certainly seen this approach elsewhere, both at home and abroad.					502			
703944	Cllr John Little	Christchurch & East Dorset Conservative Association	CSPS449	Policy FWP5	Yes	No	Yes	Yes			The proposals fail to recognise the recommendations in the West Parley Parish Plan. Apart from the housing target of 320 there are no measurable targets on which to evaluate the proposals. The proposed highway improvements will result in a divided community rather than a "neighbourhood" as proposed in FWP5. The required funding for the highway improvements has not been adequately considered the major part of which will have to come from public funds. The effect of the improved traffic flows at this junction on neighbouring highways and communities has not been addressed.	Consideration to be given to the effect of neighbouring proposals and the desires / needs of the local community and to provide more realistic and measurable proposals.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		502				

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description					
											<p>The proposed development of 320 homes etc on the east side of New Road together with the proposed major highway improvements will in effect divide the existing community and will result in the loss of a very important green space. The proposed link road between Christchurch Road and New Road will in effect be a "rat run" and create potentially dangerous situations within a housing development which is to include social housing. The development of the superstore will not encourage small traders to open shops on the existing parade.</p> <p>How will the major road improvements be funded? The Transport Contributions will be insufficient.</p> <p>The proposals include for a "New Neighbourhood" at this location with a convenience foodstore on the eastern side and presumably improved retail outlets on the existing, western side. Shoppers will no doubt use the foodstore but how many will then attempt to negotiate a major road junction to the other side? A "New Neighbourhood" that is divided by a major road junction will hardly encourage shoppers or businesses. If the scheme is approved then it seems likely that 50% of the homes could be occupied and the development could stall due to lack of funds.</p> <p>This development is not supported and alternative sites within the urban areas should be investigated.</p>											
496749	Mr J S Davidson		CSPS696	Policy FWP5							<p>I have been given to understand that you are prepared to accept written personal submissions in the above connection. Before dealing with specific aspects of the EDDC proposals for West Parley I wish to offer general comment pertaining to the political, economic and social circumstances, which appear to have given rise to the centrally imposed obligation to provide housing on the scale indicated.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We are told that additional housing is vital. Why? – Because there are more people. Why? – Because of natural increase and immigrants. Population pressure has been exacerbated by successive Governments not having had a 'common sense' immigration policy. <p>Natural increase would see a steady, manageable demand for housing not the current mad dash to concrete over the countryside to meet Government targets, which targets have a national dynamic as well as a local one.</p> <p>We can, as a nation, have EITHER a Welfare State OR a permeable Immigration Policy but we cannot have both. We cannot ignore the root of the problem.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I have the uncomfortable feeling that many of the proposals were formulated by the planners without adequate consultation with the communities affected. Perhaps the current exercise will go some way to dispelling that impression and confirm the effectiveness of local democracy, particularly in regard to the Parish Plan, which did receive reasonably comprehensive circulation. The Plan was firmly against more than 100 houses being built in West Parley. • New housing on the scale suggested will irretrievably alter the landscape, destroy the residual semi-rural nature of the area and put intolerable pressure on services, roads and 					502						

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
											<p>other amenities. There is more than just a whiff of reliance, ultimately, on central government and some thought has to be given to future funding (roads etc) with all the obligations such funding would bring. West Parley is already being pressured into accepting a disproportionate share of the housing burden.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Besides the information and views from the planners it is vital that all parties who have a vested interest in any of the proposals be named so that transparency and accountability are established. The position of the present owners of the development land; of the likely commercial enterprises involved/approached; contractors, developers etc has to be declared as soon as possible. The channels through which the proposals are being driven and personalities (MP's, public servants et al) involved in whatever capacity must be identified. Presumably our local MP and the MEP are being kept appraised of developments. (Cc sent). <p>FWP5</p> <p>I am at a loss to comment on this proposal. I doubt that there is a more unattractive development than Parley Cross in the County. Any planning proposals pertaining to Parley Cross can suggest only cosmetic improvement; a solution is probably not possible.</p>							
654437	Mr Ron White		CSPS701	Policy FWP5	No	No	No	No	No	No	<p>FWP5 road relief.</p> <p>The proposal appears to have been put together as an afterthought for the benefit of the developers. There appears to have been no consultation or positive survey of the current or future road traffic or pedestrian use.</p> <p>1. Shoppers using the existing Parley Cross shopping area will be forced in a one way Northerly direction. Any driver wishing to travel north towards Ferndown, or east along Christchurch Road towards Hurn Airport after using the shops, will either have to turn left and battle 4 sets of traffic lights and eight mini roundabouts just to get across New Road towards Christchurch Road East, or the other alternative is to cross four lanes of extremely busy traffic, provided the cars waiting at the Parley Cross Roads traffic lights allow them to do so.</p> <p>The introduction of a further 3000 sq. ft. shopping area with limited parking will kill off the existing shops that are already struggling to survive.</p> <p>2. Traffic travelling south along New Road will be confronted with two extra sets of traffic lights before reaching New Road Bridge.</p> <p>There is no proposed relief for traffic turning left towards the airport (approximately 20%). That will require compulsory purchase of land and that of course will not be included in any budget.</p> <p>Southward flow of traffic from Ferndown towards New Road Bridge is currently unhindered until Wimborne Road roundabout.</p> <p>Under the new proposals this traffic will be held up at three different sets of traffic lights within 500yards which is a clear cause for increased congestion.</p> <p>It will be impossible to monitor and control 5 sets of traffic</p>	Extensive survey of traffic conditions and consultation with various road user groups	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination		502			

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											lights in the distance and amount of traffic travelling between them. 3. Traffic travelling east from Wimborne towards Bournemouth will be directed to turn right at a set of traffic lights, through a minor road with four mini roundabouts and finally to a set of traffic lights located on a bend, provided the road is not flooded it being built on the edge of a flood plain. If the traffic is able to turn right, with the backed up traffic from Wimborne Road, then that traffic being held up at New Road Bridge will cause traffic from New Road north to be held up. 4. Traffic travelling from Hurn to Bournemouth, including heavy Lorries, will cause greater congestion than already exists. At present traffic turning towards Bournemouth is filtered at the Cross Roads, allowing traffic to flow freely towards Bournemouth. This system at present can cause hold ups of up to two miles. If the new proposals are accepted, all traffic will have to stop at a set of lights at the new entrance to the high density housing estate. There is no provision for a filter lane, nor can there be, as local housing is too close to the Christchurch Road to allow one. This will cause even longer queues to form and cause extreme traffic disruption back further down the road towards Hurn Airport and the Bournemouth bypass. When the traffic finally turns left, they are confronted with a high density housing estate with children about and six mini roundabouts before being confronted with two further sets of traffic lights and likely congestion from traffic directed from Ferndown and Wimborne. 5. The proposed road through this estate cannot be laid as a normal light traffic constructed road. The amount of heavy Lorries, including gravel Lorries travelling along it in both directions, warrants this road to be built to a standard that will carry this extra heavy traffic, and be classified as an 'A' road 6. The width of the road depicted on information supplied to the public by Dorset County Council is extremely misleading. The road will have to be double the size as indicated on their paperwork. 7. There has already been instances of gravel lorries turning over on tight existing tight bends in the area, which could be exacerbated by the six mini roundabout they will have to negotiate to get to Bournemouth. The increase width of the road required will cause an even larger road access that will encroach and impact on cars exiting from the existing Parley Close entrance to Christchurch Road, including those coming from the Parley Sports and Church Lane exits.						
654783	Mrs Lesley Wilson		CSPS864	Policy FWP5	Yes	No	No			No	This introduces a completely new scheme for the layout of the West Parley village centre. It is described as being a "major environmental enhancement" and refers to "wholesale changes to the Parley Crossroads" but this final consultation	A further consultation.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		502		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
											on the Draft Core Strategy Presubmission is the first occasion that local people have seen the proposal. It should have been part of a previous full consultation so that local people could be involved in the spirit of the Localism Act, hence we consider that it was not Positively Prepared. Also, we believe that it was prepared before the arrival of the new National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) so may need alterations to make it Consistent with National Policy.							
654962	Mr Christopher Chope		CSPS923	Policy FWP5	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Policies FWP5, 6 and 7 together result in the removal of an essential part of the South East Dorset Green Belt from Green Belt designation. There is no justification for this, consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework which requires that development on land designated as Green Belt should be restricted when plan making is undertaken and that such a restriction should be part of the concept of sustainable development.	Deletion of these policies from the Plan.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	In order to reinforce the strong and deep rooted campaign by members of the West Parley community to preserve their Green Belt and prevent West Parley becoming assimilated as part of a suburb between Bournemouth and Ferndown.	502			
655496	Mr and Mrs S Williams		CSPS1026	Policy FWP5							It is not my job to check the Planning Policy Statement to determine whether or not the document is legally compliant. It is your job to ensure that the document is legally compliant. If you are sure the document is legally compliant why ask me? Don't pass the buck? I really don't know how many more letters I must write, informing you that I do not want you to build on FWP6 and FWP7. I am told that more houses need to be built but surely you can find an alternative site. Recently the field next to the River Stour in the area where you propose to build the new link road up to Dudsbury Heights with 220 houses was flooded and I can only imagine how much extra rainfall will be running down off the road surface when it will be impossible to be absorbed in the ground. House insurance companies are now asking how much the area you live in is likely to be threatened by flooding. So the higher the likelihood of flooding, the higher the insurance premium will be. At the moment I am able to advise my insurance co. that we do not have a problem with flooding. Will I still be able to say that when the concrete's gone down? If you think there is no further risk of flooding with the development in this low-lying area, try convincing the insurance companies! After all, the fields get flooded now – BEFORE THEY'VE BEEN BUILT ON! Please tell me how confident you are that the proposed development will not increase the risk of flood, crime, pollution and the loss of quality of life in the area. You say you want to preserve as much green belt as possible and stop urban sprawl, but I cannot understand this, when you seem to want to do the opposite. There is hardly any gap between Bournemouth and West Parley as it is. I have live in West Parley since 1983 and I have lived without a supermarket nearby quite successfully – just like millions of					502		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>other people in other towns and villages who don't want their area messed about with by dictators who don't even live there.</p> <p>Therefore, these dictators are the true 'not in MY back yard' NIMBYs who have the power to make others have it in their back yard instead. So much for local democracy. If there had been a supermarket there at Parley Cross, I would not have moved here. I am intrigued about the need for all these people to move here, when the employment is pretty much non-existent. The whole character of West Parley will change, as we will probably have an influx of take-aways (more litter and junk-mail) to follow the supermarket.</p> <p>Surely the house are the children of the residents to try to stop them moving away but I don't think this will change matters, you are just going to be bringing people in from out of the area. Therefore still not addressing the affordable housing for local residents.</p> <p>I love the photo of the proposed West Parley site outside the fish and chips parade under FWP5, you must live in a dream world if you really think that is going to be a true image. I noted also that in the 'before' photo, the trees are bare, but in the 'after' photo they are in full bloom. A nice crafty touch to make the scene look more attractive. Obviously deliberate, as this applies to both sets of photos and it is more computer work to alter the trees to green than to leave them bare. Also, if you compare the length and width of the bus lay-by to the passing traffic, you're going to need buses about four foot wide, and ten foot long.</p> <p>It's obvious that the councillors at East Dorset and the government have absolutely no idea about people's feelings and just ride roughshod over us. This will be the biggest mistake you have made for West Parley if you still build in the centre of West Parley – hindsight is a wonderful thing.</p>						
656402	Mrs Jean Williams		CSPS1161	Policy FWP5							<p>I am writing with my views on the building and drastic changes you are suggesting for West Parley. Firstly though I would say how under hand and undemocratic you have been. You seem to fo ignored The west parley residents and then only given us 12 weeks to respond. The plans that you have put forward are completely different from anything you put forward in your 2010 plans and have not involved the residents or the parish council.</p> <p>I do realise that there may have to be a small amount of building in the area (although I do not want any, I think West Parley is a big enough village0. To help the economy, create work and homes but I feel 520 houses an increase of 32% in one small village is way too much. Plus another 30 dwellings at Coppins and 110 at Holmwood which is just over a mile up the road.</p> <p>Where are all the services to accommodate 660 dwellings. The schools in Ferndown are full. There is a waiting list at Parley First School. I have to wait a week for a doctors appointment now, and there is no dentist and there is no mention from you at all of increasing these services.</p> <p>We do not need a new HIGH Street this is a village not a</p>				502		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>town. Shops are empty everywhere. Before Tesco took on the shop at the cross it was empty for 2 years and that was before the recession. No one wanted it.</p> <p>You have not said what there is going to be for all the children moving into the area, are they just going to hang around the streets? Another recipe for disaster.</p> <p>This whole area is important to wild life and you are taking 6,6% of our green belt in West Parley alone which is a huge amount..</p> <p>The fields near the bridge is a flood plain which regularly floods plus the water runs down the Ridgeway from the top fields.</p> <p>The fields in West Parley and Dudsbury Heights are key gaps to separate us from Bournemouth and prevent urban sprawl, without this we will just become part of Bournemouth.</p> <p>The new link roads will just become (rat runs) going through housing estates which will be a big danger to all that live there. Also you say about the new shops, the link roads will be taking the traffic away from the shops and there will be no trade. People will just not bother with it. You have not said anything about car parking either.</p> <p>What happened to the gyratory in your last set of plans??????????</p> <p>If the new roads are not going to be built until half the houses are built how is West Parley going to cope with all the traffic that 660 houses will bring.</p> <p>32% increase in houses in West Parley is way more than is being imposed on Corfe Mullen, Ferndown, Wimborne or Verwood. Maybe you could explain to me why.</p> <p>West Parley is on the flight path for the airport and I always thought that that fields in this area were a safety net for the airport. A prime example last year was the Red Arrow crash. If this all goes ahead.</p> <p>Where are the children going to go to school.? Will I be dead before I can get a doctors appointment? The green belt was put in place to safeguard our countryside and you are taking it away. What happens in 10-20-30 years time. Will you take more. What will happen to our green and pleasant land and the green English countryside ???</p>						
656748	Kerry Morris		CSPS1460	Policy FWP5		No					<p>I was born here in West Parley and I can say that I would not like affordable housing here. I would like to live nearer a town centre that has something going on, like Bournemouth. Build the homes where the young (20 year olds and above like me want to live.) There is no work or anything to do round West Parley because it is a country place where people retire too or want to live for some decent village life. Perhaps one day I will aspire to this type of living but dumping over 500 houses here without any decent thought or planning and no real commitment to additional amenities, roads, schools or concern for the Greenbelt land the existing Villagers (my friends and family here in West Parley) is disgusting and therefore makes FWP7 and FWP6 and FWP5 unsound and unjust.</p> <p>Build it where it's wanted not where you can think you can</p>				502		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
											easily dump it just to meet EDDC targets for affordable housing. Put it where it would better suited. Put it next to your offices In Furzehill, that a nice big piece of unused land you have around you. Plan for that as it would be easy to oversee from your office windows? Make a whole lot of sense to me ...look out the window not and think ...yes she is right. Thank me later for solving the whole issue here.							
656808	Mrs Pat Couper		CSPS1611	Policy FWP5		No					This document is unsound has not been researched and is totally unworkable. 1. Previous small business have moved away because the rents and costs of running a small business is not viable, together with the fact that Tesco Express has filled the requirements for local needs. 2. The road system planned is completely unworkable and with the increase in traffic created by 520 new propoerties would be unmanageable and dangerous. 3. The planned new supermarket appears to have very few parking spaces shown.				502			
656816	Mr P C Bamborough		CSPS1620	Policy FWP5							I write on behalf of the householders living at 88 and 88a New Road to object to the proposed development of a 32% increase in housing on current green belt land in this village. The infrastructure is totally unsustainable with a busy airport, industrial estate adjoining an already crowded at peak times, very congested roads. I have read the very detailed submissions of our local parish council and agree with them whole heartedly. A more modest increase of say 100 houses would be an acceptable alternative. We don't need more shops, the existing parades in the village struggle to survive and only do so by very specialist services (vet, tile shop, convenience store). Kinson and Ferndown shopping centres serve us well (yet they struggle) – witness the number of empty shops and duplication. It is important the village retains its distinct identity and instead of being totally submerged in a Greater Bournemouth. The proposed "relief road" from outside 86 New Road to Christchurch Road is laughable were it not being taken seriously by planners. It gives more congestion points – especially from/to a clogged Longham. Affordable housing needs to spread across all villages in East Dorset not a few				502			
359553	Mrs Linda Leeding	West Parley Parish Council	CSPS1631	Policy FWP5		No		No		No	This Plan is considered Unsound in that it is not consistent with National Policy and has not been Justified. N.P.P.F. 155 calls for "early and meaningful engagement and collaboration with a wide section of the community". E.D.D.C.s Statement of Community Involvement (part of the Core Strategy evidence base) calls for "active and continuous community involvement" in the planning process. These policies have been consistently ignored. E.D.D.C. has carried out the required formal consultations after plans have been produced, but the prior planning has been behind closed doors and requests for involvement have been turned down. When plans are published it is seen that little or no		Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination		502			

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description					
											attention has been paid to community aspirations. For instance, when the West Parley Parish Plan was delivered in 2011 it had no response or acknowledgement from E.D.D.C. Accordingly, we are unable to make responsible detailed comments relating to the new Centre Enhancement Scheme. To do so would require substantial engagement with E.D.D.C. planners on the planning details and thinking behind the parking, crossings, traffic flows, exits and entrances, recreational spaces and so on. This process has only just begun with an initial meeting on the new Link Road layout, at which we understood that no studies on traffic flow, environmental impact, road safety or funding had yet been done; and further that the road layout might yet be changed. The West Parley Parish Council's conclusion is that putting this policy (and the closely linked policies FWP6 and FWP7) forward for consultation at this stage is premature; evidence base has been produced; and that the NPPF and EDDC policies of community engagement should be properly implemented in this process.											
360060	Mr G.M Edwards		CSPS1675	Policy FWP5	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	<p>The Core Strategy response form is far from user friendly and must, by intention or otherwise, be devoid of easy understanding for many residents who will not reply because of inability to carry out in depth research to comply with the set out requirements.</p> <p>A high proportion of residents (and voters) are seriously concerned as evidenced by the WPPC. There is a strong feeling of being steamrollered into a not viable, ill conceived and poorly analysed situation that is judged to have so many flaws.</p> <p>It appears that the District Council has acceded to pressure and will accept written letters in lieu of the printed form. Given sufficient publicity it is an improvement, but is indicative of the odious air surrounding the whole proposal and action by many Councillors.</p> <p>Since Policies FW7, 6 and 5 are deemed to be unsound, not legally compliant, not justified, not effective and not consistent with National Policy, and bearing in mind Government Document PPS12, is now irrelevant. Any constructive support is negated by the lack of publicly widely reported analytical research to support viability.</p> <p>That such porous proposals should be enacted for the betterment of the West Parley area has at least to be highly questionable.</p> <p>At a time of national hardship, and possible future uncertainty of national wealth, to proceed must impose measures by councils and supportive interests of prolonged misery for which they must become accountable.</p> <p>The situation is such that it has become virtually impossible to analytically discuss with the District Council potential problems such as:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Increasing probability of flooding. 2. Full public analysis of true housing requirements, devoid of promoting house building and construction work. 3. Excessive affordable housing will inevitably attract or be 					502						

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description						
											<p>allocated to many families who are not self supporting. Consequently, rate payers will have to heavily subsidise the numerous forms of support requirements.</p> <p>4. Infrastructure in the form of schools, church, medical, care and pastime facilities will be further burdens to be carried.</p> <p>5. The 100 houses as originally proposed by WPPC would be viable and support local shops. A supermarket would kill local traders and add further road chaos.</p> <p>6. Current West Parley traffic problems are of short duration and no more than many other spots in the area. Road changes may well lead to estate road hazards.</p> <p>7. Sites of interest, green belt land and wooded areas should not be decimated and sacrificed at the seemingly whim of Councillors or others who seem to dismiss the word sacrosanct when associated with West Parley and other contentious areas in the Core Strategy Plan.</p>												
491020	Mr Simon Jordan		CSPS1713	Policy FWP5		No					<p>With reference to FWP5 and FWP5 I would like to say that I am appalled by the lack of consultation with West Parley residents and the local District Parish council who undoubtedly know more about their local area. The Core document is unsound in many areas but I particularly notice that the subsequent need for schools has not been realistically addressed. Even by your own evidence you identify that at least a new primary school would be required immediately. You also identify a need for £2.1 million to build this primary school. Yet your own evidence indicates no funding is available, no match funding in part and no source of funding identified. Indeed this area of your evidence is blank. Therefore the document and proposal is unsound. Furthermore it is unjustified because there is no space for suitable road improvements and that putting in a further 4 sets of traffic lights around West parley cross is unjustified and will add to the already overloaded crossroads and surrounding access roads.</p> <p>The fields contain grade 2 agricultural land used for human food, are Green Belt boundary Land and also contain on or near sites of Historical value in Dudsbury Rings Fort and All Saints Church listed in the Domesday book.</p> <p>For these reasons and many more the Core Document and its Proposals for West parley FWP5 and FWP6 are not just unjustified but also unfair in their impact on West Parley Village which will be decimated of its identity and character.</p>					502							
498044	Miss Carolyne Banks		CSPS1793	Policy FWP5	No	No		Yes	Yes	Yes	Policy reduces traffic lanes in an already over-congested area. Policy reduces parking at the shops. Yet policy is adding an enormous amount of traffic due to new homes.	Scrap the plan.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		502								
535063	Ms Karen Morris		CSPS1685	Policy FWP5		No		Yes			I have lived in West Parley for 22 years. In that time I have watched the high street change and the shops go from Butchers and Bakers to Bathroom tiles and garden sheds. FWP6, FWP5 and FWP7 are unsound because the shopping issue is not properly addressed. Whilst you propose to build shops you have not identified what they would be and their relevance to Qwest Parley. I have investigated with you and you have also said that you are not responsible for the type of				502								

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>business that can then occupy these shops. What good is that if we have another toilet and bath selling shop? Therefore your document in these areas is totally unsound. Additionally you say that people have requested more retail shop in Parley which is a lie. No residents have requested more superstores, I am told that at a meeting on 11 June in your chambers you said that people in West Parley had asked for a superstore and that when pressed you changed this to other retailers had asked. Naturally competitors to the current Tesco in parley would suggest another store (E, G. Co-OP Sainsbury). No locals have. You constantly devise and distort the content of all your proposed evidence for building homes in west Parley that are not required, cannot be serviced properly by roads, schools or doctors surgeries and you indicate no realistic funding for any of these. You suggest that money for the roads will after the houses have been built. This is ridiculous unsound and even a child planning a toy house starts with roads and improvement.</p> <p>Finally I have constantly defended the Greenbelt fields in this area and will continue to do so. The fields are part of the Key gap structure to prevent convergence with Bournemouth and Ferndown and Kinston. This gap gives the village its identity and your document does nothing to accommodate this identity or the villagers and residents concerns to preserve it. Your document is Unjustified in this area too with reference to FWP5,6 and 7. It is unsound in its approach as the local conservative MP Chris Chope has told me personally and written to me personally to say that the Green Belt in Parley is Sacrosanct. David Cameron also indicates under the Big Society and localism bill you are suppose to take your lead and consult with the Locals. I am a local and you have never listened too and acted on my copious correspondence before. Therefore your proposal is unsound and unjustified because it fails to consult with residents in the directly affected area of West Parley.</p> <p>The proposal uses misguidance and evidence manipulation and spin to fabricate evidence that is untrue and unfair in its representation.. This makes the document unfair, unsound and unjustified. You have no money in the council to fund this proposal in full and you are highly likely to fail to complete any of the proposals fully. You should be ashamed to reference building high density housing in areas (FWP6, FWP7) without proper infrastructure proposals, funding, amenities or evidence from those affected or those who need it. Until the 3000 people waiting on the housing list are identified as from this area and absolutely in need then I feel the document is entirely unsound.</p>						
537014	Master Kieran Morris		CSPS1693	Policy FWP5		No					<p>I have lived and played round here all my life, 18 years. I love my village and my home in West Parley and I am disappointed that you are planning to destroy the Green Belt fields in my village. FWP7, FWP6 and FWP5 are unsound because they take no account of people my age, teenagers who already live and enjoy staying here. There are no sound plans or money for facilities and communities that would</p>				502		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
											accommodate my peer group. More housing would just add to the problem as you have clearly not thought about or have funding for roads or schools. My name should be on the housing list because I live here. Who are the 3000 plus other people on this list? Until this need for housing is accurately identified then this document is unsound and wholly unjustified. On a personal not it will destroy my home village and its identity which makes the core strategy proposal UNFAIR to!!!!							
495200	Mr and Mrs J M B Webber		CSPS1875	Policy FWP5		No			Yes		Insufficient traffic analysis is available on impact of: - change in Parley Cross Traffic Management - new housing and consequential work, school and domestic traffic - 4 new non-trivial traffic junctions - size and placement - link road design for heavy use within residential areas	Full analysis of above - particularly at peak traffic flow times, and predictions to increase in economic activity and residential activity.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		502			
656940	Mrs Sheila Edwards		CSPS1677	Policy FWP5	No	No		Yes	Yes	Yes	The response form on the above matter is far from user friendly and must, by intention or otherwise, be devoid of easy understanding for many residents who will not reply because of inability to carry out in depth research to comply with the set out requirements. A high proportion of residents (and voters) are seriously concerned as evidenced by the WPPC. There is a strong feeling of being steamrollered into a not viable, ill conceived and poorly analysed situation that is judged to have so many flaws. It appears that the District Council ha acceded to pressure and will accept written letters in lieu of the printed form. Given sufficient publicity it is an improvement, but is indicative of the odious air surrounding the whole proposal and action by many Councillors. Since Policies FW7, 6 and 5 are deemed to be unsound, not legally complaint, nor justified not effective and not consistent with National Policy, and bearing in mind Government Document PPS12, is now irrelevant. Any constructive support is negated by the lack of publicly widely reported analytical research to support viability. That such porous proposals should be enacted for the betterment of the West Parley area has at least to be highly questionable. At a time of national hardship, and possible future uncertainty of national wealth, to proceed must impose measures by councils and supportive interests of prolonged misery for which they must become accountable. The situation is such that it has become virtually impossible to analytically discuss with the District Council potential problems such as: 1) Increasing probability of flooding. 2) Full public analysis of true housing requirements, devoid of promoting house building and construction work. 3) Excessive affordable housing will inevitably attract or be allocated to many families who are not self supporting. Consequently, rate payers will have to heavily subsidise the numerous forms of support requirements. 4) Infrastructure in the form of schools, church, medical, care					502		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description			
											and pastime facilities will be further burdens to be carried. 5) The 100 houses as originally proposed by WPPC would be viable and support local shops. A supermarket would kill local traders and add further road chaos. 6) Current West Parley traffic problems are of short duration and no more than many other spots in the area. Road changes may well lead to estate road hazards. 7) Sites of interest, green belt land and wooded areas should not be decimated and sacrificed at the seemingly whim of Councillors or others who seem to dismiss the word sacrosanct when associated with West Parley and other contentious areas in the Core Strategy Plan.									
656999	Mrs Sheila Gooden		CSPS1697	Policy FWP5							1) Loss of Green Belt. This is the last green space of any note between West Parley and the coast. This needs to be kept as a breathing space from Urban Sprawl. 2) The infrastructure is not adequate to take such large scale development. 3) The planned road system does not seem to have been thought through. Bringing a road across ground which is of scientific and historical interest including broad leaf trees seems to fly in the face of all the Oak Trees that have TPO's on them. The field that the road is due to connect with is a well known flood plain and was totally underwater only a few weeks ago. Taking a road through a housing development that will no doubt have probably many children living there seems to be an accident waiting to happen. 4) It appears that the concerns voiced by the residents of West Parley in the exercise undertaken a year or two ago seem to have been totally ignored. I have yet to meet anyone who said we needed a High Street or an even larger Supermarket. Where did that come from? We have a Tesco's Express that stocks all basic needs, we also have a very good Chemists and also a Post Office so most day to day needs are covered. The shops that are here are businesses that have been in West Parley for many years and we do not end up with empty shops for months on end. The only place in West Parley Village which is a bit of an eyesore is the Old Garage Site. 5) Where are the people who need these houses? Are they local residents to Dorset or are we to be used as a lung for people from inner cities who have had their rent allowances cut. When we have had meetings regarding the development of West Parley not once have we had anyone come and stand up and say that they need housing and that we are being NIMBY ish! We agreed that we were willing to accept some development but not once have we been fully consulted on any strategy. 6) Schools and Clinical Facilities. Where are the plans for children to be schooled.? I understand that the schools are already to capacity in which case surely a new or much extended school would be needed. I understand that there is not enough space to extend the school that we have. With so many new houses the Doctor's Surgery in Glenmoor Road would not be able to cope and this is possibly the same for						502			

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>the Dentists in the area assuming a lot of new residents would need an NHS dentist.</p> <p>7) The planned houses would also be under the flight area of planes coming in and out of Bournemouth Airport. This cannot be a healthy situation for residents and also the fact that it is not unknown for planes to crash in the area.</p> <p>8) We have next to no problems with damage or vandalism and doing some research these types of development lead to damage, graffiti and poor relations with neighbours. It is also known that trying to sell affordable houses can be problematic because of this type of damage, which could mean that the whole development becomes social housing.</p> <p>9) Where is the Public Transport. The buses that there are take an eternity to get anywhere quickly. They are also very expensive to use. Dorset is classed a a wealthy county. There maybe a lot of expensive properties but the salaries paid in this are are mostly low paid.</p> <p>10) Jobs. Where are all these people going to work? Even if Ferndown Industrial Estate is extended most of these types of units only employ a few people. Assuming that the current world situation improves in the near future it could possibly be many years before there is any meaningful employment in the area.</p> <p>11) It does appear that the planners have looked at a nice green area, and without any consideration for the local people, decided it could solve a large number of Dorset's housing problems.</p> <p>12) This needs to go back to the drawing board with West Parley residents properly consulted.</p>						
657003	Mr Robin Gooden		CSPS1704	Policy FWP5							<p>The proposed massive housing expansion at West Parley is totally un-acceptable, it increases the housing stock by a huge 32% without the additional infrastructure increase to match it. The new residents will have no schools and no work opportunities in the local area. This will in turn lead to additional traffic on already overcrowded roads due to the additional travel they will have to undertake to reach work. The proposed road runs across the flood plain adjacent to the river Stour and floods following heavy rains and will require extensive piling and building up as a raised structure or on a causeway. It appears that the concerns voiced by the residents of West Parley in the exercise undertaken a year or two ago seem to have been totally ignored. I have yet to meet anyone who said we needed a High Street or an even larger Supermarket. Where did that come from? We have a Tesco's Express that stocks all basic needs, we also have a very good Chemists and also a Post office so most day to day needs are covered. The shops that are here are businesses that have been in West Parley for many years and we do not end up with empty shops for months on end. The only place in West Parley Village which is a bit of an eyesore is the Old Garage Site.</p> <p>The public consultation appears to have been a complete farce as all the resident's fears and concerns have been totally ignored. Whilst we appreciate everyone has to live</p>				502		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>somewhere a reduced scheme would be more appropriate. The plans should be amended I suggest this is the best course of acting for this area and expect you to support this approach.</p>						
657007	Mrs Hilary Jordan		CSPS1716	Policy FWP5							<p>In response to the core strategy consultation, which I believe is unsound in numerous areas. Firstly I am amazed at the lack of consultation with Local Residents and the Parish Council; I would suggest they know more about the local area than you do.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What about the need for Schools, and the funding? • What about the road improvements, additional traffic lights is not the answer? • What about the Historical sites such as Dudsbury Rings Fort? <p>To conclude, not only am I appalled by the Core Strategy Consultation, but disgusted at the total waste in tax payers' money of producing it and all the pointless meetings I am sure you have undertaken.</p>				502		
657018	Mr Stuart Couper		CSPS1719	Policy FWP5	No						<p>This document is unsound has not been researched and is totally unworkable.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Previous small business have moved away because the rents and costs of running a small business is not viable, together with the fact that Tesco express has filled the requirements for local needs. 2. The road system planned is completely unworkable and with the increase in traffic created by 520 new properties would be unmanageable and dangerous. 3. The planned new supermarket appears to have very few parking spaces shown. 				502		
359553	Mrs Linda Leeding	West Parley Parish Council	CSPS1995	Policy FWP5	No			Yes			<p>This Plan is considered Unsound in that it is not consistent with National Policy and has not been Justified. N.P.P.F. 155 calls for "early and meaningful engagement and collaboration with a wide section of the community". E.D.D.C.s Statement of Community Involvement (part of the Core Strategy evidence base) calls for "active and continuous community involvement" in the planning process. These policies have been consistently ignored. E.D.D.C. has carried out the required formal consultations after plans have been produced, but the prior planning has been behind closed doors and requests for involvement have been turned down. When plans are published it is seen that little or no attention has been paid to community aspirations. For instance, when the West Parley Parish Plan was delivered in 2011 it had no response or acknowledgement from E.D.D.C. Accordingly, we are unable to make responsible detailed comments relating to the new Centre Enhancement Scheme. To do so would require substantial engagement with E.D.D.C. planners on the planning details and thinking behind the parking, crossings, traffic flows, exits and entrances, recreational spaces and so on. This process has only just begun with an initial meeting on the new Link Road layout, at which we understood that no studies on traffic flow, environmental impact, road safety or funding had yet been</p>		Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination		502		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
											done; and further that the road layout might yet be changed. The West Parley Parish Council's conclusion is that putting this policy (and the closely linked policies FWP6 and FWP7) forward for consultation at this stage is premature; that they should not be put to the public until and unless a satisfactory evidence base has been produced; and that the NPPF and EDDC policies of community engagement should be properly implemented in this process.							
361035	Mrs H.L O'Sullivan		CSPS2278	Policy FWP5							<p>I strongly object to the proposed imposition of 500+ houses on West Parley. Increasing the current housing stock by 32%! For the following reasons I would consider the proposal to be not legally compliant and unsound.</p> <p>1) These developments will seriously erode the green belt gap, designed to prevent urban sprawl and the merger of settlements. West Parley will be a suburb of Bournemouth leaving only a very narrow river corridor between the Bournemouth and Ferndown.</p> <p>2) Previous documents have also expressed concern with regards flooding resulting from substantial development in the area so close to the river. : "Insufficient weight given in the Strategy to the desirability of maintaining, protecting and wherever possible restoring the rivers and their corridors. Any type of built development close to or within the river corridors will increase existing floor risk." (Quote – Non Preferred Option CS PreSub 08 Ferndown and West Parley Proposals Background Paper)</p> <p>3) The development is being forced on the area despite the opinions of residents</p> <p>Against the government's policy of not imposing top down planning. The consultation document states there have been numerous consultation meetings with West Parley Residents Association, but little notice seems to have been taken of the opinions expressed by the WRPA. More than 1000 residents contributed to the local parish plan, suggesting 100 new homes would be more realistic. The suggestion is made in the core strategy document that there has been little interest and local response to previous planning documents. Could this be because in the previous planning document, development at West Parley was the "non-preferred option"? Local residents were mislead into thinking a "non-preferred option" meant the council would not want to further pursue development in this area and thus there was no need to respond.</p> <p>4) Although just outside the protection zone surrounding the Parley Common heathland the developments, particularly FWP6, are very close to Parley Common. Additional housing and population moving into the area will inevitably cause extra pressure on the rare habitat. Natural England and RSPB have expressed concerns regarding the developments. FWP6 & 7</p> <p>"Natural England – Object. This site offers significant green infrastructure that could remove potential adverse effects (from recreational pressure) on the Dorset heaths and increase the value for biodiversity. Disproportionate ratio of</p>				502			

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>housing to the Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG) proposed.</p> <p>English Heritage – Object. To ensure the national significance of Dudsbury Camp is conserved, its values must first be fully appreciated. Specific detailed evidence must therefore be gathered to inform consideration of the areas suitability, the proximity and the form of any future potential development.</p> <p>RSPB – We agree with the findings of the Habitats Regulations Assessment in connection with the proposed housing sites within these areas. We Object “(Quote – Non Preferred Option CS PreSub 08 Ferndown and West Parley Proposals Background Paper)</p> <p>5) FWP6 development is very close to the flight path. Noise levels from aircraft</p> <p>Are considerable in this area and will only increase as the air traffic increases. This will not make for very pleasant living conditions.</p> <p>6) The proposed roads through the developments will not alleviate the pressure</p> <p>On New Road and the Parley Cross junction. The additional car movements caused by the increase in houses will add to the problems on New Road. Frequently during the day, not just at rush hours, the traffic queues back from the Northbourne Roundabout past the Parley Cross traffic lights back to Ferndown. This situation will not be improved by 2 new junctions feeding into New Road through the two new estates. Added congestion on New Road can only lead to more congestion on Christchurch Road as Parley crossroads try to accommodate the additional traffic.</p> <p>7) The increase of 30% in West Parley housing stock will totally swamp the</p> <p>Current village. Changing a semi rural village into a suburban location.</p> <p>8) A large supermarket will also increase the traffic coming into the area. We are</p> <p>Already served well by supermarkets in Ferndown, and a substantial Tesco express at Parley Cross.</p> <p>9) There does not appear to have been any consideration of additional strain</p> <p>On other local amenities such as schools, doctors, sewerage systems etc.</p>						
474971	Mr Peter Durant		CSPS2207	Policy FWP5							<p>I am writing to protest about the proposed building plans for West Parley.</p> <p>I have major concerns about the whole thrust of the proposals. I am appalled at the manner in which East Dorset has carried out substantial consultations in West Parley, and then completely ignored the results. It was not long ago that the Prime Minister stated that it was his intention that local matters should be determined locally. I recognise that East Dorset Council has cynically combined West Parley with Ferndown in their deliberations to justify their plans. This is neither fair nor justifiable. The people of Ferndown are not directly affected by the proposals. The ancient parish of West Parley has throughout history to the present day been</p>				502		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>regarded as a proper village, with an identity distinct from Ferndown. It appears that East Dorset Council has conveniently ignored this aspect.</p> <p>This leads directly to the first point that I wish to make.</p> <p>1st. The proposed plans would produce a 32% increase in the housing stock of West Parley which would be far in excess of the proposals for other communities in East Dorset.</p> <p>2nd I believe that the proposal to build on Greenbelt land is flawed in a number of regards. The green belt designation was originally set up to avoid the sort of development that is proposed for West Parley. There will be very little to separate West Parley from the northern fringes of Bournemouth if the development goes ahead. The open fields that provide pleasant vistas to the east of New Road, and to the south of Christchurch Road will be replaced by urbanisation. The extent of the additional buildings will create many more vehicle movements at the West Parley junction, and despite the planned diversions, will cause yet more traffic chaos.</p> <p>3rd. The proposed filter roads connecting Christchurch Road to the southern section of New Road will be passing through the proposed urban development, which will almost certainly bring children into close proximity with substantial traffic movements, many of which will be heavy goods vehicles.</p> <p>4th The idea that alterations to the road network will bring about long term easing of congestion is naïve. There is almost certainly a substantial unmet demand for rush hour commuters to travel the east-west, and the north south corridors, which will probably flood these roads if additional road space is provided. The evidence for that is that when the previous alterations were made to the junction, it took just 6 months for the designed capacity to be exceeded by the flood of extra vehicles.</p> <p>5th. The District Council encouraged West Parley to provide a Parish plan. Before this was adopted by the Parish Council, the local citizens were formally consulted. The District Council have ignored it.</p> <p>I have identified most of my points. However, just in case these need to be linked to the planning policy numbering I will respond to these.</p> <p>FWP5 I see no need for an additional supermarket. Any additional local shops be it Baker, Greengrocer or other would fail in any attempt to compete with supermarkets just as they have before. I do not believe that there are enough Plymouth Brethren in West Parley to warrant a new church.</p> <p>FWP6 The main reason such a large number of houses are being proposed is so that alterations to the road network can be funded by developers. They should not be being built on greenbelt land for the reasons that I have already identified. The junction is at full capacity throughout the rush hour period. The traffic engineers have agreed on that, so the only way things could get worse is by an extension of the period during which chaos reigns. I believe that alterations to the road network will almost certainly encourage yet more vehicles. Emerging from this is that additional road space is an exercise in futility. So, if the junction remains largely as it</p>						

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
											is, there is less justification for using greenbelt land. FWP7 The same objections that I identified in my response to FWP6 apply to this. To finish: Various suggestions were made at the meetings for alternative land fit for development. There is the brown field land around Boundary Lane. The water company suggested their site off Old Ham Lane. So there are alternatives around. It appears to me that authorities are fixated about the traffic at West Parley and all the extra housing changes are being made so that changes to the road infrastructure can be funded.							
494600	Mrs Audrey Russell		CSPS2246	Policy FWP5							Initially I would like to state that this the first time that these plans have been made available to local residents, and the proposals that have been put forward in them show that comments made by the public to previous plans appear, in the main, to have been ignored. I live in the area between two of the proposed areas of redevelopment – Coppins Nursery (FWP4) and West Parley crossroads (FWP5, 6 and 7). My concerns regarding the 30 proposed houses at Coppins is that you could, potentially, have 60 vehicles entering and leaving this area via the Christchurch Road. This is a road that is already carrying more traffic than it was designed for, and where it is the norm for the traffic to be travelling in excess of the speed limit. There have been a number of deaths and 'near misses' on this stretch of road, and adding another busy junction will only exacerbate this situation. West Parley is a village, but you are suggesting increasing its housing stock by one third. This will change the whole character of the area and I do not believe that the need for this scale of development in the village has been proved. Green Belt was put in place to prevent 'urban sprawl', and yet you are planning to redefine its boundaries to allow just that. An increase in the number of houses in West Parley by 520 will result in an increase in the number of cars – possibly by 1000. New Link roads may appear to ease the flow of traffic through the Parley crossroad junction, but the traffic on the entry roads to the village (Christchurch Road – west and east, and New Road – north and south) will be carrying even more traffic that they do currently. You are just moving the current congestion further away from the junction but not resolving the problem. With the proposed increase in population in the village, I feel that there will be an increased need for medical services (doctors and dentists), and for schools. These do not appear to have been considered in the proposed plan. I would appreciate you taking these points into consideration before a final decision is made regarding the future of our area					502		
656750	Mr Kevin Streets	Foxes Commercial Ltd	CSPS2272	Policy FWP5	No	No					The forecourt of 177 - 183B New Road, West Parley is a gated private parking area for these premises, in the ownership of the Trustees of T.H. Squire deceased. They are included within the red marked area of FWP5 which is in error.	To omit the area referred to in 6 above which is privately owned.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	A. To ensure the above is carried out. B. To comment on the overall proposals.	502			

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
503395	Mr Ian Davis		CSPS2316	Policy FWP5		No		Yes		Yes	<p>Policy FWP5 – West Parley Village Centre Scheme. This plan is considered Unsound in that it is not consistent with National Policy and has not been justified.</p> <p>*N.P.P.F. 155 calls for “early and meaningful engagement and collaboration with a WIDE section of the community”. E.D.D.C.’s Statement of Community Involvement (core strategy evidence base)calls for, active and continuous community involvement, in the planning process. These policies have been consistently ignored.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prior planning behind closed doors. • Requests for participation has been turned down. • Little or no attention given to villagers aspirations. • After 2011 Parish Plan, no discussions or response from EDDC <p>Resulted from it. *</p> <p>The above text between the asterisks (*) is repeated throughout letter.</p> <p>Accordingly, I am unable to make responsible and detailed comments relating to EDDC’s proposals for OUR village centre, this policy should not be put forward for consultation at this stage, due to the NPPF and EDDC policies of community engagement.</p>				502		
512459	Sandra Davis		CSPS2350	Policy FWP5		No		Yes		Yes	<p>Policy FWP5 – West Parley Village Centre Scheme. This plan is considered Unsound in that it is not consistent with National Policy and has not been justified.</p> <p>*N.P.P.F. 155 calls for “early and meaningful engagement and collaboration with a WIDE section of the community”. E.D.D.C.’s Statement of Community Involvement (core strategy evidence base)calls for, active and continuous community involvement, in the planning process. These policies have been consistently ignored.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prior planning behind closed doors. • Requests for participation has been turned down. • Little or no attention given to villagers aspirations. • After 2011 Parish Plan, no discussions or response from EDDC <p>Resulted from it. *</p> <p>The above text between the asterisks (*) is repeated throughout letter.</p> <p>Accordingly, I am unable to make responsible and detailed comments relating to EDDC’s proposals for OUR village centre, this policy should not be put forward for consultation at this stage, due to the NPPF and EDDC policies of community engagement.</p>				502		
535574	Mr and Mrs Ralph Williams		CSPS2299	Policy FWP5							<p>I write to registry my formal objection to the building of 200 houses on the FWP 7, 320 houses and 33,000 sq.ft Foodstore on FWP 6 and to Major Enhancements to the West Parley Village Centre FWP 5 sites for the following under mentioned reasons, some of the points below also apply to Coppins Nursery FWP 6 (corrected to FWP4 by F.P. officer) which is more suited to an elderly care facility. The points raised below are by no means extensive and having read the councils proposals and accompanying documents which are contradicting and lack robust evidence as a result The</p>	<p>Site is not sustainable. Not suitable for development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No consideration give to flooding. - The Burro Happold B3073 Corridor Study 2011 needs much more detail 	<p>Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination</p>	<p>To protect the rural aspects of West Parley. Avoid damage to a Heritage Site. To Preserve the habitat of many species of wild animals and birds.</p>	502		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy Plan is therefore Unsound and Non-Compliant.</p> <p>The Consultation process is unsatisfactory.</p> <p>The Planning system is there to enable Sustainable Development to ensure the right development takes place in the right locations. It is there to protect Green Belt Land and ensure homes are provided on the right sites to meet the needs of both the established community and the people who are likely to live in the proposed new homes. Local Plans must take account of local concerns and wishes of the local population as required by the new Localism legislation. No account has been taken to current Government legislation that requires any L.A. to consult fully with local communities before setting out proposals. EDDC planners have ignored this legislation and failed to consult.</p> <p>West Parley P.C. has produced, following a lengthy consultation with residents, a well publicised Parish Plan, copies of which were sent to EDDC. In this Plan residents are overwhelmingly against having no more than about 100 houses built in West Parley. This information, contrary to new legislation, has been ignored by EDDC planners and the results have not been represented in any of the draft reports. To build more than 100 houses in the Village of West Parley would create an unbroken urban sprawl from Bournemouth to Ferndown with West Parley losing its unique identity and become just another small part of a very large conurbation.</p> <p>Green Belt Considerations.</p> <p>These proposals are in direct conflict with current green belt national planning policy CSIDE1, indeed the L.A. has itself successfully used that policy at planning appeals which has been upheld the planning inspectorate, if challenge is the L.A. expecting that given past decisions the planning inspectorate will change this view on green belt policy. Certainly it will be a major consideration if these proposals are called in by the Secretary of State.</p> <p>No tree survey has been carried out particularly in relation to FWP7 or considerations given to the habitat of many protected species of animals which inhabit this site that has established trees, hedge rows and stream that have remained unaltered for 100 of years. Also this area contains public footpaths with associated rights of way. English Nature do not appear to have been consulted in regard to this site nor it would seem have the Rivers Authority. Dudsbury Rings is an important heritage site and this proposed development is too close to this monument not for it to have an impact on protected heritage site. There is no evidence that English Heritage has been consulted in this regard.</p> <p>Sustainability</p> <p>Sustainability should be the mainstay of any planning policy and on FWP5, FWP6, FWP7 and FWP4 the proposals fails to demonstrate that any of these sites are sustainable.</p> <p>To include a un-needed 3300 sq ft supermarket in the plans for FWP6 will not make this site appropriate for housing. It will add considerably to traffic congestion.</p> <p>Lack of consideration for families that will live in these</p>						

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>proposed house and their children’s education needs are not address, Parley First School has little or no capacity is over 1.5 miles from these sites and no mention is made of middle or upper schools both in Ferndown and over 2.5 miles away with little or no public transport, putting aside the danger of the number of main roads to be negotiated the increase in car usage will again add to traffic congestion.</p> <p>Transport Transport seems largely to be ignored and no full traffic survey has been conducted to support or refute these plans. The B3073 crossing New Road from the Airport to Longham at peak times is already operating way beyond its capacity as is New Road. No amount of improvements to Parley Cross will improve the situation. To add 560 new Homes to these roads plus a super market with 22 car space when also adding the proposed increase in traffic at the airport the potential to add in the region of 1000 new cars to this junction is totally un- sustainable and unpractical for both the existing and the would be residents of these proposed developments. The 2 new roads proposed around the proposed building sites will only move congestion from one point to another and do not address the underlying problems of the current over capacity of New Road and the B3073. The industrial estate at the Airport supports over 2000 workers the majority of which in the main commute by car, most with single occupancy and this number is set to increase. This already causes major congestion at peck times The two proposed new roads will not alleviate the problem.</p> <p>With regard to the proposed road too the West from New Road and part of FWP7 this appears to cut across an existing Flood Plain and this issue has not been addressed by way of a Flood Risk Assessment, discussions with the Rivers Authority or an Environmental Report. This site is know to flood in winger and with the changes in climate the situation is unlikely to improve. No evidence that the Environmental Agency has been consulted on this matter. Covering more of this land with a large scale development will only compound the situation.</p> <p>Infrastructure. No evidence is supplied to support on how Surface and Foul Drainage will be accommodated or Gas, Water and Electricity and if the existing local infrastructure can support this addition 560 homes and a new Food Store.</p> <p>Site FWP 6 Another Supermarket in the area is not needed and will only bring in as mentioned much more traffic and delivers to the already overcrowded roads of West Parley. Sufficient supermarkets already exist within 3 mile radius of West Parley and 3 Tesco Express shops exist in a radius of 1 mile of Parley Cross. Also there appears no demand for allotments or orchards. Adequate public open space is already available in the village.</p> <p>Environmental Issues No consideration appears of have been given to the impact that noise will have on these proposed sites due to the</p>						

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>location in relation to the flight path to and from Bournemouth Airport. There is no evidence that any sound test have been carried or other environmental issues have been addressed in having large developments close to an expanding airport. Needs Survey and consideration for alternative Brownfield sites</p> <p>There seems little or no evidence that these number of homes are needed in this location and no supporting evidence to justify 50% affordable. Many undeveloped sites are available in the Ferndown area much closer to schools and local amenities some are Brownfield sites these have the potential to deliver hundreds of homes and that is without the windfall sites that will certainly occur. No consideration has been given to alternatives sites.</p> <p>All the sites above in there present form are totally Unsustainable please I would urge both the elected members and the officers of the council not to dismiss the local residents of the Village of West Parley and deny us our democratic right to have a say in plans that will have a impact massively on the environment in which we live. Details from West Parley P.C. not considered.</p> <p>Lack of Consultation Loss of Green Belt land not justified Lack of Consultation with English Nature, Rivers Authority, English Heritage, No Tree survey. Relies on New Link Road. Part in Flood Plains.</p>						
656476	Mrs Anita Howe		CSPS2623	Policy FWP5							<p>I have a financial interest in the shops and flats located between 177a and 183b New Rd, to the north of the Parley Cross intersection.</p> <p>I have the following concerns about the proposals made under FWP5, and how they may affect the businesses located in our shops:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parking FWP5 as proposed, sacrifices some of the already critically limited parking spaces, in favour of paved, planted & seating areas. This change will in my view have a highly negative impact on these shops. • Traffic Throughput FWP5 as proposed, using pedestrian crossings will in my view reduce traffic throughput through the intersection, increase jams, and lead to greater carbon emissions from queuing traffic stopped waiting for the lights. • Pedestrian Access FWP5 as proposed, using pedestrian crossings at the lights is likely to deter pedestrian access from the proposed new population centre, to the East of New Rd. I would urge this approach to be re-considered in favour of pedestrian underpasses or foot-bridges. 				502		
656479	Mr Geoffrey Squire		CSPS2622	Policy FWP5							<p>I have a financial interest in the shops and flats to the north of New Road. (177a – 183b)</p> <p>On your plan you have incorporated our private parking forecourt.</p> <p>Without this parking area our shops would not be viable. This proposal leaves no parking spaces for our shops or flats.</p>				502		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
											<p>Already, flat tenants, shopkeepers and their employees are not parking their own vehicles on the forecourt between 9a.m. – 5p.m. so as to leave these very precious car parking spaces available for any potential shop customers.</p> <p>Unfortunately, people are very time short today so if customers are unable to park outside of these shops they will drive on.</p> <p>This will have a very detrimental effect on the livelihood of the current shopkeepers and their staff.</p> <p>This would end up leaving businesses closing down and the shop fronts being boarded up.</p> <p>These shops do not make a huge financial return for the shopkeepers and I believe by not having a parking forecourt they would defiantly close down.</p>							
360190	Mr John Cullen	Barrack Road (West Parley) Residents Association	CSPS2683	Policy FWP5		Yes		Yes			<p>No consultation with EDDC Councillors</p> <p>Parish Plan results do not support new village centre scheme but does support improvement in existing shops</p> <p>Retail information report used to justify new centre in village was based on 900 new homes being built as part of RSS and states that for even these numbers that 'Residents of an urban extension in West Parley would be reasonably well served by existing stores in Ferndown in terms of proximity and qualitative choice.'</p> <p>Facts and comments in source documents have been selectively used to support a case for development.</p> <p>Danger that superstore would draw customers from existing shops leading to closures when trading already difficult.</p> <p>Parley Cross is very busy with traffic at times as are many other junctions and roads in East Dorset, such as central Ferndown, that do not have traffic mitigations schemes proposed. Most local authorities do not build roads to deal with peaks and use a certain amount of congestion to encourage traffic dispersal.</p> <p>Most traffic is directly east/west or north south therefore reduction in traffic at Parley Cross would not be significant and benefit of road improvements is strongly outweighed by loss of green belt. Parish Council is seeking to reduce speed limit on main roads in West Parley which will increase capacity of the junction and reduce effect of traffic on environment.</p> <p>This proposal only recently raised and not in options document previously out for consultation</p>				502			
360910	Mrs Fiona Baker		CSPS2631	Policy FWP5	No		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	<p>In response to the East Dorset and Christchurch Pre-submission Consultation, I would like to make the following observations that are specifically relevant to policies FWP5, FWP6 Fwp7 and the related maps. In their current format, these policies are inter-related and will not work independently, therefore my comments will apply to these three policies.</p> <p>With regard to the new road layout, I consider the proposals to be unsound, ineffective and unjustified due to the lack of detail within the plans and the consultation document. Specifically, the scheme cannot be justified, as the proposal is based on reducing the impact of traffic at Parley Cross,</p>		Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	I am happy to take part as a resident.	502	2256149_0_1.pdf		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
											<p>reducing the three lanes on the New Road South side of the junction to one. This is predicated on a new link road from New Road to Christchurch Road. The current road layout utilises three lanes in the northbound direction, yet the consultation does not address how the traffic using these lanes will be pushed back further along New Road towards Northbourne.</p> <p>The consultation does not propose new slip lanes to turn left into the new road, that will as the existing road layout confirms, is necessary to aid the movement of traffic. I believe that a slip road will be necessary, back toward the iron bridge but this will be necessary infrastructure if this plan is to go ahead. However this would be extremely expensive and have a high impact on the environment. This is a flood plain area supplied by watercourses draining from the fields and springs in the nearby field.</p> <p>The pre-submission document makes it clear that the proposals should be in line with national planning policy. The document does not state whether the plans are in line with Planning Policy Statement 25 – Flood management through spatial strategy. As stated above, the proposed road will be crossing the flood plain (which floods frequently and is well known to local residents). However, at the open evenings held at Parley Memorial Hall, the planning team denied the road would be going across the flood plain. Having lived at the above address for more than twelve years, I have seen the fields flood on many occasions, that affect the fields up to the current bridle way and has once flooded New Road itself, resulting in road closure.</p> <p>I have attached photograph, taken in April and May 2012 that provide evidence of the extent of the flooding on these fields and the drainage ditches that would be affected by the building of any slip road on the proposed site. One of these photographs was taken from my window, and importantly for my family, indicates how close this new road will be to our property. The link road will provide an unnecessary impact on the area and the case for the road is unjustified, therefore the consultation is in effective</p> <p>Policy FWP76 identifies a requirement for 200 new homes, but in my view the consultation has not justified the requirements for these homes or the number of homes identified. FWP6 identifies a requirement for 320 new homes my view the consultation has not justified the requirements for these homes or the number of homes identified. This policy also identifies a new food store and the provision for focal buildings, but with very little or no detail to justify the need, and have not provided details for other key community services, in particular, the provision of increased local school places. The link road on this side of the development will have an unnecessary intrusion and the details for the plan have not been justified.</p> <p>The areas affected by these policies are currently green belt, all be it for agricultural use. The policies for these areas proposed suitable alternative green space, but the green spaces proposed are currently green spaces. How can the</p>							

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>proposals be considered sound when the alternatives are currently green.</p> <p>It is noted that Dorset County Council, as the Transport Authority has requested a larger scheme in order to justify a major transportation solution. How can the proposals be considered sound when the scale of the development is based on the road layout and not a justified need for the number of houses?</p> <p>On a personal level, I object to the plans produced on the basis that my home will be directly and substantially affected by the impact of the new road layout. Access to our property is already difficult with traffic on New Road, but based on the plan proposals presented and discussed with your consultants at the open evening, we will be squeezed between two additional sets of traffic controls on New Road (between the 2 proposed link roads) that will be less than ¼ mile apart and only ½ mile from Parley Cross lights, that will undoubtedly further hinder access to our property. This will, in my view substantially affect the value of our property as well as the views our property enjoys and impact our quality of life through additional traffic flow, noise and airborne pollution. Finally, I would like to register objection to the consultation feedback form and process. The language in the plan feedback form is intimidating, requesting residents respond on whether the proposals are 1) legal and 2) sound. One would assume that the Council would have put the proposals through a thorough legal view before presenting this to the public. For the definition of sound, I was referred to the Council's web site, where there was a huge number of documents and thousands of pages, which to object to 'soundness' properly, requires you to review all the surveys and findings and understand 'soundness' from a planning professional perspective – like most Parley residents, I am neither a lawyer or a planning professional, so felt immediately baffled on what grounds I could raise my objections. Furthermore, many Parley residents are elderly and do not have access to or experience of a computer, but online is recommended at the 'easiest' way to make representation. Residents are required to complete a separate sheet for each policy representation (Parley Residents are impacted by a minimum of 3 policies). This process has clearly not been designed to make it easy or to encourage feedback. Thankfully, letters of objection will now be allowed and I hope the Council will this time now listen and acknowledge residents concerns.</p>						
475526	Mr Geoffrey Dark		CSPS2610	Policy FWP5	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	<p>Not Justified because there is no evidence that the views of the local community and others who may have a stake in the area have been taken into account. The two new link roads and the reshaping of the shopping area on New Road have not been part of any previous consultation, so the document is not justified on these grounds.</p> <p>Not Effective because the plans are not deliverable as currently shown. They are uneconomic as 50% of the housing will have to be 'social', meaning they have to be sold to a</p>	For all the above reasons, the proposed Policy FWP5 should be rejected.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		502		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
											<p>Housing Association at cost price and, with the many levies that will have to imposed to cover infrastructure such as new link roads and Heathland Mitigation, the sums are not viable. Not consistent with national policy because there is no evidence of Environmental Impact Studies having been made and these are necessary before a new through road could be constructed adjacent to Dudsbury Heights, which is a historically sensitive area.</p> <p>Questions 6 & 7 Policy FWP5 would be quite impractical for West Parley. In the document "Planning for the Future of West Parley" there is a photograph of the present service road showing a few cars parked on it, followed by an artist's impression of the revised service road with one car in the foreground and a few others in the distance, with a much wider pedestrian area. In reality, throughout every day, cars are parked on both sides of the service road for its whole length and on the narrower section leading to Longfield Drive and Dudsbury Gardens, cars are constantly parked on one side of the road. Presumably, there would be a small car park associated with the proposed new "food store" but this could not possibly cope with the additional number of cars associated with the large number of new houses proposed as well as the reduction in the number of cars able to park on the service road.</p> <p>The proposed link roads in conjunction with the "New Neighbourhoods in FWP6 and FWP7" would be totally impractical. The road in FWP7 runs between a dangerous bend in Christchurch Road and an equally dangerous bend in New Road and, furthermore, at the New Road end it runs across a field with floods every time the River Stour overflows its banks after heavy rain. The road in FWP6 emerges at points in New Road and Christchurch Road where there is currently a very heavy traffic flow for much of the day so, turning out of this road and especially turning right with the additional traffic due to 320 extra houses, food store, community centre, park, etc, would prove exceptionally difficult. Moreover, since these link roads, which would carry a great deal of traffic, pass through, or alongside the new housing estates, they would be very dangerous for young families.</p> <p>I also understand that these two new link roads will not be started until half the houses are built which may take many years, so until then Parley Cross will have to take hundreds more cars each day, although it is already over capacity. West Parley and, in particular, Parley Cross already suffers from excessive traffic resulting in long queues in all four directions, especially at peak periods so, with the proposed development and the resulting 750+ additional cars, the proposals outlined in FPW5 will be inadequate in enabling the road system to cope with the traffic and additional parking proposals outlined in FPW5 will be inadequate in enabling the road system to cope with the traffic and additional parking required.</p>							

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
498455	Mrs Rosemary Dark			Policy FWP5	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	<p>Not Justified because there is no evidence that the views of the local community and others who may have a stake in the area have been taken into account. The two new link roads and the reshaping of the shopping area on New Road have not been part of any previous consultation, so the document is not justified on these grounds.</p> <p>Not Effective because the plans are not deliverable as currently shown. They are uneconomic as 50% of the housing will have to be 'social', meaning they have to be sold to a Housing Association at cost price and, with the many levies that will have to imposed to cover infrastructure such as new link roads and Heathland Mitigation, the sums are not viable. Not consistent with national policy because there is no evidence of Environmental Impact Studies having been made and these are necessary before a new through road could be constructed adjacent to Dudsbury Heights, which is a historically sensitive area.</p> <p>Questions 6 & 7 Policy FWP5 would be quite impractical for West Parley. In the document "Planning for the Future of West Parley" there is a photograph of the present service road showing a few cars parked on it, followed by an artist's impression of the revised service road with one car in the foreground and a few others in the distance, with a much wider pedestrian area. In reality, throughout every day, cars are parked on both sides of the service road for its whole length and on the narrower section leading to Longfield Drive and Dudsbury Gardens, cars are constantly parked on one side of the road. Presumably, there would be a small car park associated with the proposed new "food store" but this could not possibly cope with the additional number of cars associated with the large number of new houses proposed as well as the reduction in the number of cars able to park on the service road.</p> <p>The proposed link roads in conjunction with the "New Neighbourhoods in FWP6 and FWP7" would be totally impractical. The road in FWP7 runs between a dangerous bend in Christchurch Road and an equally dangerous bend in New Road and, furthermore, at the New Road end it runs across a field with floods every time the River Stour overflows its banks after heavy rain. The road in FWP6 emerges at points in New Road and Christchurch Road where there is currently a very heavy traffic flow for much of the day so, turning out of this road and especially turning right with the additional traffic due to 320 extra houses, food store, community centre, park, etc, would prove exceptionally difficult. Moreover, since these link roads, which would carry a great deal of traffic, pass through, or alongside the new housing estates, they would be very dangerous for young families.</p> <p>I also understand that these two new link roads will not be started until half the houses are built which may take many years, so until then Parley Cross will have to take hundreds more cars each day, although it is already over capacity. West Parley and, in particular, Parley Cross already suffers</p>	For all the above reasons, the proposed Policy FPW5 should be rejected.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		502		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
											from excessive traffic resulting in long queues in all four directions, especially at peak periods so, with the proposed development and the resulting 750+ additional cars, the proposals outlined in FPW5 will be inadequate in enabling the road system to cope with the traffic and additional parking proposals outlined in FPW5 will be inadequate in enabling the road system to cope with the traffic and additional parking required.							
511916	Mr Craig Baker		CSPS2639	Policy FWP5	No		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	<p>In response to the East Dorset and Christchurch Pre-submission Consultation, I would like to make the following observations that are specifically relevant to policies FWP5, FWP6 FWP7 and the related maps. In their current format, these policies are inter-related and will not work independently, therefore my comments will apply to these three policies.</p> <p>With regard to the new road layout, I consider the proposals to be unsound, ineffective and unjustified due to the lack of detail within the plans and the consultation document. Specifically, the scheme cannot be justified, as the proposal is based on reducing the impact of traffic at Parley Cross, reducing the tree lanes on the New Road South side of the junction to one. This is predicated on a new link road from New Road to Christchurch Road. The current road layout utilises three lanes in the northbound direction, yet the consultation does not address how the traffic using these lanes will be pushed back further along New Road towards Northbourne.</p> <p>The consultation does not propose new slip lanes to turn left into the new road, that will as the existing road layout confirms, is necessary to aid the movement of traffic. I believe that a slip road will be necessary, back toward the iron bridge but this will be necessary infrastructure if this plan is to go ahead. However this would be extremely expensive and have a high impact on the environment. This is a flood plain area supplied by watercourses draining from the fields and springs in the nearby field.</p> <p>The pre-submission document makes it clear that the proposals should be in line with national planning policy. The document does not state whether the plans are in line with Planning Policy Statement 25 – Flood management through spatial strategy. As stated above, the proposed road will be crossing the flood plain (which floods frequently and is well known to local residents). However, at the open evenings held at Parley Memorial Hall, the planning team denied the road would be going across the flood plain. Having lived at the above address for more than twelve years, I have seen the fields flood on many occasions, that affect the fields up to the current bridle way and has once flooded New Road itself, resulting in road closure.</p> <p>I have attached photograph, taken in April and May 2012 that provide evidence of the extent of the flooding on these fields and the drainage ditches that would be affected by the building of any slip road on the proposed site. One of these photographs was taken from my window, and importantly for</p>					502	2255991_0_1.pdf 2255992_0_1.pdf	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>my family, indicates how close this new road will be to our property. The link road will provide an unnecessary impact on the area and the case for the road is unjustified, therefore the consultation is in effective.</p> <p>Policy FWP7 identifies a requirement for 200 new homes, but in my view the consultation has not justified the requirements for these homes or the number of homes identified.</p> <p>FWP6 identifies a requirement for 320 homes my view the consultation has not justified the requirements for these homes or the number of homes identified. This policy also identifies a new food store and the provision for focal buildings, but with very little or no detail to justify the need, and have not provided details for other key community services, in particular, the provision of increased local school places. The link road on this side of the development will have an unnecessary intrusion and the details for the plan have not been justified.</p> <p>The areas affected by these policies are currently green belt, all be it for agricultural use. The policies for these areas proposes suitable alternative green space, but the green spaces proposed are currently green spaces. How can the proposals be considered sound when the alternatives are currently green?</p> <p>It is noted that Dorset County Council, as the Transport Authority has requested a larger scheme in order to justify a major transportation solution. How can the proposals be considered sound when the scale of the development is based on the road layout and not a justified need for the number of houses?</p> <p>On a personal level, I object to the plans produced on the basis that my home will be directly and substantially affected by the impact of the new road layout. Access to our property is already difficult with traffic on New Road, but based on the plan proposals presented and discussed with your consultants at the open evening, we will be squeezed between two additional sets of traffic controls on New Road (between the 2 proposed link Roads) that will be less than ¼ mile apart and only ½ mile from Parley Cross lights, that will undoubtedly further hinder access to our property. This will, in my view substantially affect the value of our property as well as the views our property enjoys and impact our quality of life through additional traffic flow, noise and airborne pollution.</p>						
512344	Mr M Wyeth		CSPS2659	Policy FWP5	No		Yes	Yes			<p>This scheme does not fulfil the "Tests of Soundness" for the following reasons.</p> <p>Not Justified</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No credible evidence has been forthcoming to justify the scheme plan - No consultation with the West Parley residents to discuss what we actually want - No traffic monitoring evidence obtained to measure traffic flow or peak issues - No reasonable alternatives proposed <p>Not Effective</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Due to the lack of preparation, consultation and evidence 				502		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											the plan can not be delivered, has no flexibility because there are no reasonable alternatives proposed and therefore it can not be monitored.						
656399	Mrs R J Cook		CSPS2698	Policy FWP5							I am writing about the proposed plans – Policy No’s FWP5, FWP6 and FWP7. I think it very sad when you are talking about covering all this green land with Houses etc. I came home to live just because of the green. I could see and also the mild life on it. With the increase in Traffic to the already overloaded roads. No I do not agree with these plans.				502		
502950	Mr I G Banks		CSPS2767	Policy FWP5	No	No		Yes	Yes	Yes	Since I am opposed to Green Belt development at FWP6 and FWP7 the changes as proposed will not be required to Road Layout. Any new road junctions in conjunction with New Neighbourhoods would cause more congestion and delays to traffic at crossroads.	Keep the present road layout. Do not reduce present parking space available.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		502		
490823	Mr Ian Jones	Ferndown Town Council	CSPS2998	Policy FWP5	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes		The Town Council believe that the two link roads, one either side of New Road to the south of Parley Cross, would each require some means of traffic control with the A347. These new signals, together with those at Parley Cross, two sets connected with the Dormy development and the existing lights at Penny’s Hill, plus traffic associated with the new greenfield housing, be likely to significantly add to the vehicular journey time from the River Stour to Ferndown centre.		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		502		
499532	Bournemouth Borough Council	Bournemouth Borough Council	CSPS3249	Policy FWP5							Policy FWP5: West Parley Village Centre enhancement scheme Comment The junction improvements at Parley Cross referred to in Policy KS10 and Policy FWP5, the West Parley Village Centre enhancement scheme, differ from those recommended by the SEDMMTS, see paragraphs 8.61 and 8.62, which promotes the provision of a gyratory. The enhancement scheme may have a significant impact on the flows between Bournemouth and Ferndown. This scheme does not appear to have been referred to at the Preferred Options stage and there are concerns that it will not fully address the predicted traffic problems in the area although it may form part of a phased programme subject to detailed analysis. Currently long delays are evident during the peak periods leading into and out of Bournemouth along A347 New Road. Whilst the enhancement scheme will improve the situation for east-west movements and provide significant relief this should not be at the cost of the north-south movements between Ferndown and Bournemouth.				502		
656692	Mr Robin Henderson	Ken Parke Planning Consultants	CSPS3628	Policy FWP5	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	The document fails to make positive provision for residential development necessary to secure the future of community services in Longham or the provision of housing to meet local needs during the life of the plan- please see attached statement.	The Core Strategy should be modified to include the expansion of the settlement boundary of Longham around the identified parcel of land to the rear of 122 Ringwood	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	The Oral Examination will facilitate discussion of the proposed change.	502	2260313_0_1.pdf	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
												Road. This should feature as a district policy and map in chapter 10- please see the attached statement.					
360271	Cllr Paul Timberlake		CSPS514	10.36	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	<p>Whilst being flat in nature, I do not consider the land to the SE of Parley Cross as being featureless. Although mostly farmland, a number of hedgerows - interspersed with mature trees - exist, which act as important wildlife corridors. In addition, the area is not solidly built on, on three sides: The western boundary is open, (if you discount the shops on the opposite side of New Road), the northern boundary is largely the same but with housing to the north of Christchurch Road; to the south is farmland and buildings - hardly a urban area; and to the east are the properties of Church Lane, to the east of which is further farmland. In the 2002 Local Plan, the village setting of Church Lane 'envelope' is washed over by the SE Dorset Green Belt.</p>	Amend wording to take account of the true natural environment of the site.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		504		
514156	Mr J Breeze		CSPS2619	10.36	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	<p>TRANSPORT AND ACCESS: diverting traffic from the village centre will not alleviate the existing very severe traffic congestion in Christchurch Road for traffic E – W / W – E just merely move the congestion 400 yds further up the road to the proposed new junction in Christchurch Road. The effect of giving access at that point to traffic from a further estimated 200 new homes solution. It is noted the “Highways Agency” is not included in the Core Strategy Document “Key Stakeholders” a fact that speaks for itself. From the above: The “Transport and Access of FWP7 has not been properly prepared or thought out. From the above: It cannot be considered effective or justified. It can only be considered consistent with National Policy, if that policy is to Congest roads and slow the economic growth of the area</p> <p>GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE - FWP7 Para 10.39 (Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace for Public Access) SANG</p> <p>To replace the Green Belt areas currently required for development FWP7, as shown on Map 10.10, the area of “Potential SANG” is currently and in the foreseeable future, undeliverable, both to the Development, its occupants and the wider public.</p> <p>Of the 100% “Potential SANG” area</p> <p>Some 25% Adjacent to the River Stour, is on a flood plain, often under water and unusable for long periods of time.</p> <p>Some 5% is bog/waterlogged land for much of the year.</p> <p>Some 8% is steep cliffs/valley rides up to 20mts or more. (All the above areas are currently fenced off, specifically preventing access and the associated dangers, particularly to children)</p> <p>Some 15% is an existing, working Public House, beer garden and pub car park, which although an excellent facility, is not a suitable area to claim as “potential SANG”.</p> <p>Some 30% is currently a private house, garden and grounds</p>	<p>Layout and Design FWP 7</p> <p>The Core Strategy document states that the FWP7 area is of a higher landscape value than the main development at FWP6. It is a fact that within FWP7 itself, that sector west of the of the proposed link road (Dudsbury Monument area adjacent) is of a far higher order of natural beauty again. Council Policy HE3 applies and, particularly with any removal of Green Belt protection, should give protection to the quality and diversity of the landscape in this special sector of FWP7. This is not mentioned in the Core Strategy. It should be. The present Green Belt policy has afforded significant protection to the ancient hedgerows lying in the proposed area west of the link</p>	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		504		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
											<p>in private ownership, and not either owned by the developers or within the development area. Why this "Dudsbury Manor" estate has been included in the potential SANG area is inexplicable and an explanation should be given.</p> <p>Of the some 17% of the "potential SANG" remaining that is the only SANG for FWP7 that is currently or for the foreseeable future, actually available or deliverable on the grounds of Land Suitability, Availability, or (Safety for Public use under Policy HE2) Implementing Policy D.</p> <p>To remedy this SANG shortfall a significant sector of the development should remain open space. The area abutting the Ancient Monument may be considered, providing a improved 'setting zone' and protecting the better habitat found west of the link road in FWP7.</p> <p>No development on FWP7 should be permitted until equivalent area to that shown on Map 10.10 can be allocated to actually usable SANG by all ages of the public, all year around.</p> <p>Policy HE4 Local Play and Sports</p> <p>The development area of FWP7 located to the west of the proposed link road is designated as a "Sports Field" on numerous local maps. Compilers of the Core Strategy may consider this area to supplement SANG, given its previous use.</p> <p>For the above reasons,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Positively Prepared: I do not believe the presented plan meets the objectives and needs of the area. 2) Justified The actual SANGs portion needs greater clarity and justification. 3) Effective: the plan is not deliverable in respect of "potential SANG" areas shown, and Policy HE2 public safety. 4) Would not be consistent with National Policy in providing unusable and unsafe SANGs set off. 	<p>road, that are recognised as providing a major protected habitat for numerous bird, animal and insect species, including butterflies not widely found. The Ancient Hedgerows contain dense thicket of a wide variety of indigenous shrubs and wild plants, interspersed with Mature Oak trees and within the Development site, immediately adjacent to proposed housing places these at severe risk. They should be specifically protected in their entirety.</p> <p>Policy ME1 Protection of designated areas of Nature Conservation interest/Protected Habitat.</p> <p>If the Greenbelt status is removed then ME1 should be actioned for this area. The "right of way" from Christchurch Road (Adjacent to and behind the Owl's Nest Restaurant) running to the rear of "Dudsbury Manor" runs alongside the western Hedgerow and is a footpath for most of its length. It is not used for Vehicular access. This hedgerow would be at risk, being within the development, should developers require to widen the current access to provide either access to the development, during building or to provide a permanent main vehicular access to Dudsbury Manor,</p>						

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
												<p>which may be required by virtue of the new development.</p> <p>The Council should meet with English Nature/CPRE/RSPB/ and local Parish Council to determine a future protection for these ancient hedgerows and the flora and fauna therein.</p> <p>Policy ME1 should provide a minimum future safeguard and distance between the sensitive habitat and housing increased.</p> <p>The final document should note that if the Inspector removes green belt status from this area west of the link road, nature will be so protected.</p> <p>Policy HE1 (safeguarding the historic heritage of the Country)</p> <p>The FWP7 development area west of the link road, and adjacent to the Hill Fort Ancient Monument is significant in historical and archaeological terms, to this area of Dorset/West Parley District. Previous maps show archaeological finds that are consistent with the monument and access to it. The public gallows, was located next to the development, and it is highly likely, as was usual that burial of the victims was actioned very nearby.</p> <p>The first maps of this area indicate habitation of two cottages adjacent to</p>					

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
												<p>the development (possibly dating back to 1500's or earlier) at a time when no other habitation was found locally, it is behind. For all the above reasons, and the HE1 policy, the Council (EDDC) should action a full archiological survey of this area of development, west of the proposed link road, It should involve English Heritage/Dorset County Architects Dept, CRRE, and Local Universities. This survey should be actioned and discussed results before this area is included in any permitted development.</p> <p>As drawn, map 10.10 in the Core Strategy, shows the proposed affordable housing, west of the link road, within just 75 mrs of the Ancient Monument Hill Fort, just a 15 second cycle ride away. It is difficult to equate this fact with the opening Statement in para 10.39 of the Core Strategy "The Hill Fort is an ancient monument, so development must be kept clear from it and open space used to maintain its integrity" (A 15 second bike ride to a "ready made" playground/BMX track, or under a 50 odd seconds walk, is that adequate protection?) 75mts is not an adequate buffer zone</p>						

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
												<p>for the public visiting it or the monument itself. It will put the monument under stress and the buildings that close will ruin the existing picturesque "setting zone" in which the monument currently sits and which visitors see on arrival, with attractive hedgerows and established countryside along its access via the "StourWay" national footpath.</p> <p>It is noted that the Statutory body responsible for the Ancient Monument, "English Heritage", is not listed as a Key Stakeholder in the Core Strategy Document for FWP7 although lesser bodies are. This is clearly a serious omission, and it seems unlikely that English Heritage would give Statutory Approval for such an immediate distance as 75 mrs, given the present ideal situation and the detrimental impact both visually, and practically that such a distance will bring to the Ancient Hill Fort.</p> <p>In the present proposal, intense use of the Monument Site for all manor of activities by estate residents is highlighted, by the fact that of the "potential SANG" area (Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace for Public Recreation) in FWP7</p>						

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
												<p>on Map 10.10, only some 17% of it is usable to the Public of all ages on a year round basis. A fact that will not be lost on the Statutory body (EH) who would undoubtedly seek a greater distance from such a large scale development.</p> <p>The Hill Fort site incorporates land owned by the Girl Guides Association and main guide camps for Dorset facility within it. It is important for the safety of the hundreds of children guides, using the site annually, and despite the levels of supervision, to ensure security. A good level of security is currently provided by the isolation and distance away from any housing.</p> <p>Development so close to the monument will eventually put unneeded pressure on the Guides facility, which has been a wonderful retreat for parent and children alike, and its interests require safeguarding. For all the above reasons:</p> <p>1) Positively Prepared: I do not believe the present plan meets the objectives and meets the objectives and needs of the area.</p> <p>2) Justified: The plan is not the most appropriate strategy given the constraints of the particular area of FWP7.</p>					

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
												3) Effective: The plan is not deliverable in respect of HE3, ME1, the limited actual usable SANG and the distance from/effect on the ancient monument. 4) Would not be consistent with National Policy for the protection of ancient monuments and the Flora and Fauna of the specific area west of the link road in FWP7.						
496473	Mr Brian Morgan		CSPS26	Policy FWP6	No	No		Yes		Yes	The reasons are for the most part set out in my attached copy letter to Christopher Chope MP dated 17th February 2012 (actual letter dated 8th February), in addition to which I consider there to be little or no need (as opposed to demand) for new housing here, and certainly not enough to override green belt protection.	Complete deletion of FWP5, FWP6 and FWP7. Exactly the same comments as those in 3, 4, 5 and 6 above apply to many other policies in the document with similar deletion considered necessary - these include:- FWP3 and 4, WMC3 and 5, and VTSW4 and 5. The only proviso to this is that it in so far as any of these sites are not now green belt, then that factor would obviously not apply to those sites.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	1. I consider a well-argued oral and public presentation of the case outlined above would be much more effective than mere written argument. 2. The opportunities for open public debate on this matter have so far been far too limited, having regard especially to the long term importance of the Green Belt heritage, as opposed to the short term 'needs' to promote economic growth, both locally and nationally.	506	2158987_0_1.pdf 2158985_0_1.pdf 2158984_0_1.pdf		
496575	Mrs Gillian Sewell		CSPS63	Policy FWP6	No	No		No	No	No	The site of the new link road is in an area that floods every few years! This has not happened recently, but is significant flooding, which reaches up to the bungalow/house's gardens on the left hand side on the approach to West Parley from Bournemouth. Housing will threaten (ie. fires) near SSSI.	None. Housing development on this scale will spoil the green 'corridor' between West Parley and conurbations of Bournemouth and Christchurch. We will lose our village identity. Link roads are unsuitable, because of beautiful river setting and the flood plain (considerable flooding!!!)	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination	I would like to observe if possible. Local democracy should be observed, please refer to West Parley Parish Plan. Our family's views are in accordance with the Parish Plan NOT these proposals, which will spoil our lovely area.	506			
496597	Mr Colin Sewell		CSPS53	Policy FWP6	No	No		Yes	Yes		320 homes are too many. Density too high for existing area. traffic will increase with new link road and higher population.	No. Housing should have larger gardens	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral	International Law, EEC, "Aarhus	506			

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											Present schols will not cope. We have 2 churches already. Cheaper houses present future problems, quality buildings are desirabile.	(not allotments!). When weather changes, flooding could spread towards Christchurch. SSSI needs protecting as does Didsbury Fort area. Local democracy has been ignored, ie previuos surveys in West Parley.	examination	Convention" 2005 requirs the second pillar, public participation to be taken into account when environmental decisions are being made. This is an environmental decision.			
508605	Miss Janet Ames		CSPS66	Policy FWP6	No	No		No	No	No	We voted against large scale development. We in West Parley or even Ferndown do not have large numbers of homeless. Where are these people coming from? Are we building for Bournemouth, Poole or London? There is a consistent 'Dump problems in Parley or Hurn'. Where is the transport? We have none in Dudsbury.	That you listen to the locals. I also hope that lford and Christchurch will sue if water levels rise as flood water will be drained into the river.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	See above.	506		
644715	Mrs Barbara Ralph		CSPS72	Policy FWP6	No	No		No	No	No	Not legally compliant - because if anyone else except the government tried to sell land that had no planning permission then it would be regarded as a 'land scam'. It has not been proved that these houses are needed. Unsound, not positively prepared - We do not need 60+% of houses (30+% which are for social housing) to be bought by older people. Not justified - We need the Green Belt. If the banks would lend, younger people could afford houses which already exist. Not effective - The plan isn't deliverable. Who is going to buy all these new houses? It will be using arable land and the new roads that are planned through the developments are just plain ridiculous. They will erode another block of right turn traffic as well as at Parley Cross and another block of left turn traffic on the airport side of Parley Cross. Not consistent with National Policy - We cannot increase the Green Belt land (to stop urban sprawl) so what we should have should be preserved. Will there be anymore police to regulate. Where will new schools be built and doctors or dentists surgeries?			Not forgetting that Councils receive an 'incentive' payment from the government for allowing housing to go ahead. Where is the Democracy? (in name only).	506		
501530	Mr and Mrs J Archer		CSPS143	Policy FWP6	Yes	No		Yes	Yes	Yes	The document is unsound. It should be positively prepared:- where is the evidence that the planners have realistically researched OTHER areas for housing? This lack of evidence for housing suggests it was not delieverd because it was uneconomic. The plans for housing are unsound because the residents were not consulted at an early stage and lack of evidence there is any need for the housing in the local area. The depth of public support against the proposals, the desire to be able to plan our own future, no school places for new families, the valuable green belt stopping urban sprawl etc. all this could be avoided if negotiations with local people and councillors had taken place at every opportunity with openness. The proper way to plan new houses is for new developments from builders. Fair democracy is needed.		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		506		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
503864	Heather Freeman		CSPS124	Policy FWP6		No			No		<p>Deep concerns for school facilities to cover the increase in 'child' population the 320 homes will bring to the area as local schools are already oversubscribed. Concern for the residents affordable housing will bring to the area. Traffic levels, noise levels, light pollution.</p> <p>Concern about allotments behind houses of Church Lane due to current crime rates in connection with allotments and ease of access to properties through allotment areas.</p> <p>The proposal of modernising the new developments will completely change the look and feel of West Parley village centre and de-value the area and current properties. Current residents have moved to West Parley to live in this village community. No additional medical support - closest Doctors surgeries at present are in Ferndown and Kinson.</p>	<p>Reduce the number of homes proposed and keep the structures in 'like' style to current properties in the area, spacing, gardens, bungalows etc.</p> <p>Reduce the size of the development. Address the schooling and medical support for the increase in population and traffic congestion. Keep as a village!</p>		<p>I have not got a problem discussing these views with the Government Inspector, but as you will be aware the local community is very much against these proposals.</p>	506		
503869	Mrs Jean Khan		CSPS132	Policy FWP6	No	No		No	No	No	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Movement of Green Belt to suit development plans. Contrasting to legislation covering preservation - maintenance of Green Belt land. 2. Reduction of land dividing Northbourne and Parley village. 3. Development encroaching on valuable and high quality agricultural land. 4. Not in West Parley Parish Plan. Undemocratic process. 5. Failure to provide adequate school and medical facilities. 	<p>This area is being totally overdeveloped making a 30% increase in housing in West Parley.</p> <p>The road plan in my opinion is far from sound. 320 homes means another 600 cars in an already congested area. The new road goes through high density housing. Affordable housing means NO garages. This area need to 80% less developed.</p>	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		506		
508708	Mr & Mrs G Peskett		CSPS378	Policy FWP6							<p>We think that the Green Belt in these two areas should be kept to stop the urban sprawl from Bournemouth.</p> <p>The West Parley Parish Plan which was contributed by over 1000 residents and was encouraged by the District Council has been ignored.</p> <p>We do not want another supermarket in the village, with its inherent traffic problems that will arise, as the Parley Crossroad is already over capacity as the fellow from the Dorset Highways told us at the meeting a few weeks ago.</p> <p>To build 300 houses on the large field along New Road, with the proposed changes to the crossroads, meaning that heavy 32ton Artic Lorries will run through the new housing estate, beggars belief to the safety of young families and pets.</p> <p>Along with the proposed 220 houses on the Dudsbury heights field next to the old hill fort and the endangered animals' and bats in this area.</p> <p>The two roads through these proposed housing estates will have traffic lights at each junction with New Road and Christchurch Road, how ever they are fazed this will cause traffic tailbacks on two very busy roads, this has not been thought through in any way.</p> <p>Another thing is the school where are the schools and medical going to be put, as the existing system is at full</p>				506		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description		
											capacity. With this proposed 520 houses in the village is equivalent to 32% increase to the houses along with 600 to 1000 more cars to use the now overcrowded roads. We think these proposals are completely unsound and not justified in any way.								
524338	Mr Kenneth Brooks		CSPS241	Policy FWP6							This proposal appears to be virtually identical to the Non-Preferred Option FWP5 in the Core Strategy Options Document 2010. Ironically, the reasons for not being 'preferred' included in the statement:- 'possible improvements to this junction could result in a pedestrian unfriendly environment and not one around which a new community should be based.' It is difficult to envisage the effect of the two link roads allocated in Policies FWP6 and FWP7 would have on the acknowledged serious traffic problems already experienced at this junction. Indeed, the projected scheme for improving Parley Crossroads would probably be inadequate to solve even the current traffic problems. An additional 520 homes within a short distance of the junction on both sides of New Road plus new shops and facilities would only exacerbate the severe congestion in the area, despite the attractions of 'developer gain' funding.					506			
648124	Mrs Lesley Eve		CSPS141	Policy FWP6	Yes	No		Yes	Yes		100%, not 50% should be low cost as there is a great need for lots more low cost housing in this area especially (high cost houses, low wages). The council lists are not reliable as many people know they have no chance of getting a house because they don't qualify for points - i.e. they work and are responsible in not bringing into the world large families which would increase their points.	Free up land for low-cost housing only - brown sites / buy farm land cheap / edge green belt. Financial help - part rent / buy or lend 1/4 to be repaid on sale of house - ringfence rent, or loan to keep provision up in perpetuity. Quick build houses - pre built? timber / skills train youngsters whilst they build their own homes.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination			506			
648847	Mrs Catherine Lugg		CSPS168	Policy FWP6	Yes	Yes					WPRA and the Parish Council have both indicated they approve of development at Coppins and Holmwood both in Ferndown's Green Belt, yet are complaining about building on their own Green Belt. NIMBY! Isn't this a touch hypocritical? All of their properties were green fields once!		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination			506			
649759	Mrs Amanda Jones		CSPS255	Policy FWP6	No	No					West Parley already experiences serious traffic congestion from all directions in and out of Parley lights and through Longham; the proposed layout changes at Parley lights will offer limited or no improvement. It is the volume of traffic that is the issue and unless all the connecting roads and junctions are factored into the infrastructure plans; it will do nothing more than push the gridlock further up or down New Road or		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination			506			

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description		
											<p>Christchurch Road.</p> <p>The number of proposed houses is excessive and there is little or no plans for community services such as schools, doctors etc to support the additional homes; the homes are too far from local schools which will result in even more traffic on the main roads. Glenmoor Road already has serious problems around pick up and drop off times at Parley First School; this will be exacerbated if the intention is to increase headcount at the school.</p> <p>Where are the statistics to justify the need for 30%+ increase in housing stock in West Parley? Do our schools have waiting lists? Are they oversubscribed? Do the doctors and dentists have capacity? Or is it the case that West Parley happens to have more green belt areas than its neighbours and by default that makes it the best option? Why is it acceptable for the Council to build on green belt land when a private homeowner will struggle to achieve planning consent for an extension to an existing property that just happens to be in the vicinity of green belt land?</p>								
650107	Mr David Baxter		CSPS294	Policy FWP6							<p>While development of this area is regrettable, with the way that this country's population is booming due to immigration and the natural development of society, it is understandable that land has to be found for new housing.</p> <p>Although I do resent that yet more green fields have to be built on, it is not this that I object to in the plan. I object to the idiotic road system that has been proposed.</p> <p>There is a road system in the proposed development that runs from New Road to Christchurch Road East. This road would appear to have no less than five roundabouts in the development, presumably met with traffic lights or roundabouts on both New Road and Christchurch Road to allow access. There are a number of additional roads throught the new development.</p> <p>The plan is also to ban traffic movements from New Road on to Christchurch Road East, despite having a dedicated land and traffic light filter. Is the council so short sighted to see that forcing ALL traffic to and from the airport through a housing estate is not just a stupid decision, but a dangerous and irresponsible decision too? From the information I have here, this is how the council's meeting must have gone.</p> <p>Councillor 1: "Here's a good idea. Let's build a new housng development next to Parley Cross junction. The, let's force all the traffic that goes to the airport off the purposely built lane on the junction and through the middle of the housing development. I'm sure the people living in the new houses will absolutely LOVE having HGVs and boy racers tearing past their houses, and I'm sure their health will improve greatly from the queues of vehicles sitting in solid traffic in the rush hours. They'll also sleep better at night with cars constantly accelerating and decelerating on no less than FIVE roundabouts. Sound good to everyone?</p> <p>Councillor 2: "That sounds great. I'm sure property values will be great too, living next to such a main road. And in the summer, the people in the houses will be able to open their</p>					506			

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
											windows and breathe in the country air. They won't mind the carbon monoxide, or the nitrous oxide, or the noise caused by hundreds of vehicles navigating the numerous junctions!" Councillor 3: "Not to mention that having all those vehicles will make it a really safe environment for kids to play on the streets outside their homes. Nothing bad could possibly happen." Councillor 1: "And hey, when the traffic gets really bad, the drivers can start using the residential roads in the new development to try and cut through and past the traffic on the main through road, creating new rat runs and bringing all the benefits we've mentioned to everyone in the new development." Councillor 2: "I think we're on to a winner here. Let's go to lunch!" Get the point? In addition to all of the above, putting roundabouts on New Road and Christchurch Road East will not only disrupt the traffic flow and cause additional pollution as vehicles have to accelerate, decelerate, stop at the roundabout / lights, accelerate away again, it will also cause additional congestion at Parley Cross junction as traffic tails back, blocking the junction. So your initial aim of reducing traffic at Parely Cross junction will be thwarted before you've even got started! Dedicated filter lanes on these junctions, be they roundabouts or traffic lights are essential and must be compulsory, otherwise the traffic will be stopped and congestion will occur as one car waits to turn into the new development, holding up all the other cars behind it. The ONLY HGVs that should be driving through the new development are those necessary to deliver supplies to the shops in that area.							
361069	Mr & Mrs Clive Butcher		CSPS358	Policy FWP6							We are writing to object to the part of the core strategy that relates to the proposed provision of additional housing in West Parley. Our objections may be summarised as follows: 1. The housing proposals contained in Policy FWP6 and FWP7 have totally ignored the wishes of the local people, who made it very clear in their own survey that they were opposed to redevelopment on such a massive scale. In a well-researched and documented survey, made available to East Dorset District Council at the time, 80% of residents said in the Parish Plan that the sustainable number of new houses for West Parley is about 100 houses, which would be a 6% increase on our present housing stock. The District Council's proposed 520 houses are a huge and totally unsustainable increase of 32%. It is not acceptable in this context to lump Ferndown and West Parley together (in order to arrive at a lower percentage increase), as they have their own councils and representatives. All these points show that the Core Strategy does not conform to the wishes of the local people and therefore does not comply with the Localism objectives of the Government's Planning Policy. 2. The 520 additional houses as proposed will result in continuous housing between Bournemouth and Ferndown,				506			

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>thus completely negating the most important Green Belt objective of preventing urban sprawl and the joining up of distinct communities. Many other green belt locations do not perform this primary function. This shows that FWP7 and FWP6 strike right at the heart of the reasons for Green Belt planning.</p> <p>3. Parley Cross is one of the busiest crossroads in Dorset. The new housing will generate much additional traffic coming onto the new road system near a busy junction, in many cases wanting to cross over main traffic flowws to get to their destinations. The proposed new shops will also create their own additional traffic. Our understanding is that right hand turns at Parley Cross will be banned into and out of New Road south, traffic being diverted instead along new roads to be constructed as shown on your plans. This is completely unrealistic, as observation of such right-turning traffic at present will show that the numbers and types of such traffic are totally unsuited to a new road constructed in a residential area. The roads will also require traffic lights to be constructed in New Road south and Christchurch Road west, in order to facilitate the traffic turning right at these new interesctions. This, of course, imposes additional time penalties on through traffic and environmental deterioration to those living nearby. This shows that the traffic proposals, which must be integral with the associated housing proposals, have not been properly thought through, have not been the subject of any local consultation and are totally unrealistic.</p> <p>4. The Government's Planning Policy requires brown-field sites to be considered before use of green-field sites. We cannot see in the Core Strategy where there is any consideration of a brown-field site in this part of East Dorset and therefore the recommendations in the Core Strategy have been reached without full consideration of the Government's own planning criteria.</p> <p>We should be obliged if you would formally record and respond to these points and consider how the Core Strategy is to be amended in order to take them into account.</p>						
475494	Mr Alan Macdonald		CSPS482	Policy FWP6							<p>EDDC proposals re housing in West Parley I wish to object to the building of 220 houses on the FWP7 and 300 on FWP6 sites for the u/m reasons:</p> <p>1. The consultation process is unsatisfactory.</p> <p>a. Government legislation requires you to consult fully with local communities before setting out proposals. EDDC planners ignored this legislation.</p> <p>b. West Parley has produced, after a lengthy consultation with residents, a well publicised Parish Plan, copies of which were sent to EDDC. In this plan residents are overwhelmingly against having more than about 100 houses built in West Parley. This source of information has been ignored by EDDC planners.</p> <p>c. EDDC have relied too much on the use of electronic communication to provide information to residents for this consultation and assumed that all residents in West Parley have access to the internet. This is far from the case and</p>				506		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>most residents are extremely concerned about the proposals but are unable to find the information they need to consider the proposals effectively.</p> <p>d. This land brings the countryside into the vilage and with it many important and protected species of animals. Sightings of badgers, foxes, otters, deer, buzzards are frequently reported. This improves the quality of life of all residents who regularly use these fields through which official footpaths pass.</p> <p>e. The 2 new roads proposed around the proposed building sites will be dangerous for children living in the new houses and will not ease the already stretched traffic system in West Parley. Traffic jams will be merely moved further down the main roads. 500 extra houses will bring up to 1000 extra cars all trying to get out of and into West Parley which is already ridiculously over crowded.</p> <p>e. 520 extra houses in West Parley represents an increase in housng of about 32%. This is excessive and is far more than is proposed for the other East Dorset communitites. Without the appropriate infrastructure of adequate school places, doctors, dentists, community centres etc. there will be unacceptable pressure on existing provision.</p> <p>Site FWP7</p> <p>a. Dudsbury Rings is an improtant heritage site and this field is too closely connected to the site for the security of this important site to be protected.</p> <p>b. In winter time and in times of heavy rain the slope of the field causes water to run down hill to flood the unmade and private road, Ridgeway, every time. With heavy traffic, servicing the shops at Parley Cross using Ridgeway every day, the road surface is severely eroded and flooded which makes it very unpleasant for residents who are also responsible for the upkeep of the road. With so much more concrete laid on the field due to the proposed buildings flooding would be even worse.</p> <p>Site FWP6</p> <p>a. Yet another supermarket in the area is not needed and will only bring in much more traffic to bring chaos to the already crowded roads of West Parley. Sufficient supermarkets (Tesco, Asda, Sainsbury2, Lidl) already exist within 3 mile radius of West Parley and 3 Tesco Express shops exist in a radius of 1 mile of Parley Cross. There is no demand for allotments, orchards etc.</p> <p>West Parley should not be sacrificed by planners unrealistic dreams and an attempt at social engineering. I urge you to reconsider these proposals and to start talking to the people in West Parley community who are entitled to have a say in the drawing up of proposals for any increase in housng in their vilage.</p>						
489411	Mr JMT Morris		CSPS319	Policy FWP6							<p>I would like to record my objections to FWP6 on the following grounds:-</p> <p>1. The proposed number of houses is far too large for an area which has already one of the most congested traffic areas - Parley cross roads.</p>				506		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											2. It is too close to Hurn airport and is under the flight path which should not be allowed. 3. It destroys much of the free space which exists between Bournemouth and West Parley turning it into a suburb of Bournemouth.						
496575	Mrs Gillian Sewell		CSPS411	Policy FWP6							I am writing to oppose policies FWP7 and policy FWP6. I am against the building of 520 houses, which is totally disproportionate to the present housing stock, The green belt, the 'green lungs', should not be built on. The people of West Parley have already expressed their opposition to these plans in the Parish Survey, which I absolutely agree with. Dudsbury Hill fort area is a beautiful area and should be preserved for posterity. Our community and its spirit will be shattered by these developments. We will no longer be a 'village', but the urban sprawl will be continued to Bournemouth. We enjoy our area and good facilities as they are; we are already well served with shops, walks, our parish council and lovely environment. For the above and other reasons, I am against these proposed developments.				506		
498359	Mr Brian Miles CBE		CSPS381	Policy FWP6							West Parley - proposed housing developments. I must first make clear that like many of my fellow West Parley residents, I fully acknowledge that additional housing in our area will need to be provided in the future also that we must be willing to accept a reasonable share of this new housing along with other local communities in Corfe Mullen, Ferndown, Wimborne and Verwood. Notwithstanding the foregoing I do feel that the proposals incorporated in policies FWP7 and FWP6 to build 220 houses on Dudsbury Heights and 300 houses in the New Road field, a combined total of 520 houses, is out of all proportion representing as it does an increase of over 30% on the existing number of houses in West Parley. Encouraged by the District Council great care was taken recently to produce a Parish Plan and I believe I am correct in stating that over 1000 West Parley residents made some contribution to it. I suggest that this is a clear indication of how strongly the people in this community feel about these proposals which will have such a profound effect on the future of West Parley, a community which is not just proud of its individuality but also able to trace its roots back to Norman times. The current infrastructure already experiences significant problems in dealing with existing traffic but with the advent of the new houses on the scale proposed together with the link roads and new supermarket and shopping facilities, it is difficult to comprehend how our community would be able to cope with such increases. Furthermore we should also bear in mind the requirement to preserve the green belt which is intended to incorporate the "Key Gaps" with Bournemouth in order to prevent further urban sprawl. In conclusion let me again emphasise that I acknowledge that we must accept a reasonable share of new houses and I believe the Parish plan made clear that a figure of about 100				506		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
											would be reasonable. I consider however, that 520 houses is just not acceptable and with great respect I would urge those involved with planning to think these proposals through again.							
499019	Mr William Legg		CSPS483	Policy FWP6							<p>Policy FWP6 and policy FWP7</p> <p>Regarding 220 houses and the new road planned for the Dudsbury heights field near the old hill fort and 300 houses, supermarket, shopping centre and link road planned for the New Road field.</p> <p>It is obvious that these new plans would prove very dangerous for young families because of the hundreds more vehicles per day around what is already Dorset's busiest crossroad - especially as these new roads will not be started until half the new houses are built!</p> <p>In addition, the New Road and Dudsbury heights fields are not any old green belt - they are "Key Gaps" with Bournemouth - to prevent urban sprawl. Furthermore, 520 more houses here is a whopping 32% increase in West Parley's housing stock. This is excessive, wrong and damaging and way in excess of what is being imposed on Corfe Mullen, Ferndown, Wimborne and Verwood!</p>					506		
499040	Mr K Grimshaw		CSPS332	Policy FWP6							<p>As a resident of West Parley having lived in the above address since 1984 I wish to submit my objections to the proposed increase in the housing in West Parley under Policy FWP6 and FWP7 in particular to FWP6.</p> <p>My property is situated approx half a mile on the Knson side of Parley Traffic lights and even now under the present traffic conditions from about 7.15am until after 9am on a working day traffic is backed up from the lights almost to Kinson way way past my proeprty and the proposed number of houses and the lay out of the road system proposed will make this even worse.</p> <p>From the business park at Hurn Airport large lorries turn left at Parley lights and travel past my property in the direction of Kinson and from looking at the proposed layout of the estate it would seem that 5 traffic island are included which these vehicles will have to negotiate after leaving Hurn along the Christchurch Road turning left into the new estate before joining New Road midway between Parley traffic lights and my property. I would imagine that with the length of some of these vehicles they will find it difficult to rejoin New Road from the estate as it not all that wide.</p> <p>At the present time vehicles wanting to turn right towards Hurn have a set time with the traffic lights but unless more traffic lights are installed at the New Road entrance to the proposed estate there will be traffic hold-ups and dangerous attempts to cross in front of traffic travelling along New Road as vehicles attempt to enter or leave the proposed estate.</p> <p>The same danger will apply to traffic travelling to Hurn who leave New Road into the estate and with families moving into property owning vehicles it is going to be very dangerous for children living on the estate with the volume of traffic passing through at peak times.</p> <p>With regard to FWP7 it is not so much an issue with me but I would point out that the field included in the road from New</p>					506		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
											Road is a flood plain and over the past couple of weeks has been mostly covered in flood water, in the time I have lived in my property I have seen the river waters right across New Road. West Parley feels to residents like a village and the proposed plans will ruin that feeling for us and for a number of residents will lower the values of their properties and also most feel that the number of the proposed houses will mean properties with little or no gardens which is out of character with present buildings in the village.							
500115	Mrs Sylvia McIntyre		CSPS354	Policy FWP6							I recently attended meetings and viewed plans on the proposals to build on the green belt land and whilst I know there is a need for housing I feel strongly that it shouldn't be at the expense of residents already living here and on our green belt. The vision for our village is to encourage a younger element to our community, however when questioned about schools which are already oversubscribed I felt fobbed off by the comment that those children living near West Moors would be sent to those schools (what happened to parents preferences). We already have children from West Parley being refused entry to all 3 local primary schools (Parley First, Hampreston and Ferndown First) and Ferndown Middle school is also turning away our local children. When questioned about which would come first - houses or infrastructure I was advised houses! So not only are our children being ferried miles but they, nor the rest of us, will get to work or school easily as with some 500 plus houses there is bound to be as many cars. My road is already gridlocked during certain times of the day and the proposed link roads will only move the problem further down the road, not to mention I will be expected to drive through the middle of the proposed 300 houses to go to Bournemouth this is potentially going to become a rat run which would be very dangerous for young families as Glenmoor Road has become! Whilst there is a lot of rhetoric about the community being consulted I feel we are being given a fete-e-comply the new plans viewed were nothing like the 2010 ones viewed previously, has the District Council ignored everything? I am advised that the green belt we have is called as "key gaps" which should prevent urban sprawl and the top reason for the green belt in the first place. I also believe the 500+ houses means a 32% increase in our housing stock and an excess of what is expected in other areas of our county.					506		
501080	Ms Olivia Collins		CSPS444	Policy FWP6	No					Yes	National Planning Policy Framework para 87. Inappropriate development is by nature, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. Para 88 "Very special circumstances" will not exist unless... harm... is outweighed by other considerations.	No building on green belt. Use the Dormy hotel site instead. It is possible, if necessary, to use small amounts of Green Belt to improve roads, without 520 new houses.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		506			

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
501136	Miss M Parker		CSPS436	Policy FWP6							<p>Although I appreciate that new housing is needed I am gravely concerned over several aspects of your plan. The 520 houses that are proposed is an increase of 32 over our existing housing, and far more than the number proposed for other sites in the surrounding area.</p> <p>Our present infrastructure will not be able to sustain this very large increase. Most importantly Parley Cross is a very busy junction at any time of the day and the possibility of an additional 1,000 cars using the road at peak times will cause very long delays and have an adverse affect on the drivers who commute from Verwood, West Moors, Ferndown and other places.</p> <p>I was unaware that Green Belt land could be used for the construction of housing and the proposed sites either side of New Road namely Policy FWP6 and FWP7 will bring us closer to becoming intergrated with Bournemouth.</p> <p>I understand that the link roads will not be constructed until half the houses have been constructed thereby adding further to the problems that the proposed plans will bring.</p> <p>All of the residents of West Parley wish to maintain their identity as a village. It was for this reason that the majority of us moved to this area and we have over one hundred volunteers undertaking many tasks to preserve our status quo.</p>				506			
501766	Mr D E Anderton		CSPS416	Policy FWP6							<p>1. Whilst we welcome the additional mixed housing to add to the diversity of the population and make a contribution to the national housing tragets, we believe that an increase of over 30% of properties will not be sustainable by the local infrastructure. Although we do not have the necessary data to make accurate calculation, this number of properties could increase the population of West Parley by up to 50%. Can the local services cope with this level of increase?</p> <p>2. We strongly object to the destruction of our green belt. The Core Strategy states that 99.5% of green belt remains, but where is the justification to destroy the other 0.5%? What are the unarguable reasons for overriding the five stated purposes of the green belt as set down PPG2? What are the special circumstances that override those principles to allow development on the green belt which is a key gap between West Parley and Bournemouth? Why not build on 'in-fill' sites around the area?</p>				506			
501772	Mrs C Wilson		CSPS380	Policy FWP6							<p>Having lived in Parley for over 40 years, I do not see the need for so many houses to be erected at Parley. A road through the FWP6 site with houses and small children will not work. Also no school or doctors. Parley school is already full and you cannot get an appointment to see a doctor in Ferndown even now. We have shops that have all changed because everyone goes out of town to shop.</p> <p>Cannot see people coming here with all the traffic. And as for having walks by the river are you going to build walk ways above the water level and getting bitten by the Blandford flies. Leave Parley alone we are quite happy with the shops and houses we already have. Build houses along the Ferndown by-pass and industrial estate but perhaps that is only for the</p>				506			

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											gypsies!						
502683	Mr and Mrs G Milne		CSPS330	Policy FWP6							We have lived in Ferndown for fifty years and seen many changes - some good, some bad. We consider the proposed policies FWP6/7 are bad. Why not stick to two basic rules? 1 - Keep our green sites and use brown sites for building. 2 - Show "entrepreneurs", who want to do otherwise, the door!				506		
503717	Mr and Mrs L Grounell		CSPS341	Policy FWP6							We wish to object to Policy FWP7 and FWP6 both are excessive and unnecessary. We will soon be unable to get out onto our roads which are very busy. We have a green belt so leave it alone and preserve our history.				506		
507463	Mr and Mrs G Hirst		CSPS317	Policy FWP6							Regarding the proposed developments at West Parley. The Government document PPS12 appears to no longer be in force so we have been referred to the 220 page 'Core Strategy' and the 57 page 'National Planning Policy Framework' document. This whole process has been made so complex that it is clearly not written with residents in mind, very few will have the patience or knowledge to complete this as requested. So we have written this letter in plain English instead. Our concerns are quite simple common sense issues and we felt there is absolutely no need for such complexity. Policies FWP6 and FWP7 are totally inappropriate and unacceptable to West Parley which already has some of the most congested routes in the Bournemouth area. The proposed link road that will pass through the middle of the houses in FWP3 has to be the most ridiculous ideas yet. This road will pass through affordable housing, children outside. I hope you get our drift on this, or should we wait for one more to be killed or injured first! The 'West Parley Parish Plan' that was contributed to by 1000 residents has been virtually ignored by the District Council. You are proposing an additional 520 houses at West Parley. What a complete nonsense. A few houses on brown field sites is fine. Certainly not building on these 'Key Gaps' against urban sprawl. You really need to remember who the customer is here (the 'West Parley Residents') and come to your senses over these decisions and listen to what we are saying.				506		
644715	Mrs Barbara Ralph		CSPS373	Policy FWP6							Same comments as for FWP7 re link road. Too many houses. Who will buy them - richer entrepreneurs not the young who won't be able to afford them. Just a new address for us all. Bournemouth - all jumbled up together. Maybe the link roads won't be built yet so heaven help Parley Cross and us on Christchurch and New Roads. We (as residents) have never been properly consulted until it is almost too late. Democracy? No of course not. What is it then? It's "incentive" payments from government to local councils. What will that "incentive" payment probably be used for? Not to reduce the council tax or to improve the area. Probably				506		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											to increase the salaries of all the 'experts' of the council who do not live on Christchurch or New Roads. In disgust.						
650450	Mr and Mrs R Legg		CSPS326	Policy FWP6							We cannot understand why the powers that be want to build another 300 new houses on this New Road Field site, when just a third of a mile up Christchurch Road some 220 new houses are being proposed. 9Policy FW7). Why should West Parley have this huge influx of housing when other areas Ferndown, Verwood, Wimborne and Corfe Mullen are only having the minimum amounts. I understand West Parley will be having a 35% increase in housing stock. Something is very wrong for this to occur and should be carefully examined. We would like to know who will be able to afford the new housing as Banks are not loaning money to the lower paid buyers. Also where do these people live at present? Has it been considered buying up the un-occupied properties in the local areas. Just looking at the buildings at Ferndown Crossroads there are many empty properties which could be renovated for use by first time buyers. With the proposed housing estates will new schools, doctor surgeries, dentists, etc be built? The roads will be gridlocked at peak times with all the additional cars, and the new proposed link road and traffic lights will certainly make matters even worst. We fully realise extra housing is required but share the state sites equally around the different areas.				506		
650651	Mr A Holden		CSPS340	Policy FWP6							Such a development would place pressure on medical services and schools. No more commercial outlets are required in this area. 2010 plans - Do not disregard what the people of West Parley think on this change. Green Belts are designated for a reason, and to treat of no importance does not serve you well.				506		
650667	Mr A D Blakely		CSPS347	Policy FWP6							Words are nearly failing me to believe that it is your intention to put 520 homes on these "Green Field Sites" and create 'two separate estates'. There is, for a start, not the infrastructure to support this amount of density, nor are the roads capable of taking the amount of extra traffic that will have to be supported. Oh yes, build your new roads and traffic lights, which will cause the existing slow traffic at peak times to be even slower, but this will also move the problem further afield to Ferndown, Haskins roundabout and the Kinson roundabout. Access to these 'new' roads, no doubt will be controlled by yet more traffic lights, again slowing down the excess traffic. Do not forget that more lights are being installed along New Road where the Dormy Hotel used to be! Hope I have made my point and without using your political 'slang', for slang it is. Use words and meanings that the average person understands, not for example in your Core Strategy Response Form, Q.7 'Please set out what change (s) you consider necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound,				506		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description				
											<p>having regard to the test you have identified at 5 above where this relates to soundness. It beggars belief. If you had a request for that question in a foreign language, you would translate it in the equivalent of 'plain' English. I also wonder how many of those councillors involved in the decision making have actually spent time at the Parley Cross roads at busy times and witnessed the existing chaos. I have only written about the traffic situation, I haven't mentioned all the other problems which would be created by such an influx of 'new residents', like schools, pets, sewerage, water, etc etc etc..... The increasing population does need extra housing, but not on this scale. Help reduce the increase in the population by 'standing up and being counted' to the existing laws, which allows too many people, too easily, take advantage of them. You are supposed to represent us. About time you did. Enough said, I am strongly opposed to your plans.</p>										
650703	J Charlton		CSPS356	Policy FWP6							<p>We have been in the area for under a year and one of the reasons we moved here is because of the lovely unspoilt area. Our nearest school is Parley first and when we moved here we visited the school to be told there was only one space left in reception and they had four more people behind me to visit the school. We quickly snapped the placement. With the amount of new housing comes children, which schools will they go to? Parley 1st already have 30 children in their classes! Are we going to increase the amount of children per class? Build another school? Where is all the money coming from to support this? We have been to a couple of the meetings where we find it quite unbelievable with the amount of houses you seem to be intent on building. With ref to Policy FWP6 the link road is a flood plain and if you checked only this year the rain / flood came running over the stables there. It would be a terrible mistake for this to go ahead. The noise from aircraft for us is not a problem at the moment, but with plans to increase the air traffic surely more households will be affected if they are built, especially those near to the airport. The houses in policy FWP6/7 are key gaps to avoid urban sprawl and looking back originally from the plans, they were the top reason for these GAPS to avoid urban sprawl! The amount of housing being built in Parley is over 30% which is a lot more then in the surrounding areas i.e. Wimborne, Ferndown. We all understand that housing needs to be addressed and all areas need to make plans for some increase, but this plan is totally unfair to all the residents that live here in West Parley and ones like us that have moved here to pay that extra to get away from Bournemouth where everyone lives 'on top' of each other. The council will make a lot more money from community tax</p>					506					

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											we know! This whole plan must be reconsidered.						
650711	Mr and Mrs S Bratchell		CSPS357	Policy FWP6							<p>We refer to policies FWP6 and FWP7 which concern the construction of a total of 520 new houses in the West Parley area.</p> <p>We appreciate the need for new housing and agree that West Parley has the capacity to accommodate some, but 520 new homes is excessive and will change the whole nature of the area.</p> <p>Despite your plans to lay new roads, the amount of traffic passing through West Parley will increase congestion on roads which are already very busy and, importantly, will have the effect of turning the area into a suburb of Bournemouth. We strongly urge you to reconsider your plans with a view to decreasing the number of houses planned.</p>				506		
650721	Mr M A Cook		CSPS368	Policy FWP6							<p>I write to object against the two aforementioned housing policies (FWP6 and FWP7), which are being considered for the West Parley area.</p> <p>I could write song and verse, but have chosen to simply identify some bullet points, as I understand an ordinary letter of objection is accepted by the District Council. My concerns / issues are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> *lack of existing infrastructure *poor link road design *disjointed plans - link roads after houses *over population *loss of green belt and 'Bournemouth Gap' *very little consultation *ignoring the West Parley Parish Plan and the views of the residents who strongly oppose. 				506		
650747	Mr John Hughes		CSPS376	Policy FWP6							<p>The conservative 'Open Source Green Paper' section 3c states 'we will maintain national Green Belt protection... stop urban sprawl...'</p> <p>Your claim to keep 99.5% is misleading and considered illegal.</p> <p>The local people of West Parley do not want this development and goes against the 'collaborative policy' that is in place.</p>	The changes require 'no urban sprawl onto green belt land'. This is quite clear in the policy documents.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	Because the GI appear to be contravening the policy.	506		
650764	Mr A J Crompton		CSPS382	Policy FWP6							<p>I have lived in West Parley for many years and write in protest against the massive increase in housing planned for the village, with a consequent increase in traffic and pollution which is already unacceptable.</p> <p>For planners, the main reason for having a Green Belt is to prevent urban sprawl, but for residents it is also to provide a good habitat for wildlife, of which West Parley has an abundance.</p> <p>The field where 300 houses are planned under FWP6 has hares, which although not a protected species, deserve some consideration. This area has been turned down in past years for development due to the flight path of aircraft using Hurn airport (Bournemouth International). If this area is developed the residents will have a poor quality of life outdoors. The extra traffic generated by 300 houses would be another 600 cars added to the already saturated roads.</p>				506		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
											The area where 220 houses are planned under FWP7 at Dudsbury Heights has badgers, which are a protected species, and should not be disturbed. I estimate that West Parley should take a maximum of 150 new properties which would be about double the requirement for local families. An ideal place for this development would be the Coppins Nursery site at the far end of Christchurch Road. Little is done to control the speed of traffic in New Road near where I live and I dread to think what it would be like should the extra traffic be added. I am told that the official response form is full of legal jargon which is a devious way of putting off protest.							
651851	Mr and Mrs Wood		CSPS435	Policy FWP6							I am writing this in response to policy FWP6/FWP7. What is the point of having planning meetings, that we all take the time to attend, plus the expense of all the displays etc, when you completely ignore the views of the local residents. Why won't you listen to what the residents of West Parley are saying? We are quite prepared to accept our share of the housing needs but the proposed 520 new homes is completely out of proportion to the size of West Parley (+32%). The increase in traffic flow to the new airport terminal is more than most areas have to contend with, let alone the vast amount of additional traffic generated by 520 new houses. Also losing so much of our valuable Green Belt is just not on. Please, please as our elected representatives listen to our concerns.				506			
652645	Mr and Mrs C Graham		CSPS442	Policy FWP6	No						The plan is not legally compliant. It runs counter to Green Belt legislation by proposing to relocate the Green Belt. In doing so it also proposes to greatly reduce the green gap between the Bournemouth and Poole urban area and West Parley. It reinstates a previously unsuccessful submission to construct a large food store / supermarket at Parley Cross FWP6 even though: * A previous submission was rejected having been through full legal process including an appeal, which was rejected by the court. Is there a compelling justification for this ruling to be overturned? * Since the aforementioned submission traffic flows have increased as a result of infilling and other construction of housing in the local area, including Bournemouth and Poole and extensive development of Bournemouth International Airport and the industrial park, recycling and future eco-plants, quarrying and other activities. * Other major supermarkets have been constructed within a two mile radius of West Parley villages, including Tesco, Sainsbury's and the Lidl stores in Ferndown and a little further out, the major development of what was the Hampshire Centre in Castle Lane. There is no justified or even perceived requirement for yet another supermarket in this area. The plan does not provide evidence that local village shops are not sufficient to serve the village even with further development.				506			

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>* It is understood that the proposal also includes resurrection of a previous failed application to build a place of worship for the Plymouth Brethren.</p> <p>The plan is not consistent with the Prime Minister's own policy.</p> <p>It is Top Down and undemocratic, ignoring the West Parley Parish Plan, notwithstanding the election of our Parish Council with an 80% vote on a mandate based on the Parish Plan, the 1000 residents that supported the plan and the lack of prior involvement or consultation with the Parish Council in the preparation of this EDDC plan.</p> <p>The plan is environmentally unsound (Policies FWP6 & 7).</p> <p>* It is apparantely not supported by an environmental impact assessment.</p> <p>* It proposes new link roads that cut diagonally across the Parley Cross area will inevitably increase the spread of noise and pollution over a wide area of Parley Cross Village and in effect will encircle the proposed housing developemnt at FWP7 and cut right through FWP6 and will encroach near existing houses. Even though we live on a link road that excludes most heavy goods traffic, we are in a position to understand the potential impact of the ridiculous proposal to impose the environmental impact of these major link roads on West Parley village, not only in terms of air and noise pollution, also very dangerous for young families.</p> <p>* Because the link road at FWP7 is on high ground there will be a disproportionate noise impact disturbing the current tranquility of the riverside walks and it will impact across the river Stour valley to the housing on the other side.</p> <p>* It does not identify the impact on local wildlife including rare species and the movement of deer between woods and common land on the Parley and Ferndown areas local area.</p> <p>* It encroaches on productive high grade agricultural land.</p> <p>* It encroaches on the Dudsbury heights fields near the old hill fort.</p> <p>The plan is incomplete - it fails to make provision for the additional school places for the education of children in the proposed and other planned local housing.</p> <p>I understand from Councillor Wilson's response to me that the current First Schools do not have the capacity to absorb the additional children from such a large development and no assessment has been made for secondary education. Clearly this requires additional construction, additional land, imposes additional loading on peak traffic flows (for school runs and busses to all levels of school), more environmental and traffic impact. This construction requirement and impact on peak traffic flows cannot be excluded from the proposal.</p> <p>The plan imposes disproportionate development on West Parley village. It proposes a disproporinoate 32% increase in housing on thr village.</p> <p>It is hypocritical for the Councils to justify this plan on social housing provision.</p> <p>The Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy Plan is being promoted on the basis of providing 35% affordable housing, yet over the past 30 years the council have and are</p>						

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>continuing to allow a relentless programme to build retirement housing and care homes (equating to hundreds of dwellings) in locations that are exactly suited to provision of affordable homes or which replace existing dwellings with very little evidence of any % provision of affordable housing. And these developments encourage more inward migration of older people into this area and place an increasing burden on the social services and health support budgets.</p> <p>Having apparently squandered these opportunities to provide affordable housing in the existing urban area, EDDC are apparently cynically exploiting the lack of affordable housing as leverage to support their case for imposing this disproportionate development on West Parley vilage and encroach on the narrow green line (including green belt land) between the Bournemouth urban sprawl and the village.</p>						
652722	Mr and Mrs N Stride		CSPS481	Policy FWP6							<p>Consultation response to West Parley Development Plans. Firstly, we wish to comment on the official response form. In our view, it is designed to ensure that as few people as possible will make the effort to respond. It uses language and terminology that a layman finds difficult to understand. We are supposed to refer to lengthy government documents as well as send in separate forms for each topic we wish to comment on. You have obviously receieved other complaints about the bureaucratic response process, as we have recently been informed by West Parley Parish Council that residents can now respond via ordinary written letters. I find it underhand that you yourselves have not publicised wider this alternative approach. It is a format much better suited to solicit feedback from the bulk of the local population; many of us wouldn't have a clue (and therefore be put off) in how to reply in a fixed format under catergories such as "justified", "legally compliant", "unsound" etc.</p> <p>We now wish and welcome the opportunity to make our comments in a free-format letter.</p> <p>Our primary concern is the huge number of houses that are being proposed for West Parley. This is a delightful village and we wish it to remain as such. 520 additional homes are too much; it will ruin the village feel and damage the local environment. The additional load on existing services such as schools, doctors, dentists etc will be intolerable. How can you justify a huge 32% increase in housing stock, far more than you are attempting to impose on the likes of Corfe Mullen, Ferndown, Verwood etc.</p> <p>Compilation of the West Parley Parish Plan was encouraged by yourselves. Approximately 1,000 residents contributed to the plan, yet EDDC has virtually ignored its contents and come up with proposals that it believes the village needs, without local consultation. Your policies FWP6 and FWP7 are very different from what you proposed in 2010 yet you have not involved the WPPC or consulted them in preparing the proposal documents. The Parish Plan is NOT (and rightly so) anti-development; its lesser-scale proposals are totally acceptable without ruining the good quality of life that villagers currently enjoy and appreciate.</p>				506		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>Policy FWP6 refers to an additional supermarket, shopping centre and link road. There is no justifiable need for an additional supermarket. Tesco's and Sainsbury's in Ferndown already provide adequate facilities and you should also take into account the planning permission already granted by Bournemouth Council for a massive new Tesco's development in nearby Kinson.</p> <p>The 220 houses proposed for Dudsbury Heights will be a complete eyesore. I urge you to take the walk from Church Lane, beside the MS Centre, through to New Road. Look up at the view to Dudsbury hill, admire the grazing horses and the tranquil setting in front of the tree-lined landscape. To destroy this with houses and a link road would be a complete disgrace.</p> <p>The loss of Green Belt land is not acceptable. The current sites provide a natural gap between West Parley and north Bournemouth. Removing this will lead to unacceptable urban sprawl. Replacing Green Belt land with so-called SANG's is not the answer. SANG's are no more than 'sanitised' open space and provide nothing of the quality of mature trees, wildlife, country walks and peacefulness afforded by the current Green Belt land.</p> <p>Any development that may be eventually approved must be preceded by associated infrastructure changes. It is not acceptable to delay this until during or after development. Parley Cross is already very busy and cannot cope with additional traffic generated by any new development, particularly at the levels being proposed by EDDC.</p> <p>In conclusion, we implore you to throw out the EDDC proposals for West Parley and start afresh, working with the WPPC and the residents, to come up with revised proposals that allows for limited development without the loss of existing Green Belt and without the significant infrastructure changes that are completely over the top for a village the size of West Parley.</p>						
652787	Mr N J Torok		CSPS503	Policy FWP6							<p>As a resident of West Parley I am very concerned about the consultation with regards to the Green Belt plans for West Parley and I am therefore writing to show that I care about keeping West Parley Green.</p> <p>Firstly, Policy FWP6 would impact greatly on the village feel of West Parley and would erode the key gaps of Green Belt with Bournemouth which were the reasons for preventing urban sprawl. The huge increase in traffic and parking related issues would further impact on our lovely village as would the huge increase in residents, putting further strain on local services which are already stretched.</p> <p>Secondly, Policy FWP7 would allow new development only 75 metres from Dudsbury Hill Fort. The proposed 220 houses would have a link road running past which could prove dangerous for any young families with children.</p> <p>I feel the proposed developments are hugely out of proportion with the present size and make up of West Parley. It is equivalent to a massive 32% increase in the housing stock of West Parley. Other areas are not been required to have such</p>				506		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description		
											a huge increase in their housing stock with all the associated problems of traffic, pollution, parking, noise and a reduction in the quality of life. In my view the plans are wrong, they would be damaging and we as residents have not been consulted in their preparation. I therefore ask the District council to re consider their position and to keep West Parley as it is.								
652793	Michael and Judith Ranger		CSPS504	Policy FWP6							Policy FWP7 and Policy FWP6 consultation response. We are writing to respond to the two building plans proposed for West Parley namely 220 houses at Dudsbury Heights and 300 in the New Road field. Our objections to these proposals are as follows: 1. An extra 520 more houses is a 32% increase in West Parley housing stock. A huge increase, and way in excess of any developments being proposed for Corfe Mullen, Ferndown, Wimborne or Verwood. The extra houses and large supermarket will change the village atmosphere of West Parley. 2. These extra houses will increase the traffic on the already busy roads around West Parley and the proposal to put new roads through these new estates to come out on New Road will make the traffic around the area intolerable at peak times. The new link roads are planned to go through the estates which will also be very dangerous for young families. 3. We understand that these link roads will not even be started until half the houses are built increasing the number of cars going through Parley Cross by hundreds a day. A junction that is already over capacity. 4. An extra 520 houses will bring a huge increase in the demand for schools, doctors and other services. There does not seem to be any extra schools or doctors surgery included in the plans. Our current schools are already full and there are always difficulties making appointments at the doctor's surgery now. 5. The New Road and Dudsbury Heights fields are not any old green belt. They are 'Key Gaps' with Bournemouth. These key gaps, to prevent urban sprawl, were the top reason for having a green belt in the first place. West Parley will become a suburb of Bournemouth. 6. West Parley's Parish Plan was encouraged by the District Council, and 1000 residents contributed to it. These views appear to have been ignored. 7. The two policies are very different from the 2010 plans and we have not been involved or consulted at all in their preparation. Please reconsider your proposals. We accept that more houses are required in East Dorset but it is not acceptable to have a disproportionate number of extra houses built in West Parley.						506		
652950	Mr Peter Holttum		CSPS529	Policy FWP6	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	1) The area is Green Belt. 2) the area provides the main separation between East Dorset and Bournemouth. 3) There is no local need for more housing. The population of UK is declining apart from the effect of immigration.	No changes are needed to the area.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		506				

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
											4) There is no justification for "affordable housing". The authority charged with judicial decision in this matter should not be the same one that is charged with executive duties in the provision of affordable housing. If the East Dorset Council want more affordable housing, let them buy the land themselves. It is against natural justice for the "division of powers" not to be recognised in planning matters.							
652711	Mr Raymond Silverthorne		CSPS585	Policy FWP6	No	No				Yes	<p>The area through which the link road is to pass is subjected to regular flooding from the Stour River. the NPPF paragraph 94 states -</p> <p>Local planning authorities should adopt proactive strategies to mitigate and adapt to climate change, taking full account of flood risk, coastal change and water supply and demand considerations.</p> <p>Paragraph 99 of the NPPF states -</p> <p>Local Plans should take account of climate change over the longer term, including factors such as flood risk, coastal change, water supply and changes to biodiversity and landscape. New development should be planned to avoid increased vulnerability to the range of impacts arising from climate change. When new development is brought forward in areas which are vulnerable, care should be taken to ensure that risks can be managed through suitable adaptation measures, including through the planning of green infrastructure.</p> <p>The first half of paragraph 101 of the NPPF states -</p> <p>The aim of the Sequential Test is to steer new development to areas with the lowest probability of flooding. Development should not be allocated or permitted if there are reasonably available sites appropriate for the proposed development in areas with a lower probability of flooding, bearing in mind that this is a flood zone, my client is very concerned that the new link road will either be directly effected by flooding or contribute to increased flooding through surface run off of rainwater.</p> <p>My client is also concerned as to the impact of Traffic lights being installed outside his property. this will directly impact on the value of his property and increase immediate area pollution caused by stationary traffic.</p>	A full strategic flood risk assessment should be carried out All existing brown field sites should be utilised first	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		506			
703944	Cllr John Little	Christchurch & East Dorset Conservative Association	CSPS450	Policy FWP6	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes		The proposals fail to recognise the recommendations in the West Parley Parish Plan. Apart from the housing target of 320 there are no measurable targets on which to evaluate the proposals. 160 houses could be built without the proposed highway improvements. The required funding for the highway link road on the eastern side has not been adequately considered, the	Consideration to be given to the long term effect of the proposals on existing facilities and the separation of the housing development from the	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		506			

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>major part of which will have to come from public funds. The proposed link road separates the housing development from the SANG and the safety of pedestrians and others wishing to use the SANG has not been considered.</p> <p>The proposed development of 320 homes etc on the east side of New Road together with the proposed major highway improvements will in effect divide the existing community and will result in the loss of a very important green space. The proposed link road between Christchurch Road and New Road will in effect be a "rat run" and create potentially dangerous situations within a housing development which is to include social housing. The development of the superstore will not encourage small traders to open shops on the existing parade.</p> <p>How will the major road improvements be funded? The Transport Contributions will be insufficient.</p> <p>The proposals include for a "New Neighbourhood" at this location with a convenience foodstore on the eastern side and presumably improved retail outlets on the existing, western side. Shoppers will no doubt use the foodstore but how many will then attempt to negotiate a major road junction to the other side? A "New Neighbourhood" that is divided by a major road junction will hardly encourage shoppers or businesses.</p> <p>If the scheme is approved then it seems likely that 50% of the homes could be occupied and the development could stall due to lack of funds.</p> <p>This development is not supported and alternative sites within the urban areas should be investigated.</p>	SANG by the link road.					
360235	Mr Christopher Undery	Christopher D Undery	CSPS742	Policy FWP6	No				No		Housing proposals fail to take account of the benefits that could accrue to the established but disjointed settlement of Longham where little or no development is envisaged.	The Core Strategy should be amended to utilise and enhance the settlement of Longham in conjunction with the identified need for residential housing provision.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	To draw attention to the existing settlement of Longham.	506		
491034	Mr Kenneth Dalglish		CSPS723	Policy FWP6							<p>Further to receiving recent communication regarding the housing proposals, I write to confirm my formal objection to the building of 300 houses on site FWP6 and 220 houses on site FWP7 for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposal represents a housing increase of approximately 32%. This is an unacceptable increase in a small village and puts the status of West Parley 'village' in jeopardy. 2. Increased volume of traffic will create further pressures on an already busy and sometimes dangerous junction. The creation of two additional roads will not alleviate this issue; it will only exacerbate the growing concerns of further major traffic incidents. I truly believe that any parties that authorise such an infrastructure change to Parley Cross, knowing the plans would increase traffic to an unacceptable level in an already dangerous junction, should be wholly accountable for increased injuries and fatalities. 						

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>3. The proposals will destruct the countryside which is home to many wild birds and animals, with many of those being protected; this in itself is so wrong.</p> <p>4. The Green Belt is a policy where urbanisation will be resisted for the foreseeable future, maintaining an area where agriculture, forestry and outdoor leisure can be expected to prevail. The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open, and consequently the most important attribute of Green Belts is their openness. The proposals fail to recognise the importance of the detailed advice regarding PPG2's whereby there are five stated purposes of including land within the Green Belt, namely:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas • To prevent neighbouring towns form merging into one another • To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment • To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns • To assist in urban regenerations, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. <p>5. West Parley is much older than our neighbours in Bournemouth and Ferndown, and has deeper roots than most of the settlements in South East Dorset. Dudsbury Rings, indeed, is an important heritage site and the protection of this and the surrounding area appears to be regarded as irrelevant in the proposals.</p> <p>I feel most strongly about the housing proposals and have highlighted the reasons why this should not pursued. Each of the above reasons is valid, however, there is one area of additional concern which I would wish to raise. I question the reasoning and genuine integrity of the intentions of the EDDC planners as they have failed to conduct the consultation process in accordance with legislation. Government legislation requires consultation to be carried out fully with local communities before setting out local proposals.</p> <p>Therefore:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Why have EDDC proposed these plans in this format? Who is accountable for EDDC? And who checks the validity of what has been proposed? <p>Credibility is very important and the process, at this time, does not appear to be very credible.</p> <p>I look forward to hearing more positive news regarding the amendment or cancellation of the proposed plans.</p>						
496749	Mr J S Davidson		CSPS699	Policy FWP6							<p>I have been given to understand that you are prepared to accept written personal submissions in the above connection. Before dealing with specific aspects of the EDDC proposals for West Parley I wish to offer general comment pertaining to the political, economic and social circumstances, which appear to have given rise to the centrally imposed obligation to provide housing on the scale indicated.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We are told that additional housing is vital. Why? – Because there are more people. Why? – Because of natural increase 				506		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
											<p>and immigrants. Population pressure has been exacerbated by successive Governments not having had a 'common sense' immigration policy.</p> <p>Natural increase would see a steady, manageable demand for housing not the current mad dash to concrete over the countryside to meet Government targets, which targets have a national dynamic as well as a local one.</p> <p>We can, as a nation, have EITHER a Welfare State OR a permeable Immigration Policy but we cannot have both. We cannot ignore the root of the problem.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I have the uncomfortable feeling that many of the proposals were formulated by the planners without adequate consultation with the communities affected. Perhaps the current exercise will go some way to dispelling that impression and confirm the effectiveness of local democracy, particularly in regard to the Parish Plan, which did receive reasonably comprehensive circulation. The Plan was firmly against more than 100 houses being built in West Parley. • New housing on the scale suggested will irretrievably alter the landscape, destroy the residual semi-rural nature of the area and put intolerable pressure on services, roads and other amenities. There is more than just a whiff of reliance, ultimately, on central government and some thought has to be given to future funding (roads etc) with all the obligations such funding would bring. West Parley is already being pressured into accepting a disproportionate share of the housing burden. • Besides the information and views from the planners it is vital that all parties who have a vested interest in any of the proposals be named so that transparency and accountability are established. The position of the present owners of the development land; of the likely commercial enterprises involved/approached; contractors, developers etc has to be declared as soon as possible. The channels through which the proposals are being driven and personalities (MP's, public servants et al) involved in whatever capacity must be identified. Presumably our local MP and the MEP are being kept appraised of developments. (Cc sent). <p>FWP6</p> <p>There is an air of wishful thinking about this proposal. 320 new houses, a supermarket, additional traffic emptying on to already congested roads, pressure on services etc do not a village idyll make. the loss of open agricultural land is to be deep;y regretted. the unrelenting compulsion to fill in the gaps to ensure urban sprawl all the way to Bournemouth beggars belief. Furthermore, the area is well-enough served by grocery stores. Why is there specific accommodation of the Plymouth Brethren? Has the EDDC Planning Department a special remit regarding the spitual welfare of the residents of West Parley?</p> <p>General</p> <p>A reasonable amount of housing imposing a minimal extra burden on services and the countryside is acceptable. What is now proposed is, in my opinion, scandalous for the reasons I have indicated and smacks of 'Big Brother'. Such proposed developments should take place to meet local needs,</p>							

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
											whereas in this instance pressure from central Government is clearly the dominating factor. The consequences of resisting such pressure are not apparent. The number of 520 extra houses goes beyond that which a relatively small community such as West Parley should be expected to bear. In registering my strong objection to FWP6 and FWP7 it is clear that EDDC needs to re-think the situation urgently and imaginatively.							
654320	Mrs Meghann Downing	Highways Agency	CSPS756	Policy FWP6	Yes	Yes					The proposed New Neighbourhood to the East and West of New Road are not immediately adjacent to the A31, nonetheless they represent a significant increase to existing housing, and therefore we would highlight the importance of including impacts upon the Strategic Road Network in the Transport Assessment and resulting mitigation to ensure that traffic impacts upon the SRN are appropriately managed.		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		506			
654437	Mr Ron White		CSPS707	Policy FWP6	No	No	No	No	No	No	FWP6 The housing development and road proposal is an ill-conceived and ill thought out scheme that goes against all local democratic views and infrastructure concepts. The proposed development and influx of high density housing along with FWP6 and FWP5 schemes can be compared with two such local developments in completed in Bournemouth, namely Townsend Estate and West Howe Estates. These two Estates subsequently resulted in the highest crime rate of the surrounding areas. The current FWP7, FPW6 and FPW 5 schemes have a far greater content than the original schemes proposed by East Dorset Council, which when submitted to the electorate for consultation were democratically rejected by 98% of West Parley residents. The local parish council at the time did not oppose these proposals. Subsequently, at the next parish council elections all councillors were voted out by the residents of West Parley and new councillors voted in. Since the election, the local council has consulted with the electorate and the consensus of opinion is that although the residents clearly object to the current proposals of building on green belt land, they are willing to accept that new housing will be required, but in far fewer numbers. The proposal by the recently elected local parish council was put forward for a future maximum development of 100 homes within the West Parley parish. These homes could be accommodated on brown fill land without incursion onto the green belt. This proposal was submitted to the electorate and was overwhelmingly accepted, yet the District council ignored the recommendation. The current East Dorset planning of this scheme failed to consider: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The democratic wishes of the electorate • The infrastructure required to sustain this type of development • The effect on the local environment • The effect of this great influx of population on the local 	West Parley Parish Council (recent) has subbitted adequate proposals for housing developement in the West parley area. Consultation on this document should be sought before any decision on the core strtagey is considered.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	To put the views of the local general public before the enquiry	506			

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
											<p>doctors, dentists, schools.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The increase of traffic on an already over used road system • Lack of local employment in the area • The impact of increased crime statistics in the lowest crime rated parish district in the Dorset area. • Failed to consult fully with all of the local electorate on the latest proposals • Failed and misled the residents on the actual class and width of road through the proposed FWP6 area to allow the amount of heavy vehicles from the industrial estates and gravel extraction site driving through. <p>The proposed 3000sq. ft. shopping area will cause even more traffic to be generated to this site. There seems to be insufficient parking allowed for the size of development and overflow will cause disruption to local traffic.</p>							
654581	Mr and Mrs H Hedges		CSPS721	Policy FWP6							<p>My wife and I wish to object most strongly to the plans for huge housing development in West Parley under Policy FWP6 and FWP7.</p> <p>The overwhelming majority of residents are against these plans which if implemented will seriously damage the quality of life of all who live here.</p> <p>It would seem that key areas of Green Belt are to be stolen, justified on the altar of house building with no regard to the wishes of the resident population.</p> <p>The Green Belt is there for a good reason: to leave a breathing space and prevent further urban sprawl. Parley is already a notorious black spot at Parley Cross with excessive traffic volumes, with hold ups and accidents commonplace.</p> <p>The air pollution we have to endure is appalling and will be exacerbated by hundreds more cars from the proposed housing.</p> <p>Councils have a duty to protect the Green Belt and maintain the quality of life of its Ratepayers. Ratepayers will not forget Councils which ignore their wishes.</p>					506		
654595	Mr and Mrs T Sams		CSPS727	Policy FWP6							<p>We would like to express our concern at the proposed huge development in this historic and beautiful village.</p> <p>We are sure the residents of our community understand that housing is a requirement in line with the population expansion, but a development of this size in an area that has already seen the increase in scheduled flights from the now Bournemouth Airport, the lorries serving the Waste Disposal Unit and the impossible traffic situation along Christchurch Road and New Road, is a plan for disaster.</p> <p>This village has also had to suffer the increased Ambulance, Police and Fire activity that excess traffic has brought to this area. Surely there is better logic than to increase the residential capacity by the amount you are proposing?</p> <p>It has also been our understanding that Green Belt land is a government policy for controlling urban growth, the type that you are proposing.</p> <p>Surely, the main purpose of this policy was to protect land and maintain the designated area for forestry and agriculture as well as to provide for wildlife and protect the unique character of rural communities.</p>					506		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>How can we ever believe Government and Councils who ignore the very policies they introduce? Rather than subject the local Parley community to irresponsible developments, perhaps your focus should be more on the 3,000 empty properties at any one time in the Bournemouth and Christchurch area. Surely this is a significant wasted resource which would contribute towards the housing demands. The Empty Homes Strategy 2009-2012 identifies this wasted resource as you probably know. It must also be clear to you that the consultation process has been unsatisfactory. Government legislation requires you to consult fully with those who will be severely impacted by your proposal. You have failed to adhere to this legislation. The West Parley Parish Council have been proactive in consulting residents who responded overwhelmingly against more than 100 homes being built in West Parley. It is evident that EDDC planners chose to ignore this. The general concerns are that EDDC seem to indulge in secret consultations and decisions which are not only unacceptable but also fail to meet Government legislation. Creating an unbroken urban sprawl from Bournemouth to Ferndown by building on Green Belt land does not represent good practice and ignores Green Belt Policy and the community which you are supposed to represent. The proposal for 2 new roads will be dangerous for children living in the new houses and will not ease the already stretched traffic system in West Parley. Traffic jams will be merely moved further down the main roads. 520 extra houses will bring up to 1000 extra cars trying to navigate through West Parley. Such a development represents an increase in housing of about 32%. This is excessive and is far more than is proposed for the other East Dorset communities. Without the appropriate infrastructure of adequate school places, doctors, dentists, community centres etc there will be unacceptable pressure on existing provisions. The planners do not seem to have considered traffic congestion issues, floodplain, heritage sites, and the traffic chaos that yet another supermarket will bring. We implore you not to make such community impacted decisions that may well haunt you for years. Such examples are the Castlepoint disaster for both traffic flow and major car parking issues with jacks holding up some of the foundation and the IMAX Centre which you are now considering demolishing to name but two major Council planning disasters. West Parley should not be sacrificed by planners' unrealistic dreams and an attempt at social engineering. I urge you to reconsider these proposals and to start talking to the people in West Parley Community who are entitled to have a say in the drawing up of proposals for any increase in housing in their village.</p>						
654783	Mrs Lesley Wilson		CSPS865	Policy FWP6		No	No		No	No	The previous consultation for this Policy showed a preferred provision of 100 new houses on Green Belt land. Green belts were created for the excellent ideal of keeping gaps between	A further consultation.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		506		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>urban communities and it follows that to move the boundaries to allow building on them when they lie between two adjacent conurbations flies in the face of that ideal and should be a very last resort. This green belt lies between West Parley and Bournemouth and should be retained complete.</p> <p>The current consultation has increased to number of house to 320 from the above 100 so tripled it. It has introduced SANGS, allotments, community orchards and a supermarket, none of which were in the original consultations and so makes a mockery of the consultation process.</p> <p>Together with FWP7 it introduces for the first time two new link roads across the green belts and four new traffic signal controlled junctions on the two main roads through Parley crossroads. This is claimed to reduce traffic through Parley crossroads by 30% from current levels but makes no reference to the impact of an extra 550 houses being built alongside those roads as part of this strategy and ignores the fact that the local airport passenger numbers in this recession are something like 2 million less than the airport was built to cater for. A previous consultation should have included all the above changes and provided evidence of their buildability and effectiveness. The policy is to include a requirement for the new link roads to be built when 50% of the new houses have been constructed. That is very weak. The new road construction should be required to commence at Day One if the houses are approved.</p>						
654962	Mr Christopher Chope		CSPS1014	Policy FWP6	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	<p>Policies FWP5, 6 and 7 together result in the removal of an essential part of the South East Dorset Green Belt from Green Belt designation. There is no justification for this, consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework which requires that development on land designated as Green Belt should be restricted when plan making is undertaken and that such a restriction should be part of the concept of sustainable development.</p>	Deletion of these policies from the Plan.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	In order to reinforce the strong and deep rooted campaign by members of the West Parley community to preserve their Green Belt and prevent West Parley becoming assimilated as part of a suburb between Bournemouth and Ferndown.	506		
650257	Mr Ian King		CSPS1001	Policy FWP6	No	No		No	No	No	<p>The proposal to build 520 new homes within the areas FWP6 and FWP7 is not consistent with current Government policy and should be legally challenged. The schemes proposed are not sound as they are not justified, effective or consistent with National Policy for the following reasons:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Indiscriminate re-drawing of the Green Belt boundaries in West Parley is not consistent with current Government policy. • West Parley already experiences serious traffic congestion from all directions in and out of Parley lights and through Longham due to the inadequate size of the A348 to Bear Cross. This is a major trunk road and needs to be upgraded to relieve the congestion on the Christchurch Road and New Road. The proposed changes to the layout at Parley lights will offer limited or no improvement; whereas the proposed link roads will cause additional tailbacks and traffic problems for all traffic trying to join the New Road just before the New 	A more viable solution could be a roundabout on the Parley Crossroads, making use of the garage site which is available to be used, and part of the field opposite. This would enable the flow of traffic to be better managed and without the expense of 2 new roads being built through residential areas of taking over Green Belt land.			506		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>Road Bridge. It is the volume of traffic that is the issue and unless all the connecting roads and junctions are factored into the infrastructure plans; it will do nothing more than push the gridlock further up or down New Road or Christchurch Road. Not justified or effective.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed number of houses in FWP7 (220) is excessive even unnecessary as the site is far from ideal being a hilly mound, totally unsuitable for civil engineering works which would need to be utilised both for the building of the of the houses and their services and the construction of a substantial road which will carry heavy goods vehicles as well as the increase in local traffic. The proposed housing in FWP7 is alongside an area that already experiences flooding issues; the plan does not mention anything about this or how it proposes to alleviate the issues with run-off water that more hard standing areas such as houses and roads will create. The number of houses proposed for the schemes in FWP6 and FWP7 is too great for the area to absorb and there are little or no plans for community services such as schools, doctors etc to support the additional homes; the homes are too far from local schools which will result in even more traffic on the main roads. Glenmoor Road already has serious problems around pick up and drop-off times at Parley First School; this will be exacerbated if the intention is to increase headcount at the school. <p>Questions the residents are asking are:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Where are the statistics to justify the need for 30%+ increase in housing stock in West Parley? Do our schools have waiting lists? Are they oversubscribed? Do the doctors and dentists have capacity? Could it be the case that West Parley happens to have more green belt areas than its neighbours and by default that makes it the best option? Why is it acceptable for the Council to build on green belt land when a private homeowner will struggle to achieve planning consent for an extension to an existing property that just happens to be in the vicinity of the green belt land? <p>As far as the road scheme is concerned, it is difficult to envisage the effect the two link roads proposed in Policies FWP6 and FWP7 would have on the acknowledged serious traffic problems already experienced at this junction. Indeed, the projected scheme for improving Parley Crossroads would probably be inadequate to solve even the current traffic problems. An additional 520 homes within a short distance of the junction on both sides of New Road plus new shops and facilities would only exacerbate the severe congestion in the area, despite the attractions of 'developer gain' funding. This is a case of the new housing funding and proposed roads and change of layout, thereby defeating the objective and indeed making it worse.</p>						
654506	Mr John Showell		CSPS992	Policy FWP6		No		Yes	Yes	Yes	Policy FWP6 is a policy which designs in future problems. The history of Parley has been one of complaining about the	Delete the housing from the policy. This is	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral		506		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description		
											noise from the airport. Planning to build homes and facilities under the flight path is destined to create problems in the future. The best that could be considered for the area is open space and or an industrial warehousing or retailing facility where people are less resitant to nosie a fuel pollution.	a possible site for the relocation of Wimborne Rugby and Football clubs. But generally building close to airports flight paths is not a sound idea. Also the traffic implications on Parley cross roads need to be considered. There are only three river crossings linking East Dorset with the conurbation ie New Road, Longham Bridge and Wimborne Bridge. Any increase in housing to the north of the River Stour will inevitably lead to further strain on these links. That is why Verwood with its links to the Spur Road and East towards the M27 is the best location for any planned growth in population.	examination						
655073	Mrs Barbara Bailey		CSPS1002	Policy FWP6	No	No	No	No	No	No	The proposal to build 520 new homes within the areas FWP6 and FWP7 is not consistent with current Government policy and should be legally challenged. The schemes proposed are not sound as they are not justified, effective or consistent with National Policy for the following reasons:- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Indiscriminate re-drawing of the Green Belt boundaries in West Parley is not consistent with current Government policy. • West Parley already experiences serious traffic congestion from all directions in and out of Parley lights and through Longham due to the inadequate size of the A348 to Bear Cross. This is a major trunk road and needs to be upgraded to relieve the congestion on the Christchurch Road and New Road. The proposed changes to the layout at Parley lights will offer limited or no improvement; whereas the proposed link roads will cause additional tailbacks and traffic problems for all traffic trying to join the New Road just before the New Road Bridge. It is the volume of traffic that is the issue and unless all the connecting roads and junctions are factored into the infrastructure plans; it will do nothing more than push the gridlock further up or down New Road or Christchurch Road. Not justified or effective. • The proposed number of houses in FWP7 (220) is excessive even unnecessary as the site is far from ideal being a hilly mound, totally unsuitable for civil engineering works which would need to be utilised both for the building of the of the houses and their services and the construction of a 	A more viable solution could be a roundabout on the Parley Crossroads, making use of the garage site which is available to be used, and part of the field opposite. This would enable the flow of traffic to be better managed and without the expense of 2 new roads being built through residential areas of taking over Green Belt land.				506			

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
											<p>substantial road which will carry heavy goods vehicles as well as the increase in local traffic.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed housing in FWP7 is alongside an area that already experiences flooding issues; the plan does not mention anything about this or how it proposes to alleviate the issues with run-off water that more hard standing areas such as houses and roads will create. The number of houses proposed for the schemes in FWP6 and FWP7 is too great for the area to absorb and there are little or no plans for community services such as schools, doctors etc to support the additional homes; the homes are too far from local schools which will result in even more traffic on the main roads. Glenmoor Road already has serious problems around pick up and drop-off times at Parley First School; this will be exacerbated if the intention is to increase headcount at the school. <p>Questions the residents are asking are:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Where are the statistics to justify the need for 30%+ increase in housing stock in West Parley? Do our schools have waiting lists? Are they oversubscribed? Do the doctors and dentists have capacity? Could it be the case that West Parley happens to have more green belt areas than its neighbours and by default that makes it the best option? Why is it acceptable for the Council to build on green belt land when a private homeowner will struggle to achieve planning consent for an extension to an existing property that just happens to be in the vicinity of the green belt land? <p>As far as the road scheme is concerned, it is difficult to envisage the effect the two link roads proposed in Policies FWP6 and FWP7 would have on the acknowledged serious traffic problems already experienced at this junction. Indeed, the projected scheme for improving Parley Crossroads would probably be inadequate to solve even the current traffic problems. An additional 520 homes within a short distance of the junction on both sides of New Road plus new shops and facilities would only exacerbate the severe congestion in the area, despite the attractions of 'developer gain' funding. This is a case of the new housing funding and proposed roads and change of layout, thereby defeating the objective and indeed making it worse.</p>							
655076	Mrs Phyllis Evans		CSPS1004	Policy FWP6	No	No	No	No	No	No	<p>The proposal to build 520 new homes within the areas FWP6 and FWP7 is not consistent with current Government policy and should be legally challenged. The schemes proposed are not sound as they are not justified, effective or consistent with National Policy for the following reasons:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Indiscriminate re-drawing of the Green Belt boundaries in West Parley is not consistent with current Government policy. West Parley already experiences serious traffic congestion from all directions in and out of Parley lights and through Longham due to the inadequate size of the A348 to Bear Cross. This is a major trunk road and needs to be upgraded to relieve the congestion on the Christchurch Road and New 	A more viable solution could be a roundabout on the Parley Crossroads, making use of the garage site which is available to be used, and part of the field opposite. This would enable the flow of traffic to be better managed and without the expense of 2 new				506		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>Road. The proposed changes to the layout at Parley lights will offer limited or no improvement; whereas the proposed link roads will cause additional tailbacks and traffic problems for all traffic trying to join the New Road just before the New Road Bridge. It is the volume of traffic that is the issue and unless all the connecting roads and junctions are factored into the infrastructure plans; it will do nothing more than push the gridlock further up or down New Road or Christchurch Road. Not justified or effective.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed number of houses in FWP7 (220) is excessive even unnecessary as the site is far from ideal being a hilly mound, totally unsuitable for civil engineering works which would need to be utilised both for the building of the of the houses and their services and the construction of a substantial road which will carry heavy goods vehicles as well as the increase in local traffic. • The proposed housing in FWP7 is alongside an area that already experiences flooding issues; the plan does not mention anything about this or how it proposes to alleviate the issues with run-off water that more hard standing areas such as houses and roads will create. • The number of houses proposed for the schemes in FWP6 and FWP7 is too great for the area to absorb and there are little or no plans for community services such as schools, doctors etc to support the additional homes; the homes are too far from local schools which will result in even more traffic on the main roads. Glenmoor Road already has serious problems around pick up and drop-off times at Parley First School; this will be exacerbated if the intention is to increase headcount at the school. <p>Questions the residents are asking are:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Where are the statistics to justify the need for 30%+ increase in housing stock in West Parley? 2. Do our schools have waiting lists? Are they oversubscribed? 3. Do the doctors and dentists have capacity? 4. Could it be the case that West Parley happens to have more green belt areas than its neighbours and by default that makes it the best option? 5. Why is it acceptable for the Council to build on green belt land when a private homeowner will struggle to achieve planning consent for an extension to an existing property that just happens to be in the vicinity of the green belt land? <p>As far as the road scheme is concerned, it is difficult to envisage the effect the two link roads proposed in Polices FWP6 and FWP7 would have on the acknowledged serious traffic problems already experienced at this junction. Indeed, the projected scheme for improving Parley Crossroads would probably be inadequate to solve even the current traffic problems. An additional 520 homes within a short distance of the junction on both sides of New Road plus new shops and facilities would only exacerbate the severe congestion in the area, despite the attractions of 'developer gain' funding. This is a case of the new housing funding and proposed roads and change of layout, thereby defeating the objective and indeed</p>	roads being built through residential areas of taking over Green Belt land.					

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
											making it worse.							
655496	Mr and Mrs S Williams		CSPS1027	Policy FWP6							<p>It is not my job to check the Planning Policy Statement to determine whether or not the document is legally compliant. It is your job to ensure that the document is legally compliant. If you are sure the document is legally compliant why ask me? Don't pass the buck?</p> <p>I really don't know how many more letters I must write, informing you that I do not want you to build on FWP6 and FWP7.</p> <p>I am told that more houses need to be built but surely you can find an alternative site. Recently the field next to the River Stour in the area where you propose to build the new link road up to Dudsbury Heights with 220 houses was flooded and I can only imagine how much extra rainfall will be running down off the road surface when it will be impossible to be absorbed in the ground.</p> <p>House insurance companies are now asking how much the area you live in is likely to be threatened by flooding. So the higher the likelihood of flooding, the higher the insurance premium will be. At the moment I am able to advise my insurance co. that we do not have a problem with flooding. Will I still be able to say that when the concrete's gone down? If you think there is no further risk of flooding with the development in this low-lying area, try convincing the insurance companies! After all, the fields get flooded now – BEFORE THEY'VE BEEN BUILT ON!</p> <p>Please tell me how confident you are that the proposed development will not increase the risk of flood, crime, pollution and the loss of quality of life in the area.</p> <p>You say you want to preserve as much green belt as possible and stop urban sprawl, but I cannot understand this, when you seem to want to do the opposite. There is hardly any gap between Bournemouth and West Parley as it is.</p> <p>I have live in West Parley since 1983 and I have lived without a supermarket nearby quite successfully – just like millions of other people in other towns and villages who don't want their area messed about with by dictators who don't even live there.</p> <p>Therefore, these dictators are the true 'not in MY back yard' NIMBYs who have the power to make others have it in their back yard instead. So much for local democracy. If there had been a supermarket there at Parley Cross, I would not have moved here. I am intrigued about the need for all these people to move here, when the employment is pretty much non-existent. The whole character of West Parley will change, as we will probably have an influx of take-aways (more litter and junk-mail) to follow the supermarket.</p> <p>Surely the house are the children of the residents to try to stop them moving away but I don't think this will change matters, you are just going to be bringing people in from out of the area. Therefore still not addressing the affordable housing for local residents.</p> <p>I love the photo of the proposed West Parley site outside the fish and chips parade under FWP5, you must live in a dream</p>					506		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>world if you really think that is going to be a true image. I noted also that in the 'before' photo, the trees are bare, but in the 'after' photo they are in full bloom. A nice crafty touch to make the scene look more attractive. Obviously deliberate, as this applies to both sets of photos and it is more computer work to alter the trees to green than to leave them bare. Also, if you compare the length and width of the bus lay-by to the passing traffic, you're going to need buses about four foot wide, and ten foot long.</p> <p>It's obvious that the councillors at East Dorset and the government have absolutely no idea about people's feelings and just ride roughshod over us. This will be the biggest mistake you have made for West Parley if you still build in the centre of West Parley – hindsight is a wonderful thing.</p>						
655527	Mr R K Lewis		CSPS1030	Policy FWP6							<p>I will not bore you with an endless explanation concerning your development plans for West Parley but merely offer bullet points for your consideration.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There is no shortage of housing in West Parley unless you intend to import sufficient people to create one. 2. It is not necessary to fill every open space with a building project. 3. The traffic at West Parley is already at saturation point at certain times of the day and only a fool would consider adding to it. 4. I am reliably informed by developers that there are sufficient brown sites to satisfy any shortfall in the housing stock without building on green belt. 5. When we voted for councillors we did so with the belief that their intention was to represent us and protect our interests. You would do well to remember that. 6. Finally we are determined to fight the building proposals at West Parley vigorously and I sincerely hope that our determination remains legal. 				506		
656195	Mrs A Andrew		CSPS1065	Policy FWP6							<p>I would like to register my objection to the proposed major development of the Green Belt land in West Parley. I am particularly concerned about the irreversible destruction of these large areas of land which are so highly valued for their natural beauty, peace and tranquillity by so many in the locality. They are highly valued too for the break they create between the Bournemouth conurbation and the built-up area of Ferndown. In the past people living in these areas have been promised this land is protected by being designated Green Belt.</p> <p>I also object to the significant impact this will have on the local infrastructure: access to doctors, school places and most of all the roads. If most of the 500 houses proposed have two-car ownership then local roads, already busy, will have to handle up to another 1,000 cars.</p> <p>The size of the rooms in these houses are too small with inadequate storage and too many of them are being squeezed into too small an area.</p>				506		
656253	Mr N Marvin		CSPS1085	Policy FWP6							<p>I am writing to express my complete and total opposition to the proposed "development" of new houses, roads and shops</p>				506		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
											<p>at West Parley.</p> <p>As I understand it, the two new link roads are not expected to be built until the houses are built, or half the houses are built – this alone is utter madness, as Parley Cross junction is already the busiest junction in Dorset.</p> <p>The proposed link road from Christchurch Road to New road will pass right through the middle of 300 houses according to policy FWP6. This is potentially dangerous for young families. And New Road & Dudsbury Heights fields are KEY GAPS – originally there to PREVENT urban sprawl.</p> <p>The bottom line is that I, along with all the other local residents I have talked to, DO NOT want this development. I have set up home here and have no plans to move, I am opposed to this completely and will fight it at every turn.</p>							
656254	W A Oldfield		CSPS1088	Policy FWP6							<p>Having attended many meetings regarding the proposed development at West Parley I would like to voice my objection to this development.</p> <p>I object to the fact that green field site which is the last barrier to Bournemouth should be proposed when there are other brown field sites in the area, i.e. St. Leonards hospital area which has been available and far more suitable.</p> <p>The proposal to build new roads which I understand will be from the developers money is not a viable proposition as the return on the number of houses proposed which includes an high level of social housing will not enable them to cover the cost of the road development which in anycase is far from acceptable as the traffic volume is already very congested at times.</p> <p>The increase in population proposed re FWP6 will alter the whole character of the village which does not need another supermarket or shopping centre and is entirely unreasonable to try and increase the population by a third.</p> <p>These proposed houses will not help the local people as in such a desirable area they will be bought up by incomers still not helping the young people of the village and there are enough houses up for sale already in this area.</p> <p>The ground being proposed for development is unsuitable as the water from the surrounding area including springs from Chine Walk which drain down to Parley Cross by stream then underground pipes will be compromised if the ground water from the proposed development at duds bury, which will all be concreted over , will also drain onto this land causing flooding on a very large scale as the flood plain from the Stour reaches the edge of this development.</p> <p>This has all been planned by outside interest with no regard for villagers who will have to put up with all the disruption for years with no relief at the ends of it but finding oneself in the middle of a small town instead of a village with fields, and property prices falling as a result.</p> <p>It seems that all the local areas (Christchurch and Ferndown) are very happy to let building happen as long as it is as far away from them as possible with no regard for the total destruction of the road system which is struggling even now and the lives of people that have chosen to live the village life</p>					506		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description		
											rather than estate living.								
656255	Mrs Dorothy Bundle		CSPS1091	Policy FWP6							<p>I am writing on behalf of my Husband and myself to say that we are very much against the proposals to build 520 New Homes on Green Belt Land.</p> <p>West Parley already experience serious traffic congestion which creates very long tailback both mornings and early evening, which makes it very difficult for pedestrians to cross the road and for getting out of their properties and to add several hundreds more vehicles to the area will make matters worse.</p> <p>Schools:- As things stand at the moment the local schools haven't enough places for all the children, which means that some of them have to travel to Colehill and West Moors. And the plans for all these New Road means that the whole area will be surrounded by Roads, and all built on Green Belt Land.</p> <p>Please give these comments some thoughts.</p>					506			
656256	Tim Sill		CSPS1093	Policy FWP6							<p>I refer to the recently published building plans for the Green Belt areas of West Parley. I am particularly concerned about the massive increase in traffic that will undoubtedly occur, given the volumes of new dwellings under policies FWP7 and FWP6. Christchurch Road is already a major route for very heavy lorries that often break the 40 mph speed limit. The Linden Road turning is very dangerous when trying to turn left and right into Christchurch Road. More housing is already set to go ahead on the old garden centre site which will only add to the traffic volumes. Parley Cross is an absolute nightmare for travelling in any direction. Traffic will only get worse. The planned 520 houses in these two policies is completely excessive for this area of green belt. We need to protect this area and not drag it into the sprawl of Bournemouth. Soon it will be covered and it cannot be retrieved!</p> <p>Why are the people who contributed to the Parish Plan for West Parley being ignored. This is not democratic and smacks of decisions being already made.</p> <p>The amount of airport traffic is only likely to increase further with additional flights, ore businesses using the industrial parkwhich when added to the planned increase in housing will cause traffic chaos between Longham through to the Spur Road. Someone has surely got to see that the current road system cannot sustain existing traffic volumes, let alone what is being planned.</p> <p>Please can someone in an appropriate position arrange for these plans to be thought through again.</p>					506			
656259	Michael G Woodgate		CSPS1094	Policy FWP6							<p>I am writing to ask you to stop or at least modify the plans for 520 more houses in the West Parley area.</p> <p>Policy FWP6 is, for me, particularly awful with 300 new houses proposed. They will close a Key Gap between Parley Cross and Bournemouth and the amount of extra traffic at peak times on already congested roads will add to the long queues at traffic lights. Remember there can be lane closures on the A338, Bear Cross to Longham and New Road itself. Living here we all know the dreadful traffic jams we</p>					506			

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											experience every few months. Policy FWP7 will also add to the congestion and spoil the lovely area which is Dudsbury Heights, and without all those extra houses we will not, or course, need another supermarket. Please do not allow these plans to go ahead.						
656260	Mr and Mrs MP Porto		CSPS1095	Policy FWP6							<p>Re: Policy FWP7 & FWP6 – OBJECTIONS</p> <p>I refer to your above policy for the construction of 220 houses & the new road planned for Dudsbury Heights field near the old fort, along with the policy for the construction of 300 houses supermarket shopping centre & link road planned for the new Road Field</p> <p>The newly proposed link road goes from Christchurch Rd to New Road right through the middle of the 300 houses in FWP6 which is very dangerous for young families.</p> <p>The FWP6 & FWP7 are both very different to the 2010 plans which we have not been included in or consulted over clearly top down planning.</p> <p>Parley Cross is already over capacity the 2 new link roads will not be built until half the houses have been built & therefore the already strained infrastructure will be placed under more pressure – clearly unacceptable.</p> <p>1000 residents contributed to the West Parley Parish plan as encouraged by them however the district council has virtually ignored it, unacceptable.</p> <p>The New Rd & Dudsbury Heights fields are not any old green belt, they are “Key Gaps” with Bournemouth. These “Key Gaps” prevent urban sprawl & were the “TOP” reason for having a green belt in the first place any changes then this would also be unacceptable changes.</p> <p>520 more houses is a 32% increase – again clearly an unacceptable level for the infrastructure, it is excessive, wrong, damaging and way in excess of what is being imposed on Corfe Mullen, Ferndown, Wimborne & or Verwood.</p> <p>Therefore I object wholly to both proposals of Policy FWP6 & FWP7.</p>				506		
656261	Mr and Mrs John and Barbara Russell		CSPS1096	Policy FWP6							<p>We wish to register our very strong objections to the proposals to fundamentally change the character of West Parley that will result from the implementation of the Green Belt Plans.</p> <p>West Parley is still an attractive area in which to live despite the increase in traffic during recent years with speeding vehicles using our residential roads as ‘rat runs’ to avoid the congestion at Parley Cross especially at morning and evening peak times. Any plans to increase the number of vehicles in West Parley will clearly exacerbate this problem leading to a greater risk for residents.</p> <p>However that is just one of our concerns arising from the proposals which are summarised as follows:</p> <p>Housing – The number of homes proposed via Policy FWP6 & FWP7 is quite disproportionate thus reducing the valued ‘Green Belt’ and adding to the vehicular congestion that already exists on the basis that</p>				506		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>most households now have two cars. The extra residents will undoubtedly place additional demands upon the already overstretched local services.</p> <p>Rationale – It is accepted that some housing development is necessary that include affordable housing but not to the extent that is proposed.</p> <p>West Parley must retain its character and the density of any 'New Build' must be limited and proportionate.</p> <p>Traffic - The proposal to build a new link road (east of Parley Cross) to join christchurch Road and New Road only confirms our fears that more traffic will use this area. The proposed route encroaches upon the Green Belt and passes through the FWP6 development thereby creating a danger to all residents, young and old alike.</p> <p>The proposal to build a new link road (west of Parley Cross) again encroaching on 'Green Belt Land' will create dangers for the residents of FWP7. This particular development is inappropriate given its proximity to Dudsbury Hill Fort.</p> <p>Rationale – Traffic is a major problem for West Parley residents for the reasons outlined above. As a priority the existing traffic arrangements in the area should be reviewed focussing upon, speed limits, traffic management & pedestrian safety, especially at Parley Cross, New Road & Christchurch road before any building work is undertaken.</p> <p>Environment –</p> <p>New Build – The proposal in FWP6 to site a 'New Foodstore of 3,000 sq. m', presumably a supermarket, will attract additional traffic to an already overburdened area and again encroach upon the Green Belt.</p> <p>Air Pollution – No mention is made in the proposals of the impact that increased traffic in West Parley will have upon the air pollution in that area. Whilst levels are currently within acceptable guidelines consideration must be given to the detrimental impact that any increase will have, including the anticipated increase in aircraft using</p>						

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
											Bournemouth Airport during the next decade and beyond. Rationale - Redevelopment of the existing shopping area is needed together with the creation of additional shops and services that would support and attract local residents. Central Government has placed much emphasis upon decisions that affect local communities being made at a local level, i.e. 'bottom up' not 'top down'. This is your opportunity to demonstrate to the residents of West Parley that you understand, support and embrace that principle. Please don't let us down.							
656262	Pauline Vince		CSPS1097	Policy FWP6							We are very much against the proposal for 300 houses, supermarket, shopping centre and link road planned for New Road. 300 new families will put enormous strain on our schools – already full to capacity; medical facilities – already 10 days wait for a doctor's appointment; employment vacancies in the surrounding area – already in very short supply. We already have a local supermarket and shopping centre – a new superstore will probably put them all out of business – look at the number of empty premises in Christchurch since the increase in out of town supermarkets. New roads will eat up valuable green space and just move congestion along to the next bottle neck. Where is the money coming from for this scheme? Any money available would far better be spent on improving public transport and making it more affordable for families. We understood that Government policy was against building on green belt land and indeed that the New Road and Dudsbury height fields were 'Key Gaps' to prevent urban sprawl. We also understood that development was supposed to be self financing. If the developers are intending to provide all the increased facilities that are required then it is hardly likely to be affordable housing – they will still expect to make their profit. Why has the District Council virtually ignored the West Parley Parish Plan which 1000 residents contributed to? A 32% increase in West Parley housing stock is completely unacceptable, it will turn an historic village into a bland housing estate at best – the worst doesn't bear thinking about.					506		
656264	J A Newell		CSPS1101	Policy FWP6							I wish to object to planning proposals FWP6 (300 new homes) and FWP7 (220 new homes) I have included some background information as an introduction to my opposition to the new housing proposals A public meeting was held in 2010 and the West Parley Steering Group was formed from West Parley Parish Council and West Parley Residents Association. A survey was designed for residents to give their views on all aspects of the community over the next 5 – 10 years of which 1,000 residents replied. From this information the West Parley Parish Plan was published with funding contributions from					506		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>East Dorset District Council, Dorset Community Action, West Parley Parish Council and various local open days. The main points of the plan were -</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Residents like to live in the village, they are not transient and would like to keep its rural open nature. 2. A maximum of 100 new houses are acceptable. Large scale housing development is strongly opposed as the green belt is highly valued. 3. Other topics were mentioned such as roads, traffic, parking and sports and health facilities. <p>In November 2011 the Parish Plan was distributed to all houses in West Parley including EDDC. A meeting was held in West Parley Memorial Hall on 2-12-11 to discuss the Parish Plan. This was when the first piece of information was released to us giving details of perhaps 100 new houses at New Road and 260 at Dudsbury Heights, all on green belt land, by the Parish and District Councillors. The residents were encouraged to write to EDDC councillors stating their objections to large housing developments, general lack of consultation about decisions being made on lack of infrastructure and roads, etc. which is totally unsatisfactory. EDDC planners have ignored government legislation to consult fully with local communities before setting out proposals. EDDC planners have ignored the information in the Parish Plan which sets out residents requirements, all this is unsatisfactory.</p> <p>IN February 2012 we were again urged to e-mail EDDC councillors because the number of houses proposed to be built was approx. 500 at 4 sites at West Parley, a substantial increase to the last estimate of 360. Again all the residents requirements have been ignored. Also it was revealed that the councillors would abstain from voting against the proposal, why, they could have voted for the proposal so that the residents objections could be used to modify the plans. I was also later informed that all points of objection were ignored and that further plans would go ahead on 16th April 2012. I was informed that EDDC would hold an exhibition at West Parley Memorial Hall on 24th April, 2012 and that their planners would attend and explain new plans for building on green belt at New Road. Arrangements around Parley Cross and shopping centre.</p> <p>This was the moment that the residents saw the enormity of the proposed new plans FWP6 and FWP7 for West Parley new Housing Development. These plans were detailed proposals setting out new roads, high, medium and low density housing with a total of 520 houses.</p> <p>Building more than 100 homes would destroy West Parley as a village and change its character as it would become part of the Bournemouth urban sprawl. This development once accepted would encourage EDDC and other developers to add even more housing to suit their needs and the loss of the valued green belt would be lost forever.</p> <p>West Parley is in the countryside and has many species of animals and birds which the residents can see from their gardens and official footpaths marked in the surrounding</p>						

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>fields, all this would be at risk. The two new main roads which are going through the two developments will channel all existing heavy goods lorries and more in the future to satisfy the increase in demand from shops and services to suit the 520 new homes. It is not going to be an ideal start for children in terms of safety with the possibility of 1,000 cars to join existing heavy goods lorries. As both of the new developments are south of Parley Cross they will be very close to the airport noise envelope of aircraft and increase pollution from aircraft, cars and lorries is not desirable when buying a new dwelling. Parts of both developments are prone to flooding sometimes during the year and will become worse as there will be less surface to soak up rainwater as houses and roads are built. As the commercial side of the airport has been given permission to expand, Parley Cross will be even busier with all types of vehicles.</p> <p>If a hundred homes were built, EDDC would have to supply and pay for roads and services but I understand developments over five hundred the developers are responsible for funding all access roads, so it is easy to see why 520 homes are to be preferred by the EDDC. If this is correct, when asked if an environmental survey had been carried out and agreed with all interested parties, the answer was no that would come later. I thought this a bit odd with a development of this size because, if unsatisfactory, this could be expensive to rectify.</p> <p>Since this last meeting, I have been told that English Heritage has concerns about houses far too near the ancient monument Dudsbury Hill Fort and has concerns that the environmental impact has not yet been considered and are very interested.</p> <p>The timescale for the development was approximately 14 years starting in 2014 but other work could start outside the major development and the two new link roads will not be started until half of the houses are built so Parley Cross would be even busier for a number of years before they are completed and the development completed. Therefore, I ask that there should be more consultation to discuss and consider these plans.</p> <p>West Parley is served with its own infrastructure and has use of Ferndown, Northbourne and Longham for back up but, although not ideal, is liveable and with future small modifications could be improved.</p> <p>EDDC and local and national policy makers should take into consideration the wishes of West Parley residents and satisfy The Parish Plan also local and government MPs and Ministers are supposed to represent out interests.</p>						
656267	Mr and Mrs Mitchell		CSPS1103	Policy FWP6							<p>Regarding the building plans for West Parley green belt, we refer to policy FWP6. The potential effect of the roads which you intend to build, will have a detrimental impact on New Rd and the roundabout going toward Wimborne Rd and Castle land during peak times.</p> <p>In regards to policy FWP7 it is already difficult to exit Elm Tree Walk during morning and evening rush hour. We have to</p>				506		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											go up to Chine Walk to be able to get in the right land. The cross roads are well known for it's congestion. How will the roads cope with all the extra cars these houses will bring? No schools or doctor, Tesco, we rest our case.						
656268	Lynne and Paul Clayton		CSPS1104	Policy FWP6							<p>We are writing to formally object to the proposed building of 220 houses on the FWP 7 and 300 houses on the FWP6 sites.</p> <p>We believe the consultation process has been unsatisfactory for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Government legislation requires full consultation with local communities prior to setting out proposals; this legislation has been ignored by the EDDC planners. 2. The proposed building of 520 houses in West Parley constitutes an increase in the housing stock of around 32%. We feel this is disproportionate and far exceeds what is proposed in other East Dorset localities. 3. The detailed West Parley Parish Plan [2011] was produced following significant consultation with residents. The vast majority of residents are against having any more than 100 houses built in the West Parley area. The plan was well published and copies were forwarded to EDDC who appear to have ignored the opinion of the community. 4. The elected UK Government policy is to protect the green belt. Locally the green belt areas are boundaries which form an integral part of the West Parley identity and act as key gaps between us and the Bournemouth and Ferndown sprawl. 5. As members of the RSPB and the Woodland Trust we are extremely concerned regarding the effect of the proposals will have upon the West Parley environment. Our quality of life is enriched by living adjacent to and having access to open countryside with the associated sighting of birds and wildlife. 6. The local infrastructure, particularly the roads, throughout the parish is currently inadequate and would be overwhelmed by the addition of the proposed two new roads. 7. Too much reliance has been placed by EDDC on communication via electronic means, a presumption appears to have been made that all residents have internet access. This is not the case and has both disadvantaged and caused stress to those unable to access the necessary information in order to make an informed response. <p>The proposal for a supermarket on Site FWP6 is not warranted. The West Parley area is already well served by the major retailers Sainsburys, Tesco and Lidl within three miles plus two Tesco express branches in West Parley itself. The ensuing increase in traffic will add to the already overloaded West Parley traffic lights site and environs. Dudsbury Rings is a significant local heritage site; the proposed building on site FWP 7 is too close to guarantee the protection of Dudsbury Rings.</p> <p>We strongly urge you to reconsider the proposals.</p>				506		
656272	Mr Ronald Daw		CSPS1107	Policy FWP6							The proposed two new roads would considerably relieve crossroads congestion and make it much easier to cross New Road as a pedestrian in the vicinity of the shops.				506		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
											<p>I have concerns that it is possible for a great deal of development to take place without these new roads being built.</p> <p>I consider the high density of housing proposed is totally out of keeping with the character of the area. It is likely to rapidly become a slum enclave with a lack of car parking affecting the surrounding area.</p> <p>Reason: Small cars are getting smaller and cheaper and the trend is for every person to own such car in addition to a larger car for families. Small cars will probably be battery electric and collision avoidance systems will enable a wider ownership that today (e.g. younger and older people etc.) We can expect considerable changes over the next 20 years.</p> <p>If self-driving cars become acceptable, things could be very different, one car serving many people rather like a taxi and it could be sent away to part and summoned by telephone.</p> <p>The development of this area took place in 1960's and the then planners, in their wisdom, left green belt areas they considered appropriate. I see no reason to justify overturning their decisions.</p>							
656273	Mrs Angela Swift		CSPS1108	Policy FWP6							<p>I write to object strongly, to the proposed building of 220 houses on the FWP 7 and 300 on FWP6 sites for the following reasons:</p> <p>CONSULTATION PROCESS. The consultation process has not been carried out thoroughly. There has not been well publicised information, readily available to all. Rather there has been scant, electronic information, which has only reached a portion of residents. On a previous building proposal, which proposed many fewer new houses, residents made their views plain, the vast majority voting against. The EDDC were supplied with this information. Rather than then take these views on board, they have instead chosen to put forward a new plan which increases the proposed number of new houses from 100 to a simply staggering 520. This is certainly not consultation, it is dictatorial, and, in my view, not in any way democratic!</p> <p>SIZE OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT. The huge, I believe, 32% increase in West Parleys' houses, is disproportionately & unfairly high when compared to other building proposals in the surrounding areas. The proposal requires more roads, shops etc. West Parley cannot take more cars, more roads & even a supermarket. We cannot keep building ad-infinitum. There has to be a point beyond which any area cannot & should not be further developed. Or are we to "concrete over" this "green & pleasant land" for future generations?</p> <p>GREEN BELT. I am both amazed & disgusted that FWP6 & 7 propose building on our "protected" green belt land. The whole point of designating this land as green belt was to prevent development on it. The government advocate building on brown field sites. Therefore, to build on green belt, 520 houses, shops etc., cannot be right, fair, is certainly not what was intended or what the residents of West Parley find</p>					506		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>acceptable. I would add that these residents elect the councillors, & the residents' views should be represented by them rather than being largely ignored. West Parley is not an outskirt of Bournemouth & * should never be so. Further the building on our countryside would not only be negatively felt by residents but also deplete wildlife, including some protected species. This is completely unacceptable. It is, I believe, generally accepted that we should now be conserving the whole of our natural biodiversity. Whether it is in relation to land, flora or fauna, if "protection" is in place, the this should remain protected, not be ignored, overridden or bulldozed through by anyone & certainly not just to suit planners.</p> <p>In summation, I believe that a) the views of West Parley residents have been completely disregarded, b) the proposed number of new houses to be unfairly high & in the wrong place, c) West Parley cannot cope with the extra traffic, shops & indeed extra residents d) it is not acceptable to build on land that has "supposedly" been protected, e) West Parley residents' quality of life would be detrimentally affected, & f) habitat & species would be depleted.</p> <p>Previously, certain councillors have stated that they were against building on green belt areas. When it came to the vote they abstained seemingly not having the courage of their convictions. This was extremely disappointing. I now urge you to heed the above objections & those of others in relation to these building proposals. And to take action to stop these terrible proposals from being implemented.</p>						
656274	Mrs K D Pearce		CSPS1110	Policy FWP6							<p>I write to object to the above named policies for the reasons summarised in my letter:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The proposal to build estates of 300 houses in the field adjacent to us at Parley Cross with a further 200 at Dudsbury would probably spell the end of our treasured Green Belt, or certainly establish a massive "thin end of the wedge". 2) Despite our clear opposition to the destruction of our prized Green Belt, EDDC do not appear to want to consider resident's views, but sit remote in their Furzehill offices dreaming up ways of covering it all in concrete. 3) Over the past decade, the local roads have barely coped with the increasing traffic, yet EDDC propose a third more dwellings concentrated at the worst location. 4) The whole overloaded infra-structure would need extensive modification prior to, rather than following any increase in housing. 5) EDDC have sprung policies FWP6 and FWP7 without consultation, (other than with developers). <p>What happened to the 2010 plans? Why has West Parley's Parish Plan been ignored?</p>				506		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description					
											<p>6) We remain uninformed by EDDC of the need of all the housing they propose. Our Green Belt could be preserved by more sensitive in-fill building of houses to match those existing. This would meet real demand rather than the developers speculative greed. 7) During involvement with WPRA we sought the views of pilots flying out of The local international airport, since the Western end of its runway is just 2 km from the proposed FWP6 site. The pilot's committee was opposed to dense housing in such a location. An engine failure following take-off could have devastating results 8) I am bound to conclude that EDDC have agendas widely different from those They purport to represent. I suggest they withdraw and consult much more widely before issuing further edicts. Perhaps they should get out of their office chairs and visit us in West Parley and see what their lack of vision is doing to our local countryside.</p>											
656276	A R Pearce		CSPS1111	Policy FWP6							<p>I wish to object to the building of 300 houses on the FWP6 and 220 houses on the FWP7 sites. 1) My wife and I moved here in late 1998 as West Parley appeared a location which enjoyed a nice balance of rural and urban facilities. We have found that our neighbours, of all age groups, were of the same opinion. We also found that they were prepared to enhance and jealously protect the area against inappropriate development. The West Parley Residents Association was the outcome of this regard as was the subsequent election of its members to the local parish council. Over the years by dint of meetings and all manner of communication we have made our views clear to the EDDC. It now appears that those whom we have elected have continued to conspire against us, and by stealth and cunning would undo all that we have worked for. 2) Since we have been here, I have yet to meet a so called "NIMBY" in our midst! Most residents are aware that reasonable changes are inevitable and that an increase in housing can be accepted within the Green Belt without destroying its very intent. The increase in housing proposed in policies FWP6 and FWP7 are beyond belief! An increase of over a third in our housing stock is the rationale of the asylum. Any sane plan would first ensure the adequacy of an infrastructure capable of accepting such a change. It should be the primary consideration rather than following the ravages of greedy speculative development. Even a cursory visit to the vicinity would conclude that it was already overloaded and priorities were in need of careful consideration. 3) Local residents have had no input to policies FWP6 and FWP7, it is a dictat, conceived in the secrecy of EDDC's comfortable offices. Why have EDDC departed from what was agreed in the 2010 plans? What consideration was given to our own Parish Plan? Why were we not fully involved or consulted as promised by</p>					506						

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
											<p>the national government? What evidence have EDDC got that there is a current demand for the number of dwellings proposed? What type of dwellings are envisaged; are they all to be "affordable" or varied to match the locality? Will their construction (e.g. foundations) be adequate to a predicted rising flood plain? 4) In view of the above, I suggest that these proposals are carefully reconsidered and that the West Parley community is shown the courtesy of having it's views heard. P.S. During a recent T.V. news item depicting the Olympic Stadium's opening centre-piece; namely England's Green and Pleasant Land; I was relieved to note that it was entirely rural in content. Not a hint of an ill conceived development!</p>							
656330	Ms Eileen Mussell		CSPS1129	Policy FWP6							<p>I object to the loss of any West Parley green belt. The West Parley green belt is a precious and integral part of the parish. An open space designed in part to control urban sprawl; it seems ironic that our District Council proposes to destroy this bulwark with the very thing it was meant to prevent. The proposals for this development have been pushed through without consultation; and completely ignores the West Parley Parish Plan supported by over a thousand residents. The development will profoundly alter the unique character of West Parley forever; and yet the residents are obliged to respond with detailed objections on the District Council's terms, as though it were a backland development of a few spare fields. Policy FWP6 and Policy FWP7 will smother the green belt land with five hundred and twenty houses; a supermarket and other sundry infrastructure. This open ended project will entail major road alterations; cause massive disruption, and create long-term congestion at Parley Cross, which is already a congested nightmare. The District Council's casual disregard of a West Parley Plan comes as no surprise; A Residents Association telling them what they want; whatever next. Their apparent contempt for the democratic process sets a new low in their relationship with West Parley rate-paying residents.</p>					506		
656335	Mr and Mrs Downward		CSPS1131	Policy FWP6							<p>We strongly oppose the proposition to build more houses on Green Belt in New Road & Dudsbury Heights field. These are Key Gaps. Not only this, but we travel into Bournemouth every day to work and already there are considerable holdups at Parley Cross & Kinson roundabout – the bridge over the river between Bournemouth & West Parley – the thought of 520 more families – a potential of 1000 more cars on that road is unthinkable. It is time that you listened to those of us who live here. We do not want to lose our green fields</p>					506		
656390	Mrs Karen Brittain		CSPS1155	Policy FWP6		No				Yes	<p>We moved to this area of West Parley just over two years ago to live among quiet like minded mature people, without too many children running around. Now, we find that suddenly the</p>					506		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
											<p>District Council propose to build three hundred & twenty houses East of New road, West Parley, plus a further two hundred homes West of New Road, with a minimum of 50% being affordable, which is a whopping 32% increase for West Parley. This is totally unacceptable to us, particularly as over half of the new properties would be affordable. If we had wanted to live near a Council Estate, we would have moved to West Howe, not West Parley.</p> <p>Where is the proof that these houses are actually needed. This land is green belt Land, which are "key gaps" between West Parley & Bournemouth, to prevent "urban sprawl" which is the very thing that you are now proposing, without, may I add, even the decency to consult us until this late stage. You cannot just "move" green belt land to where it suits you. The land is used as agricultural land at the moment, & it is against national policy to build on such land. A 32% increase in housing also brings problems with traffic, schools, employment & health. Where are these people coming from to fill five hundred & twenty houses? That is over one thousand people plus children. Most councils are demolishing such estates, not building them. Putting main roads through a housing estate is utter madness, & very dangerous for children.</p> <p>The District Council has totally ignored the wishes of local residents, & in fact, held meetings, & made decisions where residents were not even allowed to speak. This, alone, makes the proposals unsound, & undemocratic. One thousand residents responded to the West Parley Parish plan which was totally ignored.</p> <p>I submit to you that these proposals are unsound, unproven against National Policy, & certainly against the wishes of the local community.</p>							
656394	Dawn Jones		CSPS1157	Policy FWP6							<p>I would like to oppose the plans as follows: POLICY FWP7 To build 220 houses and a new road goes totally against the West Parley Parish Plan which was put together with a 1,000 response from local residents. The Parish Plan has largely been ignored. To build 220 houses with a large proportion affordable would mean young families would be moving in with virtually no infrastructure i.e. schools, doctors, dentist. The road would be heavily used and would therefore be a danger to the people living there. The area is a key gap between West Parley and Bournemouth which prevents urban sprawl. POLICY FWP6 To build 300 houses, supermarket, shopping centre and link road on the New Road field would totally change the village and turn it into a "new town area" because of the nature of the housing "low cost/affordable" attracting people with young families. There is no infrastructure for young families in the area – no schools, doctors, dentist. The new road would be a danger to children. Most families have at least one car - this would mean an increase of at least 520 more vehicles using the already congested roads. This pln has not been thought</p>				506			

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
											through – it is almost that you have seen an empty field and thought “that will do” – top down planning at its worst. The two new link roads would not be started until half the houses are built which could be years – until then hundreds more cars will be using the local roads. The total number would be a 32% increase in West Parley’s housing stock. This is planning madness – please re-think your plans – they are wrong.							
656201	M G Miller		CSPS1069	Policy FWP6							<p>East Dorset District Council Proposals re Housing in West Parley</p> <p>1) Objection I wish to object to the building of 520 houses on the FWP 6/7 sites.</p> <p>2) Legislation The Localism Act received Royal Assent on 15 November 2011 – The Bill reformed the planning system to give local people new rights to shape the development of the communities in which they live.</p> <p>3) EDDC Non Compliance The District Councils proposals published on 17th January 2012 are very different from the 2010 plans and were prepared at district level without involvement or consultation with the democratically elected West Parley Parish Council. This is contrary to The Localism Act 2011.</p> <p>4) Only 100 houses I agree with the Parish Council’s view which reflects the verdict of over 80% of the residents (Parish Plan Survey) that West Parley could find room for about another 100 houses. On top of our present housing stock this would be a sustainable addition. Any new houses should be built in small to mid sized closes in the several open clearings along the B3073 Christchurch Road to the east and west of Parley Cross. Such ribbon development has the merit of being traditional, broadly acceptable and in accord with DES 8. West Parley’s infrastructure (most particularly the roads) is barely adequate at present and would be overwhelmed by large housing estates. The proposal for another supermarket adjacent to Parley Cross junction is beyond belief. Sufficient supermarkets already exist in the near vicinity and 2 Tesco Express shops exist in West Parley.</p> <p>5) Green Belt I strongly oppose large scale housing in the green belt (Government Policy, which is to protect) that provides ‘natural drainage’ and is a ‘key gap’ to prevent urban sprawl between Bournemouth and West Parley.</p> <p>6) Loss of Village Status 520 more houses in West Parley is a 32% increase in the village’s housing stock, this figure together with the high density build is not acceptable. It would mean the identity of the village being lost for ever.</p> <p>7) Entitlement to ‘Have a Say’ The uniqueness of West Parley village must at all costs be</p>				506			

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											retained. I urge you to reconsider your proposals and to start talking to the people in West Parley whose rights are enshrined in The Localisation Act 2011.						
656209	Mrs Y Tiley		CSPS1074	Policy FWP6							<p>I cannot understand why anyone would think it OK to increase the number of houses in West Parley by over 1/3 and on green belt land too. I understand that green belt is supposed to prevent urban sprawl. To loose the green belt in this area it would just be a continuation of Bournemouth.</p> <p>Apart from the 520 proposed houses in West Parley there are other pockets of land which are being built on.</p> <p>Already the air around West Parley is very polluted. More houses, more traffic, more pollution. Space, on the plans, shows an allotment area. Who needs an allotment with so much pollution?</p> <p>A question was being asked on the Radio last week. Do you live in a good environment? They came back with answer that it should be yes!</p> <p>The proposed Supermarket will also bring more traffic to the area. As will the proposed development about ½ mile along the road. More houses, an Hotel and a rest home etc. What is going to happen with all the traffic then? Schools? Playground? Water? Gas? Electricity? Etc. Not to mention Employment.</p> <p>I was under the impression that residents were going to have more say in matters concerning their area?</p> <p>This certainly doesn't seem to be happening. Residents do not want to many houses on their door step. If this project goes through I will have many of the proposed houses looking down into my back garden and some will look directly into my bedroom!</p> <p>As well known, rats are unable to live in over-crowded conditions and as we all well know the over-crowded situations cause many problems in many areas where people are living on top of one another.</p> <p>More thought should be given to this project and people who live and know the area should have the final say.</p>				506		
656216	Mrs Jacqui Rainsbury		CSPS1076	Policy FWP6							<p>I wish to object to the building of 220 houses on the FWP 7 and 300 on FWP6 sites for the following reasons.</p> <p>The New Road and Dudsbury heights fields are not any old green belt sites they are "KEY GAPS" with Bournemouth. These gaps were to prevent urban sprawl, and the main reason for having a green belt in the first place.</p> <p>The proposed link road will go right through the middle of 300 houses in FWP6 which will be very dangerous for young children.</p> <p>The new roads will not be started until half the houses are built so Parley Cross will have to cope with hundreds more cars a day. It is already over capacity and is dangerous at peak times.</p> <p>Will their construction (eg foundations) be adequate to a predicted rising flood plain ? and the new road planned near the river stour will be liable to flooding. If this road is raised to avoid flooding the displaced water would have an effect on surrounding residential dwellings.</p>				506		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description		
											The proposed development is close to a site of special scientific interest and the increase in cats & dogs would have an impact on natural wildlife. Another Supermarket is not needed in the area and will only bring chaos to the already crowded roads of the area. I urge you to reconsider these proposals and find more appropriate locations for this level of residential accommodation								
656223	M Williams		CSPS1078	Policy FWP6							We are writing to express are grave concerns over the plans to build 520 new houses at West Parley. We see this as a massive increase in the number of houses within the village and consider it will overload the already limited resources within the area. The road system at Parley Cross is presently severely congested and is a nightmare during the rush hour. The proposal to put in link roads we consider will not alleviate this problem. In fact the extra houses will create even more traffic. On top of this here are only limited Doctors, Dentists and Schooling facilities within the area. We cannot understand why the Green Belt is being built on in such a small area with so many houses. This excessive building is much more than proposed for Corfe Mullen, Ferndown, Wimborne or Verwood. In putting forward the proposals, the District Council has ignored the wishes of the West Parley residents embodied in the West Parley Parish Plan. In summary, we feel the District Council is pushing forward with plans without the consideration of West Parley residents.					506			
656398	E Spitori		CSPS1158	Policy FWP6							I am compelled to write in response to the large and unwelcome building plans for our Green Belt in the beautiful village of West Parley. The policies outlined in FWP6 and FWP7 for a total of 520 houses equates to a massive 32% increase in West Parley's existing housing stock! This is excessive, damaging, wrong, grossly unfair, disproportional and way in excess of what is being proposed for Corfe Mullen, Ferndown, Wimborne and Verwood. There are good reasons why the existing residents chose to live in West Parley and the main reason that often comes up in conversation as the top reason on their list is the green belt we enjoy which separates us from major conurbations of condensed housing in surrounding areas. The New Road and Dudsbury Heights fields are not any old green belt area. These are KEY GAPS with Bournemouth. These key gaps prevent urban sprawl and indeed were the main reason for having a green belt here in the first place! To continue to ignore the residents' objections to the plans within FWP6 and FWP7 is at the very least insensitive to the existing residents contributions. These plans will damage the quality of life for all and particularly those residents who have lived in the vicinity and paid council tax, most of whom for a quarter of a century and several others for longer.. Christchurch Road is already suffering from high volumes of heavy traffic creating noise pollution and (existing road and housing) construction damage by the existing excessive traffic					506			

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description						
											with the evident congestions. The newly proposed link road from New Road to Christchurch Road, incidentally, going through the middle of the 300 houses in FWP6, is bad planning, very dangerous and compounds the already congested Christchurch Road traffic. Christchurch Road and New Road are overcapacity already and to add 500 to 1000 more vehicles is unsafe and plain madness. Furthermore, the link roads are not planned to be constructed for several years from the commencement of the housing construction. Imagine the traffic build up at Parley Cross as a result! This will directly affect Christchurch Road and its residents by the line of traffic that builds up from the traffic lights. Imagine also the increase in volumes of heavy construction vehicles and heavy plant machinery during the years of construction!! This is not why we, the residents chose to live in West Parley. FWP6 and FWP7 plans are unsound, ineffective and not good for the existing residents. They are also inconsistent with the national policy for green belt areas and with the wishes of the existing residents. We look to the District Council officers to do what is right for its council tax payers and to respect their wishes by rejecting the plans in FWP6 and FWP7.												
656425	Mrs M H Marsh		CSPS1168	Policy FWP6							As a resident in the part of Dorset I feel I must add my concern to others about the proposed building etc. that is being planned. I am old & may not see what happens, but I am very sad to think how utterly ruined this part of the world will be, by more Houses, New roads, thousands of cars etc. Danger to all children & the elderly & disastrous to protected species of animals. We would need more shops, where? And the traffic through here would be just unbearable Bournemouth is already joined up with Poole & Christchurch & we really don't need to get rid of the small bit of countryside we now enjoy. The proposed amount of extra houses in West Parley represents an enormous increase, I'm told about 32%. There would not be adequate Schools, Doctors, Dentists etc. Where would we go to cope with these shortages? And where would we park to do our shopping? It is all a nightmare, please think again.					506							
656434	Mr D Ware		CSPS1171	Policy FWP6							Having been a resident in the area for more than 30 years I am very unhappy with the proposed buildings and additional houses planned for West Parley. 1. The detrimental affect on appearance and the adverse affect on recreational activities such as Jogging and walking. 2. 2. The extra traffic will be dangerous & the additional cars will make travelling more difficult & time consuming. 3. Facilities will be inadequate, and I name (?) medical services as an example. Where it will become more difficult to make an appointment or to receive the necessary service. I hope further time and thought will be given to this project.					506							
656523	Mr Matthew Rainsbury		CSPS1210	Policy FWP6							I wish to object to the building of 220 houses on the FWP 7 and 300 on FWP6 sites for the following reasons.				506								

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description		
											<p>The New Road and Dudsbury heights fields are "KEY Gaps" with Bournemouth. These gaps were to prevent urban sprawl, and the main reason for having a green belt in the first place. The proposed link road will go right through the middle of 300 houses in FWP6 which will be very dangerous for young children.</p> <p>This land brings the countryside into the village and with it many important and protected species of animals. Sightings of badgers, foxes, otters, deer and buzzards are frequently reported. This improves the quality of life of all residents who regularly use these fields through which official footpaths pass.</p> <p>Government legislation requires you to consult fully with local communities before setting out proposals. EDDC have ignored this legislation.</p> <p>Another Supermarket is not needed in the area and will only bring chaos to the already crowded roads of the area.</p> <p>I urge you to reconsider these proposals and find more appropriate locations for this level of residential accommodation.</p>								
656630	Mr & Mrs PJ Gill		CSPS1285	Policy FWP6							<p>Having read through the various documents which comprise the "Core Strategy" and having attended presentations by East Dorset District Council we are writing to object to the Council's Core Strategy and to any plans to implement it without full and proper input from the residents of West Parley. Our objection is for the following reasons:</p> <p>1 Government policy is that you should consult with local residents before formulating your Core Strategy - clearly this has not happened.</p> <p>2 The West Parley Parish Plan produced as a result of receiving input of more than 60% of the residents of West Parley does not feature in the District Council Core Strategy.</p> <p>3 At the last local election, the people of West Parley voted in every single candidate for the "Keep West Parley Green" party. We are not making a political point here but want the District Council to acknowledge the wish of the residents of West Parley (that is the people directly affected by the Council's proposals) that they wish to keep West Parley "Green" - no building on green belt !!</p> <p>4 David Cameron's coalition Government has a clear message of "The Big Society" where individuals and communities should be at the centre of decision making on local matters - we haven't been!</p> <p>5 West Parley is a village, and has very few amenities and little or no employment. A 32% increase in housing stock is out of all proportion with the rest of the District, the County and the UK. Economic growth is currently flat and at best the forecast is 1%. How can the District Council possibly justify this massive increase?</p> <p>6 As there is no work in West Parley, why are the houses not being built where the work is? If the work is in Christchurch, build them there!</p> <p>7 The traffic on New Road is already at an unacceptable level - another 500+ houses will make New Road and Parley Cross</p>					506			

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description						
											<p>a heavily congested black-spot. This is going to lead to more accidents, more frustrated drivers and an increase in traffic noise and pollution.</p> <p>8 The green belt is there for a purpose - to allow separate communities to retain their own identity, to prevent urban sprawl and to provide habitat for local wildlife. For years the District Council has fought to maintain it, and had declined planning applications from individuals who wanted to build on parts of it, but all of a sudden the Council has done a U-turn and seems happy to build on acres of green belt.</p> <p>9 West Parley is a "retirement area" for a large number of people and it enjoys being one of the safest places to live in the UK. Building 500+ house in such a concentrated manner will make West Parley a suburb of Bournemouth and we will have increases in crime and an increased threat to our safety and way of life.</p> <p>In summary, the residents of West Parley have voted "No" to building on green belt, have made their views very public, so we too urge you to think again and produce proposals which are more realistic in terms of growth in housing stock and which do not eat up large swathes of green belt.</p>												
656636	Cllr Roger West		CSPS1287	Policy FWP6			No	No	No	No	<p>I do not think it has been positively prepared as the proposed infrastructure requirements do not take into account the need for Bournemouth residents to also have a good quality of life. Any planned growth in the Parley Cross area must take into account the needs of those residents in Bournemouth who live in the north of the borough. Any major development there will make lives worse for future generations of those residents living in the Kinson/Northbourne area because of transport issues.</p> <p>I do not think that the proposals can be justified as I can see no reference to consultation with Bournemouth residents about the impact this proposed strategy will have on them. It is not effective as I can see no effort on working across authority boundaries.</p> <p>Without good transport infrastructure being in place to serve both East Dorset and Bournemouth in this area these policies are not sustainable and therefore are contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework</p> <p>Background information relating to the above comments. The emphasis of the policy relating to transport is focused on reducing congestion at Parley Cross junction. North South movements are hardly referred to, though New Road (A347) is a major route that serves this need. There are only 4 crossings of the Stour in the conurbation and this is the central one.</p> <p>The policy refers to improved walking, cycling and public transport but gives no indication how this can be achieved between these two authorities. I hope that it is noted that there are NO good dedicated cycle routes out of Bournemouth that link the cycle infrastructure in Bournemouth into wider Dorset, over the Stour.</p> <p>It should be noted that the character of New Road changes when it is in Bournemouth. In Bournemouth the houses are</p>					506							

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
											<p>much closer to the road and Kinson already suffers from side roads off new road being used as "rat runs".</p> <p>The existing congestion at busy times makes efficient and punctual public service transport impossible as there are no possibilities for dedicated bus routes; hence the traffic congestion both in East Dorset and Bournemouth. I can see no reference to this.</p> <p>Please also note that I have concentrated just on the transport question though I am also against any encroachment into the green belt.</p>							
656943	Mr and Mrs T Scott		CSPS1269	Policy FWP6							<p>We would like to register our objections to the proposed plans for West Parley. With reference to Policy FWP7 and FWP6 for housing you are proposing to build on green belt land near the old hill fort and the New Road field which is agricultural land and not building land.</p> <p>We moved to West Parley nearly 2 years ago and nothing came up in searches by our Solicitors referring to the proposed schemes which are far too big and not wanted here in West Parley as schools, doctors, hospitals etc. could not cope with the increased population. We are told that the new link road would not be started until half the houses are built so until then which may be years Parley Cross will have to take hundreds more cars a day – what a joke have you seen the traffic chaos now if a road nearly is closed for whatever reason. It is over capacity already.</p> <p>The link road you propose will go straight through a new housing estate and not ideal for families with children. The other through a flood plain – have you not seen what the recent weather has done there? With the unpredictable weather we now have this would only get worse.</p> <p>These green fields i.e. green belt are to prevent urban sprawl which in effect would make Bournemouth West Parley! And Ferndown one big town – West Parley is a village.</p> <p>The West Parley parish plan which over 1000 residents contributed to has been virtually ignored so maybe you will listen now and leave West Parley as it is now a safe and peaceful place to live which is why we moved here.</p> <p>PLEASE LISTEN TO THE PEOPLE OF WEST PARLEY.</p>				506			
359461	Mrs Nicola Brunt	Dorset Wildlife Trust	CSPS1345	Policy FWP6	No		No			No	<p>Ecological survey information for this site is not available therefore it is not possible to assess the potential environmental impacts of development on this site. NPPF (165) states that planning policies and decisions should be based on up-to-date information about the natural environment.</p> <p>Should this site be determined as of low ecological value, Dorset Wildlife Trust has no objection to the allocation of this site providing that an effective Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace strategy can be achieved, as the site lies only just outside the 400m zone from the Special Protection Area</p>	<p>DWT hold an objection until ecological survey information is provided for this site to assess whether the environmental strand of sustainability is satisfied and the allocation is deliverable.</p>	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		506			
656249	Ms Gemma Care	Barton Willmore LLP	CSPS1081	Policy FWP6	Yes	Yes					<p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on the Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy (JCS) Pre-Submission document. On behalf of our client, Stour Valley Properties (Dorset) Ltd., we are pleased to provide the</p>		Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	To ensure our case is presented in full and to be party to discussions.	506			

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>following response, which should be read in conjunction with the accompanying Consultation Response Forms.</p> <p>Background Barton Willmore LLP has been instructed to make representations to this document, on behalf of Stour Valley Properties (Dorset) Ltd. ('SVP') SVP have land interests within East Dorset and welcome the opportunity to contribute to the emerging Core Strategy (JCS). SVP are currently promoting the release of their land to the south of Wimborne for housing. Fundamentally, SVP have serious concerns over the level of overall housing provision identified within the draft JCS and the degree to which that which is proposed is sufficient to meet identified needs within the East Dorset and Christchurch locality. We submit, having regard to the evidence base material available that the level of housing proposed for East Dorset within the draft JCS is inappropriate and inconsistent with national planning policy, which states that each local planning authority should ensure that the Local Plan is based on adequate up-to-date and relevant evidence about the economic, social and environmental characteristics and prospects of the area. Local planning authorities are expected to ensure that their assessment of and strategies for housing, employment and other uses are integrated, and that they take full account of relevant market and economic signals. Consideration is given within the submitted representations to the strategic site allocations for Wimborne and Colehill identified within the JCS and the extent to which the proposed allocations fulfil the overall objectives and spatial vision for East Dorset and Christchurch. On the premise that insufficient housing requirements are identified in the Pre-Submission JCS we submit that additional strategic allocations or an increase in the specified number of required new dwellings are required in order to plan positively for the further housing growth we consider necessary in light of our appraisal of the Council's published JCS evidence base. In accordance with section 20 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended) local plans must be 'sound': i.e. they must be positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy. We suggest that the housing strategy adopted within the JCS as it stands is (a) not the most appropriate (on the basis that it is not considered fully justified) and (b) it is not 'positively prepared' – i.e. it is not based on a strategy which in our view genuinely seeks to meet objectively assessed needs. Within these representations we do not comment on every aspect of the JCS; our intention is to comment on those sections where we non-compliance with tests of soundness is apparent, or where we are particularly supportive. To be clear, our primary concern in this instance is the content and justification of Policy KS4 and the proposed housing allocations for Wimborne and Colehill – specifically Policy WMC6. An alternative proposal for housing to the south of Wimborne is considered with specific reference to the SVP land shown</p>						

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description		
											<p>on the concept plan attached at Appendix 1 to these submissions.</p> <p>Comments are also provided on a number of other policies within the JCS, on individual response forms, as requested. The full list of policies to which these representations respond are:</p> <p>Policy KS1, KS4, KS5, KS10 Policy WMC3, WMC6 Policy FWP3, FWP4, FWP6, FWP7, FWP8 Policy ME3 Policy HE4</p> <p>Copies of all Core Strategy Response Forms relating to each policy addressed within these representations are contained at Appendix 4.</p> <p>Appendices 1 – 3 to this cover letter are those referred to in the various consultation forms.</p> <p>I trust that all of the enclosed is clear and in order and we look forward to engaging with you further in the consultation process.</p> <p>We broadly support these allocations.</p>								
656748	Kerry Morris		CSPS1461	Policy FWP6		No					<p>I was born here in West Parley and I can say that I would not like affordable housing here. I would like to live nearer a town centre that has something going on, like Bournemouth. Build the homes where the young (20 year olds and above like me want to live.) There is no work or anything to do round West Parley because it is a country place where people retire too or want to live for some decent village life. Perhaps one day I will aspire to this type of living but dumping over 500 houses here without any decent thought or planning and no real commitment to additional amenities, roads, schools or concern for the Greenbelt land the existing Villagers (my friends and family here in West Parley) is disgusting and therefore makes FWP7 and FWP6 and FWP5 unsound and unjust.</p> <p>Build it where it's wanted not where you can think you can easily dump it just to meet EDDC targets for affordable housing. Put it where it would better suited. Put it next to your offices In Furzehill, that a nice big piece of unused land you have around you. Plan for that as it would be easy to oversee from your office windows? Make a whole lot of sense to me ...look out the window not and think ...yes she is right. Thank me later for solving the whole issue here.</p>				506				
656757	Miss Kay Bundy	Multiple Sclerosis Society	CSPS1553	Policy FWP6							<p>We are a very busy Day Centre located on Church Lane, which is open 3 days a week (Mondays, Tuesdays and Thursdays). The Centre is for all local people affected by MS and on average we have about 70 people with MS attend each day that we are open. And to run the Centre we need about 20 and 30 vounteers each day to support our members. As these numbers have increased over the last few years we are now struggling with car park space.</p> <p>From the proposed plans we can see that the area directly behind our Centre will be used for a community green area and we were wondering if there would be any possibility of the council helping us out by allocating a small part of this area as</p>		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		506				

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description		
											<p>an extension to our car park. Alternatively the field directly opposite the Centre on the other side of Church Lane is a potential SANG site. We understand that this area will need a car park for the dog walkers and we wondered if it would be possible for this to be located close to our Centre and for us to use part of this on the days that we are open. We would really appreciate any help or support that you can give to us, as we do not want to be in the position that we have to turn people in need away due to lack of car park spaces.</p>								
656758	Mr Derek Moore		CSPS1592	Policy FWP6							<p>: This plan if implemented will alter quality and well-being to a negative degree. An housing estate of this proportion is completely unsustainable, adding area 30% to the present housing stock will change West Parley beyond recognition.</p>	<p>The democratic process has not been ahead too. When we have been allowed to put forward out point of view we have been ignored & treated with stoney silence, or patronised.</p>			506				
656760	Mrs Dorothy Moore		CSPS1597	Policy FWP6							<p>Volume of Traffic now unsustainable will increase by at least 1000 vehicles. More tarmac and much more concrete affecting drainage & strain utilities. Our democracy and right to localism completely undermined. 99.5% of green belt unaffected in E. Dorset. Is West Parley the .95%?</p>	<p>This document is unsound, Undemocratic. The Plans are not Viable A) Traffic increase B) Enviromental impact C)Well being of present residents. You are asking us to pay high rates for For removing our quality of life.</p>			506				
656796	Mr & Mrs Cornelius		CSPS1542	Policy FWP6							<p>Our view is that to build 520 new houses and 2 link road in a relatively small area would lead to overcrowding and destroy the rural historical green belt of West Parley. By comparison with Corfe Mullen, Ferndown, Wimborne and Verwood this is far in excess for West Parley. We have recently moved from a built up area to West Parley in order to enjoy the rural aspect which would be destroyed if your plan succeeded.</p>				506				
656804	Mrs Joyce Terrill		CSPS1602	Policy FWP6							<p>Have you considered the traffic congestion and problems that will occur when New Road and New Road Bridge floor and have to be closed? Having been born and lived in the area all my life, I have seen New Road closed to traffic because the road is deep in water. It has been known to be closed for 1 or 2 days at a time in past years. With all the extra cars from 520 houses planned for West Parley, traffic chaos will be extreme when the floods occur. There is so much spare open space/ground N.E. & N.W. of Ferndown – loads of open land where houses could be built</p>				506				

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
											<p>instead of using the small piece of green belt that separates West Parley from the Bournemouth boundary. There is no need to build on that small piece of green belt land!</p> <p>The Government Minister for Planning, Mr Greg Clark states: "I can't imagine any council would want to build on greenfield when they can use derelict land".</p> <p>We do not need new shops or allotments. Most residents of West Parley have large gardens where they can grow vegetables!!</p> <p>I do hope E.D.D.C. will see fit to throw out the Core Strategy and adopt the Parish Plan.</p>							
656806	Mr S T Terrill		CSPS1607	Policy FWP6							<p>I have lived in the village of West Parley for over 25 years. The previous Parish Council were removed by the electorate for not protecting our village and not carrying out our wishes. The NEW PARISH COUNCIL were voted in by a huge majority of the Residents and NOW, the Residents want you, the Councillors, to LISTEN to our elected Representatives: West Parley Parish Council</p> <p>Please discuss with the W.P. Parish Council and the Residents Association the details of their/our responses to the Core Strategy.</p> <p>We would like our modified Parish Plan to be introduced to a "Higher" planning authority; one which is aware of the Government GREENBELT requirements that have been completely overridden by the E.D.D.C. and planners. They have also ignored all the modifications suggested by West Parley Council & Residents' Association.</p> <p>"I can't imagine any council would want to build on greenfield." Greg Clark:</p> <p>The Minister for Planning, Govt. !!!</p> <p>"Whitehall shouldn't be saying to people in specific places with a history, character and unique way of life, this is what you need to dowe don't want one huge developer dominating the landimposing their will and design on communities"</p> <p>Greg Clark: The Minister for Planning. Govt. !!!!</p> <p>PLEASE LISTEN to Him and Us!!!!!!!</p>				506			
656808	Mrs Pat Couper		CSPS1614	Policy FWP6		No					<p>This document is unsound, unjustified and not consistent with national policy.</p> <p>This also completely ignores the residents wishes as shown in the comprehensive Parish Plan.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 320 homes together with another 200 in West Parley giving a 32% increase in housing all on green belt is totally unjustified. The proportion of 50% affordable property is completely out of keeping with the present structure of the area. The plan provides allotments which have never been required. A new park is planned when the council have recently upgraded out park and woodland walks. The complicated road system makes no sense at all this would divert heavy traffic through the new housing estate which would be dangerous and the road from Dudsbury would damage the Stour Valley Way where there is considerable 				506			

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											wild life with Badgers and Deer and would then emerge into New Road on a bend where the road narrows. 5. The primary school and doctors are all at maximum capacity but no provision has been made for the increase in population.						
656816	Mr P C Bamborough		CSPS1623	Policy FWP6							I write on behalf of the householders living at 88 and 88a New Road to object to the proposed development of a 32% increase in housing on current green belt land in this village. The infrastructure is totally unsustainable with a busy airport, industrial estate adjoining an already crowded at peak times, very congested roads. I have read the very detailed submissions of our local parish council and agree with them whole heartedly. A more modest increase of say 100 houses would be an acceptable alternative. We don't need more shops, the existing parades in the village struggle to survive and only do so by very specialist services (vet, tile shop, convenience store). Kinson and Ferndown shopping centres serve us well (yet they struggle) – witness the number of empty shops and duplication. It is important the village retains its distinct identity and instead of being totally submerged in a Greater Bournemouth. The proposed "relief road" from outside 86 New Road to Christchurch Road is laughable were it not being taken seriously by planners. It gives more congestion points – especially from/to a clogged Longham. Affordable housing needs to spread across all villages in East Dorset not a few				506		
656819	Christine Davies		CSPS1626	Policy FWP6		No		Yes			I write in response to the Green Belt proposals for East Dorset specifically those for the village of West Parley. The proposals are unsound and unjustified for a number of reasons, some of which I will outline. Firstly, the plan has been considerably amended and the option set out for West Parley is the one that was designated as 'least preferred' in an earlier round of consultation. The current plan – effectively an entirely new document – was withheld, even from our District Councillors, until the very last moment leaving little opportunity for them or for the residents of the village to be properly involved at an early stage. It has therefore not been 'positively prepared'. FWP 6 and 7: West Parley, at the behest of the District Council, produced a Parish Plan. In this, a majority of residents agreed the need for some more housing – up to a hundred and within the current built-up areas. 520 imposed on the village would be a massive 32% increase in the housing stock; there is no solid evidence that this is needed and it is therefore unjustified. This is also a far higher proportion than any other area is being required to take; this is by anyone's standards unfair. What has happened to the empowerment of local people to shape their surroundings as stated in the National Planning Policy Framework? FWP 6 shows a supermarket, a shopping centre, a church and an orchard – among other surprises – in and around the proposed 300 dwellings and major link road. Nowhere has the				506		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>need for any of these been documented. What is evident is that by building on the key gap between Bournemouth and West Parley, urban sprawl will turn the area into one huge conurbation; there is no justification for broaching the Green Belt in this way, the need has not been proven, and doing so can only cause detriment to the quality of life of those who live in this sprawl.</p> <p>The 'roads' that have been drawn onto the latest plan have not been part of any consultation yet this is a vitally important junction for the whole of the area; on that basis alone the document is unjustified. FWP 7 concerns Dudsbury Heights, an ancient monument and a sensitive area – where are the Environmental Impact Studies for the road that is proposed there?</p> <p>I believe that people of West Parley have been sold short by the production of this plan. They are willing and able – the evidence is there in the Parish Plan – to give their views on how the village should go forward. Top down planning is unjust, we have the right to have our views properly considered.</p>						
359553	Mrs Linda Leeding	West Parley Parish Council	CSPS1635	Policy FWP6	No	No	No	No	No	No	<p>This plan is considered Unsound, in that it is neither Consistent with National Policy, Justified, Effective, or Deliverable.</p> <p>N.P.P.F. 155 calls for “early and meaningful engagement and collaboration with a wide section of the community”.</p> <p>E.D.D.C.s Statement of Community Involvement (part of the Core Strategy evidence base) calls for “active and continuous community involvement” in the planning process.</p> <p>These policies have been consistently ignored. E.D.D.C. has carried out the required formal consultations after plans have been produced, but the prior planning has been behind closed doors and requests for involvement have been turned down.</p> <p>When plans are published it is seen that little or no attention has been paid to community aspirations. For instance, when the West Parley Parish Plan was delivered in 2011 it had no response or acknowledgement from E.D.D.C.</p> <p>When this plan was published on 17 January 2012, it was a complete surprise to District Councillors, Parish Council and Residents alike. The 2010 Core Strategy Options had said building on a similar scale on this site was a “non preferred”option. Moreover the link road was completely new, and the community facilities shown had never been discussed with the community.</p> <p>The scale of this planned development is unsustainable. Taking FWP6 together with FWP7, FWP3 and FWP4 totals 660 houses. If Ferndown and West Parley are regarded as one community, as the planners have done, this is an addition of some 14% to the housing stock. But for West Parley alone the 520 houses in FWP6 and FWP7 represent an overwhelming and unsustainable addition of 32% to West Parley’s existing 1630 houses.</p> <p>The District planners have mistakenly treated the two communities as one. This is a serious error, even though</p>		Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination		506		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>Ferndown and West Parley have to be thought about together in some planning terms, for instance roads.</p> <p>The village of West Parley is separate constitutionally from Ferndown, having its own boundaries, own Council and (in 2015) a separate M.P. West Parley has all the elements of a self contained village – churches, village hall, pubs recreation ground, sports ground, shops. It has a distinctly separate identity. Ferndown is largely a post war dormitory town; West Parley has a long history going back through the Domesday Book to a Saxon church to an Iron Age Hill fort.</p> <p>The topography of West Parley is also different; although post war housing has joined it to Ferndown at the North, a walk around the South, West and East of West Parley shows it to have a rural environment surrounded by farms, horse paddocks, heathland and the river Stour.</p> <p>West Parley has a sense of community that is strikingly different from Ferndown. In the last local elections, for instance, the Ferndown turnout was below the national average, whilst in West Parley it was one of the highest nationally. West Parley has an active residents association and over 100 volunteers in teams who litter pick, maintain the public flower displays, clear the pavements and hedges, maintain and improve the woodland, tend the grass verges, and distribute information to all the households.</p> <p>It is submitted that such a rapid increase in West Parley's housing stock by one third will have an unsustainable and adverse effect on a distinct and separate community.</p> <p>We have grave doubts on the effectiveness and deliverability of a link road through FWP6. It would carry major traffic to and from the airport, mineral sites, the Eco waste plant and the Bournemouth water treatment facility right through the middle of a high density area of housing. Safety would be a major issue. No safety, environmental or traffic flow studies, or costings have been done. We also doubt the deliverability of the necessary SANGs, on which we understand that only initial discussions have taken place.</p>						
360060	Mr G.M Edwards		CSPS1676	Policy FWP6	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	<p>The Core Strategy response form is far from user friendly and must, by intention or otherwise, be devoid of easy understanding for many residents who will not reply because of inability to carry out in depth research to comply with the set out requirements.</p> <p>A high proportion of residents (and voters) are seriously concerned as evidenced by the WPPC. There is a strong feeling of being steamrollered into a not viable, ill conceived and poorly analysed situation that is judged to have so many flaws.</p> <p>It appears that the District Council has acceded to pressure and will accept written letters in lieu of the printed form. Given sufficient publicity it is an improvement, but is indicative of the odious air surrounding the whole proposal and action by many Councillors.</p> <p>Since Policies FW7, 6 and 5 are deemed to be unsound, not legally compliant, not justified, not effective and not consistent with National Policy, and bearing in mind Government</p>				506		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
											<p>Document PPS12, is now irrelevant. Any constructive support is negated by the lack of publicly widely reported analytical research to support viability.</p> <p>That such porous proposals should be enacted for the betterment of the West Parley area has at least to be highly questionable.</p> <p>At a time of national hardship, and possible future uncertainty of national wealth, to proceed must impose measures by councils and supportive interests of prolonged misery for which they must become accountable.</p> <p>The situation is such that it has become virtually impossible to analytically discuss with the District Council potential problems such as:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Increasing probability of flooding. 2. Full public analysis of true housing requirements, devoid of promoting house building and construction work. 3. Excessive affordable housing will inevitably attract or be allocated to many families who are not self supporting. Consequently, rate payers will have to heavily subsidise the numerous forms of support requirements. 4. Infrastructure in the form of schools, church, medical, care and pastime facilities will be further burdens to be carried. 5. The 100 houses as originally proposed by WPPC would be viable and support local shops. A supermarket would kill local traders and add further road chaos. 6. Current West Parley traffic problems are of short duration and no more than many other spots in the area. Road changes may well lead to estate road hazards. 7. Sites of interest, green belt land and wooded areas should not be decimated and sacrificed at the seemingly whim of Councillors or others who seem to dismiss the word sacrosanct when associated with West Parley and other contentious areas in the Core Strategy Plan. 							
360271	Cllr Paul Timberlake		CSPS1761	Policy FWP6	No	No	No	No	No	No	<p>Object to FWP6 proposals based upon:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Non justification. Although affordable dwellings are required in East Dorset as a whole, the need for a high level of housing in this locale has not been proved. Were this and FWP7 developments to go ahead, they would represent an approximate 32% increase on the existing housing stock of West Parley. 2. Green Belt principles: only two reasons are given at Policy KS2 in the Core Strategy. The Councils have conveniently omitted the remaining three key reasons. The full list in PPG2 is shown at www.communities.gov.uk/documents/planning/pdf/155499/pdf/Purposes of including land in Green Belts: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.5 There are five purposes of including land in Green belts; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To check unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas; • To prevent neighbouring towns form merging into one another; • To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment; • To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and 	Retain area as agricultural land set within the Green Belt.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		506			

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>• To assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land'. Important principles in this case include-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas; • To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment; and • To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns – presumably this includes other settlements. <p>The final principle about regeneration does not apply.</p> <p>3. Poor site – the area is under flight path of aircraft taking off and landing at Bournemouth International Airport. There could be a pollution, health and safety risks associated with building residential units at this location.</p> <p>4. Removal of good agricultural land. www.communities.gov.uk/documents/planning/pdf/155499/pdf states that – '1.6 Once Green Belts have been defined. The use of the land in them has a positive role to play in fulfilling the following objectives:' one of which is 'to retain land in agricultural, forestry and related uses.' The other reasons are-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 'To provide opportunities for access to the open countryside for the urban population; • To provide opportunities for outdoor sport and outdoor recreation near urban areas; • To retain attractive landscapes, and enhance landscapes, near to where people live; • To improve damaged and derelict land around towns; • To secure nature conservation interest.' <p>5. Destruction of hedgerows and trees which are an integral part and provide green linkages in the SE corner of Parley.</p> <p>6. Detrimental effect on the older part of West Parley and Church Lane Conservation Area. The area dates back to the Domesday Book.</p> <p>7. Likely adverse effect on protected heathlands and the water table of surrounding areas – parley Common SSSI is within 400m of northern section of FWP6 – due to enlarged area put down to roads, shops and dwellings.</p> <p>8. Economics: Unreasonable to expect developers to not only provide 50% affordable housing at cost price, but then to say they have to contribute to the cost of new roads, shops, first school; in other words, a new village centre.</p> <p>9. Advised that he route of the proposed Link Road and housing layout are only for illustration. The final design could well be different. The public are being asked to agree to a proposal that may change after the close of this consultation and will not, as far as I can see, have another opportunity to comment.</p> <p>10. I understand that the proposed Link Road will not be built until some 160 dwellings have been constructed. Residents will therefore be subject to years of noise, disruption and traffic congestion. Further, it has been stated that the new Link Road – which will go through (or along the edge of), the new estate, is likely to have traffic calming measures. Whilst fine for local roads, this would be impractical for the HGVs</p>						

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
											<p>which would need to use this road when heading towards Bournemouth.</p> <p>Outcomes: This proposal, together with FWP5 and FWP7, come forward as a solution to providing affordable housing, reduce congestion and improve traffic flows around the New Road / Parley Cross area and to create a new village centre. Whilst the motives may be well intentioned, any likely reduction in vehicles navigating Parley Crossroads, will be more than offset by – a) Traffic using the new Link Roads and at their junctions with New Road and Christchurch Road, and b) Additional traffic created as a result of 320 homes on this site and commercial premises plus new school.</p> <p>Conclusion: The 2011 Localism Act makes much of planning should be form the grassroots up, as opposed to policies being imposed form the top down. This proposal would go against the wishes of most parishioners who gave their views recently, and which are shown in the West parley Parish Plan. Whilst non statutory, the Plan has nevertheless been ignored and therefore, I feel, goes against the key principles of localism.</p>							
489765	Mr Derek Kearey		CSPS1709	Policy FWP6							<p>I wish to object strongly to the building of 220 houses on the FWP 7 and 300 houses on FWP 6 sites for the under mentioned reasons: The Consultation process is unsatisfactory. (a) Government legislation requires you to consult fully with local communities before setting out proposals. EDDC planners have blatantly ignored this legislation. I understand that there was consultation in 2010 on a similar proposal, to build substantially less houses on the Green Belt than that which is currently proposed, and you, the EDDC, decided at that time to reject those proposals. Now, without consultation, you are bulldozing this Core Strategy through without any consultation whatsoever with West Parley Parish Council or any of the residents of West Parley. Why have you decided to change the original decision of no Green Belt building? Is there some financial gain being made by EDDC, or indeed any individual of the EDDC, which we have not been informed about? Being a Conservative council I thought that you would heed what the esteemed leader of the Conservative party, David Cameron, stated earlier this year: that there will be no more building on Green Belts in this country. May I remind you that you are a democratically elected council – elected by us, the Council Tax payers, to act in our best interests. You do not seem to be listening to us, the residents and Council Tax payers of East Dorset, and you are not listening to the leader of the Conservative party. Exactly whom do you listen to? (b) West Parley has produced, after a lengthy consultation with residents, a well-publicised Parish Plan. Copies of the Parish Plan were sent to EDDC. In this Plan it was plain that us, the residents, are overwhelmingly against having more than about one hundred houses built in West Parley. The</p>					506		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>West Parley Parish Plan has been totally ignored by EDDC planners.</p> <p>(c) The so-called "Consultation Process", which the EDDC used, relied too much on the use of electronic communication to provide information to residents. It assumed that all residents in West Parley have access to the internet. This is far from the case and therefore there are a huge number of residents who do not have access to it and consequently are completely in the dark over these proposals. All residents who know of it are extremely concerned about the proposals but there are many who are unable to find the information they need to consider the proposals effectively.</p> <p>(d) To build more than one hundred houses in West Parley would create an unbroken urban sprawl from Bournemouth to Ferndown and beyond. West Parley would lose its identity and become just another small part of the very large conurbation of Bournemouth. Both of the proposed building sites in West Parley constitute much valued Green Belt land that provides a break between the Bournemouth and Ferndown boundaries. This was the main reason for introducing the Green Belt system many years ago. Once the Green Belt is built on, and hence no longer exists, we will never be able to get it back. Once it is gone, it will be gone forever.</p> <p>(e) This land brings the countryside into the village and with it many important and protected species of animals. Sightings of badgers, foxes, otters, deer and buzzards are frequently reported as well as lower-order creatures such as lizards and other smaller animals. This improves the quality of life for all residents and visitors who regularly use these fields through which official designated footpaths pass. Such as lizards and other smaller animals. This improves the quality of life for all residents and visitors who regularly use these fields through which official designated footpaths pass.</p> <p>(f) The proposed two new roads around the proposed building sites will be dangerous for everyone living in the new houses especially children. Also, it would do nothing to alleviate the already stretched traffic system in West Parley. In fact, it will only add to it. An increase in traffic jams will be expected with more further down the main roads. Five hundred extra houses will bring up to one thousand extra cars into an already overcrowded area with all of them trying to get out of and into West Parley.</p> <p>(g) Five hundred and twenty extra houses in West Parley represents an increase in housing of about 32%. This is excessive and totally unacceptable. It is more than that is proposed for the other East Dorset communities. Without the appropriate infrastructure of adequate school places, doctors, dentists, community centres etc. there will be unacceptable pressure on existing provision.</p> <p>(h) On top of this, both proposed building sites sit underneath the flight path of a very busy airport which is expected to expand threefold in the next few years. The EDDC has obviously not considered the impact on the quality of life on those unfortunate enough to move into and live in the</p>						

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>proposed houses. In a worse case scenario, the EDDC also have not considered the awful devastation and loss of life if, God forbid, there were a serious incident involving any aircraft coming down in the proposed development.</p> <p>(i) If the EDDC had acted in a democratic fashion and done the job properly of finding a suitable site for building such a large number of houses properly, they should surely consulted us, the East Dorset Council Tax payers, at some point on our thoughts instead of coming out blindly with a Core Strategy that none of us had seen before. It has to be asked why the EDDC did not look at much more suitable sites? Instead of proposing to build on designated Green Belt land why did they not see that there are many suitable Brown Field sites such as that at The Grange in the East Dorset area?</p> <p>Site FWP 7</p> <p>(a) Dudsbury Rings is an important heritage site and this field is too closely connected to the site for the security of this important site to be protected.</p> <p>(b) In wintertime, and in times of heavy rain, the slope of the field at Dudsbury causes water to run downhill and flood the unmade and private road, Ridgeway, every time there is heavy rain. The heavy traffic that services the shops at Parley Cross, and which use Ridgeway every day, causes the road surface to be severely eroded and flooded which makes it very unpleasant for residents who are also responsible for the upkeep of the road. With the large amount of more concrete being laid on the field due to the proposed buildings, flooding would be even worse than it is at present.</p> <p>Site FWP 6</p> <p>(a) Building yet another supermarket in the area is not needed. It would bring in much more traffic to an already overburdened road system which is something that us, and I would imagine the EDDC, certainly do not want. It would only bring more chaos to the already crowded roads of West Parley. Sufficient supermarkets (3xTesco, Asda, 2xSainsbury, Lidl) already exist within a 3-mile radius of West Parley. There are already three Tesco Express shops in a radius of one mile of Parley Cross. Also, there is no demand for allotments, orchards etc. so why propose them?</p> <p>West Parley should not be sacrificed by planners' unrealistic dreams and an attempt at social engineering. I urge you to reconsider these proposals on the principle that they are unsound, unsatisfactory, undemocratic and immoral. The democratically elected EDDC should start talking to the people in West Parley Community. We are entitled to have a say in the drawing up of any proposals for any increase in housing in our village.</p>						
491020	Mr Simon Jordan		CSPS1714	Policy FWP6		No					<p>With reference to FWP5 and FWP5 I would like to say that I am appalled by the lack of consultation with West Parley residents and the local District Parish council who undoubtedly know more about their local area. The Core document is unsound in many areas but I particularly notice that the subsequent need for schools has not been</p>				506		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>realistically addressed. Even by your own evidence you identify that at least a new primary school would be required immediately. You also identify a need for £2.1 million to build this primary school. Yet your own evidence indicates no funding is available, no match funding in part and no source of funding identified. Indeed this area of your evidence is blank. Therefore the document and proposal is unsound. Furthermore it is unjustified because there is no space for suitable road improvements and that putting in a further 4 sets of traffic lights around West parley cross is unjustified and will add to the already overloaded crossroads and surrounding access roads.</p> <p>The fields contain grade 2 agricultural land used for human food, are Green Belt boundary Land and also contain on or near sites of Historical value in Dudsbury Rings Fort and All Saints Church listed in the Domesday book.</p> <p>For these reasons and many more the Core Document and its Proposals for West parley FWP5 and FWP6 are not just unjustified but also unfair in their impact on West Parley Village which will be decimated of its identity and character.</p>						
491299	Mr and Mrs Shaw		CSPS1584	Policy FWP6							<p>Re: Your planning proposals of 220 houses on FWP7 and 300 on FWP6 on land at West Parley.</p> <p>My husband and myself object strongly to amount of houses and the urban sprawl which you are going to create. While it may be OK for up to one hundred dwelling places, the amount of buildings, shops and road works etc. is way out of proportion.</p> <p>We must keep this green belt of ours. More concrete and buildings is going to cause havoc with existing sewer system which is unable to work properly now.</p> <p>Where on earth are all the services coming from to deal with all the people that are going to be moving in to these new homes.</p> <p>This whole area is very important for our wildlife. You are just ripping the heart out of the countryside.</p> <p>I could go on and on but you are just going to ride rough shod what ever peoples feelings are.</p>				506		
495348	Mr and Mrs RJ Veal		CSPS1671	Policy FWP6							<p>I with my Husband are objecting strongly to these proposals. 220 Houses on the FWP7 and 300 on FWP6 sites.</p> <p>We own the land near to the road proposed from Dudsbury Heights to New Road.</p> <p>Concreting a road and building houses on that site is madness. The flood plains are already higher everytime we have it flooded. It will end up like the floods in area's that have been built on else where (Littlehampton, Bognor, etc).</p> <p>We do not want or need a concrete sprawl. The wildlife have a hard enough time as it is. They will be lost for ever for a further generation.</p> <p>There is no need for more super markets in this area.</p> <p>Leave the Greenbelt alone. Use Brownfill. There's plenty around.</p>				506		
498044	Miss Carolyne Banks		CSPS1795	Policy FWP6	No	No		Yes	Yes	Yes	Policy has not adequately provided for increase in traffic or deal with congestion that will result. The junction at either end	Scrap the plan.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral		506		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											of the link road will be impossible to get out of, and will cause even more congestion than the bad state we currently have. Policy has not addressed provisions for the safety of the many horses and horse riders in the area, seperating animals from severely increased traffic. Ignoring the problem will not make it go away. Policy goes against promises made by councillors and politicians. Proportion of new homes proposed vs existing ones in the village is grossly disproportionate.		examination				
501039	Dr and Mrs Peter Liebling		CSPS1653	Policy FWP6							I would like to object to the recent plans for more housing at West Parley on the following grounds. 1) We would lose a large part of our greenbelt. Like honesty, good manners, the Green Belt should stay as Green Belt. If loss would mean a loss of a basic sound principle and lead to urban sprawl. 2) 'Parley' comes from the French meaning the place where pears grow! 'poire – lieu' – the whole character and 'village' charm of Parley would be lost. 3) Traffic at West Parley Cross Roads is already too great. Adding side roads to New Road and Christchurch Road would only add to the confusion. 4) Putting roads through a new housing estate with young children playing seems far too dangerous. 5) The new houses are very close to the flight path out of Hurn (Bournemouth) International Airport. This would mean people living under noise, pollution, and possible danger of falling aircraft – yes it does happen! 6) Since we were last consulted this new plan suggests a huge increase in the number of houses to be built. Where is the proof that this is affordable, & desirable or necessary. Where is the infrastructure? It seems there is a nice gig green field which is easy to build on and accessible to builders, and that local feeling plays no part. Please listen to those who live in West Parley and chose to live here for some peace and quiet. Many thanks for trying to read this.				506		
503479	Mr & Mrs Robert Eastham		CSPS1649	Policy FWP6							Re: Objections to planning policies FWP6 & 7 We have lived here since 1961 having been drawn by the pleasing environment with its green belt fields assured of continuation. Accountability & democracy mean little to this council with only 2 out of the 36 living in the village. Gradual development has gone on over the decades along with a build up of traffic. The village straddles two major roads wich leads to gridlock at anytime. R,T,A,s on the road from the cross to the airport has been closed as a result. This council is hell bent on swamping this village with 520 houses in policies FWP6 and 7 as the needs of the next 14 years. At no stage attempting to justify or give reasons for this 32% expansion to residents, parish councillors and MP against their wishes. The recent changes are ludicrous and unsound diverting				506		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description		
											<p>traffic traffic to use estate roads to by-pass the cross-roads creating added entry exit points east and west on Christchurch Road and south on New Road. This will lead to additional delays and potential accident black spots. We object to the erosion of the green fields and the green belt protection in defiance of the overwhelming wishes of the residents. The policies have not been justified and are unsound.</p>								
535063	Ms Karen Morris		CSPS1687	Policy FWP6	No			Yes			<p>I have lived in West Parley for 22 years. In that time I have watched the high street change and the shops go from Butchers and Bakers to Bathroom tiles and garden sheds. FWP6, FWP5 and FWP7 are unsound because the shopping issue is not properly addressed. Whilst you propose to build shops you have not identified what they would be and their relevance to Qwest Parley. I have investigated with you and you have also said that you are not responsible for the type of business that can then occupy these shops. What good is that if we have another toilet and bath selling shop? Therefore your document in these areas is totally unsound. Additionally you say that people have requested more retail shop in Parley which is a lie. No residents have requested more superstores, I am told that at a meeting on 11 June in your chambers you said that people in West Parley had asked for a superstore and that when pressed you changed this to other retailers had asked. Naturally competitors to the current Tesco in parley would suggest another store (E, G. Co-OP Sainsbury). No locals have. You constantly devise and distort the content of all your proposed evidence for building homes in west Parley that are not required, cannot be serviced properly by roads, schools or doctors surgeries and you indicate no realistic funding for any of these. You suggest that money for the roads will after the houses have been built. This is ridiculous unsound and even a child planning a toy house starts with roads and improvement. Finally I have constantly defended the Greenbelt fields in this area and will continue to do so. The fields are part of the Key gap structure to prevent convergence with Bournemouth and Ferndown and Kinston. This gap gives the village its identity and your document does nothing to accommodate this identity or the villagers and residents concerns to preserve it. Your document is Unjustified in this area too with reference to FWP5,6 and 7. It is unsound in its approach as the local conservative MP Chris Chope has told me personally and written to me personally to say that the Green Belt in Parley is Sacrosanct. David Cameron also indicates under the Big Society and localism bill you are suppose to take your lead and consult with the Locals. I am a local and you have never listened too and acted on my copious correspondence before. Therefore your proposal is unsound and unjustified because it fails to consult with residents in the directly affected area of West Parley. The proposal uses misguidance and evidence manipulation and spin to fabricate evidence that is untrue and unfair in its representation.. This makes the document unfair, unsound</p>					506			

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
											and unjustified. You have no money in the council to fund this proposal in full and you are highly likely to fail to complete any of the proposals fully. You should be ashamed to reference building high density housing in areas (FWP6, FWP7) without proper infrastructure proposals, funding, amenities or evidence from those affected or those who need it. Until the 3000 people waiting on the housing list are identified as from this area and absolutely in need then I feel the document is entirely unsound.							
536830	Mrs Janet Sutcliffe		CSPS1702	Policy FWP6							<p>Whilst ignoring the over-complicated response form to the official consultation, I am writing to object to the plans to build 520 houses in West Parley, 300 on FWP6 and 220 on FWP7. The consultation process requires that you listen to the local community and take their views into account. West Parley Parish Council is the mouthpiece of this community. Their views are formed by living and working amongst us. They work tirelessly on our behalf and we trust them to represent us. However, it seems not to be enough in this case, so we are being asked to respond personally to the plans outlined in the Core Strategy.</p> <p>WPPC has produced a carefully considered Parish Plan, which states that building more than 100 extra homes would have a detrimental effect on West Parley and it's neighbours. The building of 520 homes seems excessive to say the least and will create an unbroken urban sprawl from Ferndown to Bournemouth. The Green Belt was put in place so that all communities would benefit from the "green lungs" that these spaces provide.</p> <p>Apart from affecting the quality of life or residents and those people who commute through West Parley, there is the very serious threat to the habitat of a wide variety of wildlife, some of it protected.</p> <p>The proposed 520 homes is social engineering on a scale unseen anywhere else in East Dorset. There is no evidence to show that an appropriate level of infrastructure will be in place. The existing provision will be unable to cope. 520 extra homes will mean 1,000 extra cars. West Parley Cross is congested now. By generating another 1,000 car journeys and redirecting existing traffic, vans, buses, huge lorries, through the proposed sites you will be exacerbating, rather than alleviating, the traffic problems. Traffic is noisy, dirty and dangerous, as anyone living on the new development will come to know. The proposed plans will result in more gridlock, more often.</p> <p>In spite of the traffic problems it seems that FWP6 shows plans for a large supermarket. Not only is the location questionable, with Tesco, Asda, Sainsbury and Lidl providing excellent facilities with generous parking nearby, there is no demand for yet another supermarket. With several "Express" stores close at hand West Parley is very well served.</p> <p>With reference to FWP7, it seems that there has been a complete disregard for the importance of Dudsbury Rings as a local heritage site. We must secure the site for others. A more obvious problem occurs after the sort of heavy rain we</p>					506		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>have experienced in the last few weeks. Water runs off the concrete and paved areas to cause flooding of paths and roads. Any new development will make further demands on an overstretched drainage system.</p> <p>As a resident of West Parley I am not opposed to development, or to the building of affordable homes and the creation of new communities but "proportionality" is vital if both the established and proposed communities are to share a good quality of life. It is what we all deserve. Please listen to West Parley residents, and consider the lives of the prospective new comers to our neighbourhood, and do your best to give us "quality" over "quantity", something we can all be happy with.</p>						
537014	Master Kieran Morris		CSPS1694	Policy FWP6		No					<p>I have lived and played round here all my life, 18 years. I love my village and my home in West Parley and I am disappointed that you are planning to destroy the Green Belt fields in my village. FWP7, FWP6 and FWP5 are unsound because they take no account of people my age, teenagers who already live and enjoy staying here. There are no sound plans or money for facilities and communities that would accommodate my peer group. More housing would just add to the problem as you have clearly not thought about or have funding for roads or schools. My name should be on the housing list because I live here. Who are the 3000 plus other people on this list? Until this need for housing is accurately identified then this document is unsound and wholly unjustified.</p> <p>On a personal not it will destroy my home village and its identity which makes the core strategy proposal UNFAIR to!!!!</p>				506		
495437	Mr Andrew Scott		CSPS1860	Policy FWP6	No	No		Yes	Yes	<p>Document has not seen complied with relevance to European Habitats Directive.</p> <p>An Environmental Impact assessment, or Arb Impact Assessment.</p> <p>The SANG areas are not usable.</p> <p>Does not consider sections 81, 84, 85, 86 and 99 of the NPPF.</p> <p>Please see enclosure.</p> <p>I write to draw to your attention the reasons why proposals FWP6 and FWP7 are not viable. The proposals are unsound and not legally compliant with the sections of the National Planning Policy Framework and other legislation that I list below.</p> <p>I detail each article and reasoning further on.</p> <p>The proposal does not comply with:</p> <p>The European Habitats directive.</p> <p>British Standard 5837 (2012) Trees, Design Demolition and Building near trees, and Planning Policy Statement 3.</p> <p>National Planning Policy Framework sections 81,84,85,86 and 99.</p> <p>The proposal also contains misleading information provided by EDDC.</p> <p>It should also be noted that the proposed SANG area South of FWP7 incorporates the floodplane of the river Stour and that from the contour lines shown the topography is such that</p>	<p>It would be necessary to prepare an Environmental Impact Assessment and find new SANG area for FWP7 and relocate the link road, changing angle through the wood.</p>	<p>Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination</p>	<p>Because I believe I am adequately qualified to address the issues raised, especially relating to tree and woodland issues.</p>	506			

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>the remainder of the SANG is not viable as it is inaccessible to members of the public especially the less able. The resultant effect would be an increased use of the Heathland area to the North which is itself a protected European Habitats area due to the rare species found. The European Habitats Directive.</p> <p>The European Habitats Directive protects not just the fauna themselves but also their feeding ground and the permanent and temporary roosts of the species. The new link road South of FWP7 is located directly over an important woodland wildlife corridor which contains several veteran trees. It is known that several species of bat use this area including Pipistrels from the largest single roost in Europe. (Bryanstone School. The bats then follow the river, feeding on the flies ect found in the surrounding woodlands) Disruption of this feeding ground could be devastating to this population which would have significant impact upon European bat numbers. The loss of Veteran oak trees in itself would also be detrimental to the wider community as these rare features provided ecological niches not found in younger trees.</p> <p>To summarise, No ecological survey has been undertaken before this proposal was formalised. Disruption to the bat colony and the veteran trees is not justified planning policy. Tree in Relation to Design, Demolition and Construction and Planning Policy Statement 3.</p> <p>The review of the BS 5837 Standard in 2005 was designed to integrate the document with PPGs and PPS. Sections within PPS3 stated that "salient landscape features should lead the design". These principles would apply to features such as rivers, lakes important wildlife corridors and significant trees. This proposal calls for the removal of the entire existing trees stock immediately adjacent to the cross roads. These mature large trees are the subject of a Tree Preservation Order. (TPO) Given the extent of the proposal one must question why these trees are lost.</p> <p>The proposed location of the "New Link Road" and FWP7 are unacceptably close to other mature trees (which are also subject to TPO) located on the higher land at the public house. No consideration has been given to intrusion into Root Protection Areas, (RPAs) the effects of shading of large trees on dwellings to the east and the post development requirement of occupiers to prune trees which would be aesthetically unacceptable, requirements</p> <p>The 2012 revision of BS5837 accentuates this reasoning further as it ties into the RIBA phasing scheme.</p> <p>To Summarise: The proposal has not been based upon site survey that incorporates important landscape features. The resultant design requires unjustifiable tree loss given the amount of space available.</p> <p>Misleading Documents Re Tree Loss.</p> <p>It should also be noted that the documents produced by EDDC are misleading as when producing before and after pictures they do not clearly state that the latter is artificially enhanced to the extent that it is unachievable in landscape terms. The future trees shown are not those currently on site.</p>						

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>Non-Compliance with Sections 81,84,85,86, and 99. Of the NPPF.</p> <p>It is accepted that the LPA may review the boundaries of the Greenbelt from time to time but in doing so they must have regard to existing features and future development and take an overview of the situation.</p> <p>The purpose of a greenbelt is to separate distinct urban areas and to contain development sprawl.</p> <p>Section 86 states that “if the openness of the village is a characteristic of the area then the village should be incorporated within the greenbelt.”</p> <p>In this instance the main feature of the village is the open space opposite the shopping area. When exiting Bournemouth it is the first rural space clearly seen after the floodplane. Travellers would have to travel a further 3 miles to see rural fields from a main road. The loss of this rural amenity feature will significantly diminish the greenbelt and significantly reduce the juxtaposition of the two elements of the conurbation.</p> <p>Section 85.</p> <p>The review of the greenbelt should make provision for “further safeguarded land for sustainable development that will enable further development stretching well beyond the initial plan phase.</p> <p>This proposal is bounded existing development and the flood plane. No further development would be possible without further impact upon the environment.</p> <p>Section 99. Climate Change.</p> <p>As alluded to earlier this proposal uses the flood plane as part of the SANG. This space is constantly underwater despite canalisation works to the river in the 1980s. If not under 600mm of water the ground is not traversable as it is too boggy. Current climate change predictions of England indicate that although the temperature will rise, rainfall will also increase. This factor has not been considered.</p> <p>Summary.</p> <p>The proposal has been compiled without a detailed environmental impact assessment and without consultation with all LPA department. It is therefore unsound.</p> <p>Conclusions.</p> <p>This proposal was formulated without consideration of an Environmental Impact Assessment, or an Arboricultural Impact Assessment.</p> <p>Were this proposal to proceed it would have an unacceptable impact upon the sylvan setting of the area and have a significant impact upon several protected European species. The document provided by the LPA are misleading as they do not reflect the true nature and immediate impact of the proposal on tree loss.</p> <p>The proposal uses the floodplane as part of the SANG and the other topography of the remaining section restricts access. (see contour lines)</p> <p>The LPA have produced this planning proposal to alter the greenbelt without full consideration of all sections of the NPPF. This is understandable as the proposal was formulated</p>						

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											before the NPPF was introduced. Thus I must conclude that this proposal is: Not justifiable in terms of tree loss, Not justifiable in terms of environmental impact, It is based upon unsound in planning principles.						
656940	Mrs Sheila Edwards		CSPS1681	Policy FWP6	No	No		Yes	Yes	Yes	<p>The response form on the above matter is far from user friendly and must, by intention or otherwise, be devoid of easy understanding for many residents who will not reply because of inability to carry out in depth research to comply with the set out requirements.</p> <p>A high proportion of residents (and voters) are seriously concerned as evidenced by the WPPC. There is a strong feeling of being steamrolled into a not viable, ill conceived and poorly analysed situation that is judged to have so many flaws.</p> <p>It appears that the District Council ha acceded to pressure and will accept written letters in lieu of the printed form. Given sufficient publicity it is an improvement, but is indicative of the odious air surrounding the whole proposal and action by many Councillors.</p> <p>Since Policies FW7, 6 and 5 are deemed to be unsound, not legally complaint, nor justified not effective and not consistent with National Policy, and bearing in mind Government Document PPS12, is now irrelevant. Any constructive support is negated by the lack of publicly widely reported analytical research to support viability.</p> <p>That such porous proposals should be enacted for the betterment of the West Parley area has at least to be highly questionable.</p> <p>At a time of national hardship, and possible future uncertainty of national wealth, to proceed must impose measures by councils and supportive interests of prolonged misery for which they must become accountable.</p> <p>The situation is such that it has become virtually impossible to analytically discuss with the District Council potential problems such as:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Increasing probability of flooding. 2) Full public analysis of true housing requirements, devoid of promoting house building and construction work. 3) Excessive affordable housing will inevitably attract or be allocated to many families who are not self supporting. Consequently, rate payers will have to heavily subsidise the numerous forms of support requirements. 4) Infrastructure in the form of schools, church, medical, care and pastime facilities will be further burdens to be carried. 5) The 100 houses as originally proposed by WPPC would be viable and support local shops. A supermarket would kill local traders and add further road chaos. 6) Current West Parley traffic problems are of short duration and no more than many other spots in the area. Road changes may well lead to estate road hazards. 7) Sites of interest, green belt land and wooded areas should not be decimated and sacrificed at the seemingly whim of Councillors or others who seem to dismiss the word 				506		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
											sacrosanct when associated with West Parley and other contentious areas in the Core Strategy Plan.							
656999	Mrs Sheila Gooden		CSPS1698	Policy FWP6							<p>1) Loss of Green Belt. This is the last green space of any note between West Parley and the coast. This needs to be kept as a breathing space from Urban Sprawl.</p> <p>2) The infrastructure is not adequate to take such large scale development.</p> <p>3) The planned road system does not seem to have been thought through. Bringing a road across ground which is of scientific and historical interest including broad leaf trees seems to fly in the face of all the Oak Trees that have TPO's on them. The field that the road is due to connect with is a well known flood plain and was totally underwater only a few weeks ago. Taking a road through a housing development that will no doubt have probably many children living there seems to be an accident waiting to happen.</p> <p>4) It appears that the concerns voiced by the residents of West Parley in the exercise undertaken a year or two ago seem to have been totally ignored. I have yet to meet anyone who said we needed a High Street or an even larger Supermarket. Where did that come from? We have a Tesco's Express that stocks all basic needs, we also have a very good Chemists and also a Post Office so most day to day needs are covered. The shops that are here are businesses that have been in West Parley for many years and we do not end up with empty shops for months on end. The only place in West Parley Village which is a bit of an eyesore is the Old Garage Site.</p> <p>5) Where are the people who need these houses? Are they local residents to Dorset or are we to be used as a lung for people from inner cities who have had their rent allowances cut. When we have had meetings regarding the development of West Parley not once have we had anyone come and stand up and say that they need housing and that we are being NIMBY ish! We agreed that we were willing to accept some development but not once have we been fully consulted on any strategy.</p> <p>6) Schools and Clinical Facilities. Where are the plans for children to be schooled.? I understand that the schools are already to capacity in which case surely a new or much extended school would be needed. I understand that there is not enough space to extend the school that we have. With so many new houses the Doctor's Surgery in Glenmoor Road would not be able to cope and this is possibly the same for the Dentists in the area assuming a lot of new residents would need an NHS dentist.</p> <p>7) The planned houses would also be under the flight area of planes coming in and out of Bournemouth Airport. This cannot be a healthy situation for residents and also the fact that it is not unknown for planes to crash in the area.</p> <p>8) We have next to no problems with damage or vandalism and doing some research these types of development lead to damage, graffiti and poor relations with neighbours. It is also known that trying to sell affordable houses can be problematic</p>					506		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
											<p>because of this type of damage, which could mean that the whole development becomes social housing.</p> <p>9) Where is the Public Transport. The buses that there are take an eternity to get anywhere quickly. They are also very expensive to use. Dorset is classed a a wealthy county. There maybe a lot of expensive properties but the salaries paid in this are are mostly low paid.</p> <p>10) Jobs. Where are all these people going to work? Even if Ferndown Industrial Estate is extended most of these types of units only employ a few people. Assuming that the current world situation improves in the near future it could possibly be many years before there is any meaningful employment in the area.</p> <p>11) It does appear that the planners have looked at a nice green area, and without any consideration for the local people, decided it could solve a large number of Dorset's housing problems.</p> <p>12) This needs to go back to the drawing board with West Parley residents properly consulted.</p>							
657001	Mr and Mrs S Wood		CSPS1700	Policy FWP6							<p>We are writing this letter to protest against the new housing proposals that are being considered for West Parley. The amount of new houses (500) represent more than 30% of the current housing in West Parley. You propose to build the 2 new link roads after the building of the new houses is 50% done, how can West Parley cope with this, we can hardly cope with the amount of traffic we get now. We are classified as a Village, not a town. We do not want to be part of Bournemouth, this new building will take away our individuality, there will be no gap between us and Bournemouth. With all this new housing where will the extra children go to school and people go to Doctors etc. There has been no thought given to this, our existing network will not cope with the huge influx you are proposing. Promises were made to us when the Airport was expanded regarding new wider roads. This has not happened, and who would want to live in new housing that is going to be in the flight path to the airport. (FWP6) You are going to be building on greenbelt, which as far as we are aware was something the Government is against. How can you build on an historical site as Dudsbury heights near the old forthill (Policy FWP7). The District Council has ignored our protests and do nothing about them. The Link Roads are going through areas that have tree preservations on them, has any thought been given to this? We have had no evidence that checks on Bats and other animals that are preserved have been done. West Parley cannot cope with the size of this development, there is no infrastructure in place. It is planned on high value agricultural land, there is no evidence we need this amount of new housing.</p> <p>Where will people work?</p> <p>Please Please reconsider this application, a much smaller amount of housing would be more suitable for this area.</p>					506		
657003	Mr Robin Gooden		CSPS1706	Policy FWP6							<p>The proposed massive housing expansion at West Parley is totally un-acceptable, it increases the housing stock by a</p>						506	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>huge 32% without the additional infrastructure increase to match it. The new residents will have no schools and no work opportunities in the local area. This will in turn lead to additional traffic on already overcrowded roads due to the additional travel they will have to undertake to reach work. The proposed road runs across the flood plain adjacent to the river Stour and floods following heavy rains and will require extensive piling and building up as a raised structure or on a causeway. It appears that the concerns voiced by the residents of West Parley in the exercise undertaken a year or two ago seem to have been totally ignored. I have yet to meet anyone who said we needed a High Street or an even larger Supermarket. Where did that come from? We have a Tesco's Express that stocks all basic needs, we also have a very good Chemists and also a Post office so most day to day needs are covered. The shops that are here are businesses that have been in West Parley for many years and we do not end up with empty shops for months on end. The only place in West Parley Village which is a bit of an eyesore is the Old Garage Site.</p> <p>The public consultation appears to have been a complete farce as all the resident's fears and concerns have been totally ignored. Whilst we appreciate everyone has to live somewhere a reduced scheme would be more appropriate. The plans should be amended I suggest this is the best course of acting for this area and expect you to support this approach.</p>						
657007	Mrs Hilary Jordan		CSPS1717	Policy FWP6							<p>In response to the core strategy consultation, which I believe is unsound in numerous areas.</p> <p>Firstly I am amazed at the lack of consultation with Local Residents and the Parish Council; I would suggest they know more about the local area than you do.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What about the need for Schools, and the funding? • What about the road improvements, additional traffic lights is not the answer? • What about the Historical sites such as Dudsbury Rings Fort? <p>To conclude, not only am I appalled by the Core Strategy Consultation, but disgusted at the total waste in tax payers' money of producing it and all the pointless meetings I am sure you have undertaken.</p>				506		
657018	Mr Stuart Couper		CSPS1721	Policy FWP6	No		Yes		Yes	<p>This document is unsound, unjustified and not consistent with national policy.</p> <p>This also completely ignores the residents wishes as shown in the comprehensive Parish Plan.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 320 homes together with another 200 in West Parley giving a 32% increase in housing all on green belt is totally unjustified. The proportion of 50% affordable property is completely out of keeping with the present structure of the area. 2. The plan provides allotments which have never been required. 3. A new park is planned when the council have recently upgraded out park and woodland walks. 				506			

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description		
											<p>4. The complicated road system makes no sense at all this would divert heavy traffic through the new housing estate which would be dangerous and the road from Dudsbury would damage the Stour Valley Way where there is considerable wild life with Badgers and Deer and would then emerge into New Road on a bend where the road narrows.</p> <p>5. The primary school and doctors are all maximum capacity but no provision has been made for the increase in population.</p>								
360103	Mr J Edwards		CSPS2188	Policy FWP6							<p>I write to object to the core strategy plans with regard to the plan to build 220 houses at Dudsbury Heights, policy number FWP7 and 300 in the New Road field, policy number FWP6, at West Parley.</p> <p>Neither of these proposals I find to be Justified, Effective or Consistent with National Policy.</p> <p>I decline to submit these objections in the biased and deliberately incomprehensible format originally requested. The very nature of these proposals and the manner that they have been put forward to premature consultation is undemocratic and outside government policy. At no point have the people of West Parley been involved in the drawing up of these plans and indeed the publicly funded, council driven Parish Plan that 1000 residents contributed to has been ignored. This document was supposed to be the driver for locally led shaping of our village and area.</p> <p>The green belt is not for cheap housing or to be sold to dig the Council out of a financial hole whenever it suits, despite what East Dorset's Alan Breakwell (ex Chief Executive) claimed at a very public meeting in the council chambers at Furzehill. I quote "the houses will be built, we need the money".</p> <p>These green belt fields are key gaps with our neighbours in Bournemouth and to a lesser degree Ferndown. They fulfil the exact purpose the green belt policy was enacted for, they prevent urban sprawl. I see no exceptional circumstances for sacrificing this exceptional green belt on the altar of cheap housing estates.</p> <p>Parley Cross is already the busiest crossroads in Dorset and yet these proposals would massively increase the volume of cars on this road, a previous local plan warned against any further development until the road system could be improved. Under these proposals half the houses could be built before either link road was started, years of greater misery for not only residents of Parley but all the other commuters who currently use these roads. One of the link roads which would be taking heavy traffic would go right through a housing estate, a concern for safety surely, but then the wisdom of placing family housing beneath a busy flightpath seems to have little concern for well being or possible safety anyway, perhaps this must come secondary to the council when the temptation of large amounts of cash from builders is on the table.</p> <p>There can be few areas, if any, being asked to take on board a massive 32% increase in housing stock and to assimilate so</p>					506			

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
											many new people into a existing population in such a way as this proposal suggests. The well being of existing residents, who are tax payers and voters is not being taken into account. Residents here value our semi rural life and object most strongly to these attempts to wipe it out. No thought has been given to the wildlife that abounds here or the protected heathland East Dorset is so pleased to boast of, and take grants to maintain, but cares so little for in reality. That there would be hundreds more residents on its doorstep who will no doubt be tramping all over it is of no regard. Please do not think that other token offerings of accessible green space will prevent the SSSI's being abused.							
612430	Mr Nick Squirrel	Natural England, Dorset and Somerset Team	CSPS1943	Policy FWP6	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	No	<p>Policies; CN 1, CN 2, CN 3, WMC 3, WMC 4, WMC 5, WMC 6, FWP 3, FWP 4, FWP 6, FWP 7, FWP 8, VTSW 2, VTSW3, VTSW 4, VTSW 8 etc are all proposing development and or mitigation in the form of SANGs on greenfield locations. In order to avoid a conflict with policy ME1 at a later stage in the planning process Natural England advise the authorities to bring to the attention of those with an interest in these locations the need to carry out a basic biodiversity survey eg Phase 1 habitat survey including assessment of the likely presence or evidence of other features likely to restrict or delay development eg badger setts, priority species such as reptiles, water voles etc in time for consideration at the EIP. In many cases this will simply be a statement as the proposer has already engaged an ecological advisor.</p> <p>These policies appear to have been brought forward in an absence of adequate information and assessment on the biodiversity features held by the policy land. There is reason to suspect that on some there may be a significant biodiversity interest owing to close proximity with designated sites and or other biodiversity sites. The NPPF requires that planning policies should be based on up-to date information on the natural environment (paragraph 165). These policies are not shown to be compliant with this requirement. Thus, irrespective of the above matters concerning other nearby designated sites, it is not possible to identify whether the policies are compliant with policy considerations in the NPPF on sustainable development for the sites alone, especially the aspect on sustainable development set out in paragraph 9 of moving from a net loss of biodiversity to achieving net gains (for example on priory habitats and species).</p>	The policies may need to include specific paragraphs about features of biodiversity importance which are to be secured or enhanced.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	Natural England has provided extensive advice to a number of the parties concerned with these policies and may be able to offer advice and reassurance to the Inspector about the reliance he may have on the effectiveness of the policy and any modification proposed.	506			
656352	Mrs Laura Webber		CSPS1850	Policy FWP6		No			Yes		Insufficient analysis of the input of 320 homes would have on the area particularly on health and school facilities. Aso the fact that potentially another 500 cars would have to be catered for in the area (jus under 2 per household) also other cars using new supermarket.	Potentially another 1,000 people living in a small space would lead to a very heavy impact on a small area which is already heavily congested with cars and people going to work at peak times.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		506			
359261	Mr Doug Cramond	DC Planning Ltd	CSPS2123	Policy FWP6	Yes	Yes					1: Introduction 1.1 By way of general comment Wyatt Homes considers that		Yes, I wish to participate at the oral	Wyatt Homes holds the controlling interest	506			

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>having regard to the NPPF the Core Strategy Pre-Submission Consultation (CS) is an impressive collaborative document which passes the 'Tests of Soundness'. Within an extremely constrained area, but one which is in need of much new development for economic, social and physical reasons, the Councils have been positive and have justified the stances taken to produce deliverable change all in accord with national policy.</p> <p>1.2 The background to population make-up and the present strains within this, along with housing supply limitations and needs, are cogently set out within Chapter 2 of the CS. The Core Strategy Vision (para 3.5) is attuned to the local situation and achieves the balance between aspiration and realism; it is supported by Wyatts. Similarly all 7 Objectives across the environmental, economic and community spectrums are soundly based.</p> <p>2: Policy Support</p> <p>2.1 In this context the Company feels there are a number of 'general' policies of particular relevance and support is expressed for:</p> <p>KS1: Settlement Hierarchy KS4: Housing Provision in East Dorset KS9: Transport Corridor Improvements ME1: ME2: Protection of Dorset Heathlands ME3: SANGS ME4: Sustainable Development Standards LN1: Dwelling Size & Type LN2: Design, Layout & Density LN6: Community Facilities & Services</p> <p>3: Potential Policy Review</p> <p>3.1 Improvement to the Plan would arise if some amendment were made to Policies LN3 (Provision of Affordable Housing), ME5 (Renewable Energy Provision) and KS8 (Future Retail Provision).</p> <p>3.2 In the case of the former the % of affordable homes should be expressed as maxima not minima. Furthermore the policy should have reference in it to any delivery target being subject to viability. It is clear from recent public presentations by the Housing Development and Enabling Manager that this is the approach intended to be taken – the policy wording should reflect this. Clearly Wyatts will do what it can on the FWP6 site but it will need to be borne in mind that the list of planning obligations, including a new link road, would give rise to a viability profile not in accord with 'normal' greenfield development. Hence flexibility needs to be maintained in the matter of precise percentage of affordable housing at this stage.</p> <p>3.3 On the issue of Policy ME5 the Councils' stance on Renewable Energy is set in too rigid a framework and to a degree reflects past rather than current thinking. The increasing consensus is that reducing energy consumption by in-built fabric means is more appropriate and effective in the reduction of carbon emissions than bolt on or even integral renewable energy devices. These could effectively just be meeting a % of energy from a wasteful home. The policy</p>		examination	in the FWP6 site and will be able to assist the examination on all technical, environmental, ecological, delivery, design, contributions and community benefit aspects as well as the inherent enabling of Policy FWP5 and other development proposals along this corridor.			

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>should acknowledge that there is 'another way of doing things' through enhanced specification for the built fabric.</p> <p>3.4 Policy KS8 could usefully have amendment to aid clarity and reflect the Councils' approach within FWP6 whereby a convenience foodstore of about 3,000 sq metres is endorsed. KS8 should thus mention West Parley as a place and this quantum of development as need which is to be met in this location. It is unhelpfully silent on the matter at the present time.</p> <p>4: Site Involvement</p> <p>4.1 As underlined in previous submissions, Wyatt Homes is a regional builder renowned for creating quality buildings, spaces and places and is fortunate to have the over-arching interest in the new neighbourhood area of Policy FWP6 at West Parley. This Policy links with, and is effectively a pre-requisite for, FWP5 West Parley Village Centre Enhancement Scheme which provides the opportunity to transform the vitality, viability and environmental qualities of the Parley Crossroads area. Wyatts would wish to express full support for that important initiative within the CS. Comment on, and support for, Policy FWP6 is expressed below.</p> <p>5: Policy FWP6 East of New Road New Neighbourhood, West Parley</p> <p>5.1 It has been recognised for many years by the LPA and its consultants that the land in the south east quadrant of Parley Crossroads would provide the opportunity for a sustainable new neighbourhood bringing forward many benefits for the immediate and wider area.</p> <p>5.2 CS Para 10.36 puts matters eloquently and succinctly: "This is a flat featureless area of land bordered on three sides by urban development. It offers the opportunity to provide much needed new housing, traffic alleviation, community, retail and commercial services and facilities, as well as significant areas of publicly accessible Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace, alongside more formal open space. It creates a chance to provide a welcoming village centre with an attractive sense of place."</p> <p>5.3 A critical scale of development is required to achieve planning objectives and development viability and Policy FWP6 achieves this; it will provide the delivery of a sufficient quantum of much needed housing and an extensive range of other benefits.</p> <p>5.4 Mitigation for any impact from about 320 dwellings and associated commercial buildings on the Parley Common SPA is an entirely achievable proposition; a fact confirmed by Natural England. Some residents concerns over either traffic additions to the Parley Crossroads or the environmental result of new works here on any new community are unfounded. The reverse is actually the case; endorsement of the development is a pre-requisite to achieving both capacity and environmental improvements at this junction and its environs.</p> <p>5.5 The Core Strategy should be just that – looking at critical core issues for the District and coming up with an achievable and sustainable strategy to address them. The document needs, and does, come forward with a deliverable and</p>						

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>visionary way ahead for the next 20 years. Policy FWP6 is an essential part of this strategy.</p> <p>5.6 Implementation of the policy aligns with the CS Vision in that it will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • provide good quality market and affordable homes to meet needs; • protect and enhance local character along with areas of environmental and ecological quality; • create jobs locally and assist with the expansion of the employment potential at the airport; • minimise the need to travel in this part of the District and make it easier when people have to get around and through this locality; and • provide appropriate services and recreational opportunities for the people of West Parley. <p>5.7 A key component of national advice is the approach to Green Belt. Any development proposed on this designation has to be assessed against the 5 purposes of GB set out in the NPPF, material considerations and whether very special circumstances exist. The evidence base gives rise to no concerns on these points. Wyatts agree that the housing and other needs outweighs any complete protectionist stance on the GB and that in any event the 5 purposes of GB would not be contravened by well planned development at FWP6. It is important to keep the old settlement (and Conservation Area) of Parley Cross, to the south east, separate from any growth of West Parley, and Bournemouth too – the development strategy for FWP6 would do this.</p> <p>5.8 Wyatt Homes, with the help of ecological practice, EPR, and the good offices of Natural England have carefully explored the issue of impacts to the SPA. A scheme has been drafted which mitigates for the site in SPA terms and brings the diversionary open space for the nearby existing population as well as offering benefits for walkers on the Stour Valley Way. Wyatts is committed to the provision for a single SANGS area of over 16 ha.</p> <p>5.9 There is consensus amongst the highway and planning authorities and the Wyatt team that a diversionary link road for part of the Parley Crossroads traffic, through and serving development on this quadrant, would be a positive way forward to the congestion and environmental problems that beset Parley Crossroads. Works must be done at this junction. All FWP proposals will require them. Progression of development at Bournemouth Airport is absolutely critical to the CS area's economy and it needs works done at Parley Crossroads as a fundamental part of this. The works which need to be done are not on highway land; the quadrant is Wyatt Homes controlled. Local opinion is clearly in favour of 'doing something' at Parley Crossroads. Over 90% of those who expressed view on this matter at the CS Issues and Options stage supported improvements to this junction. Policy FWP6 is the way to achieve this.</p> <p>5.10 The strategic case for an FWP6 approach is well made – this site is a large central piece in an overall visionary, and achievable, jigsaw. Green Belt, nature conservation, local</p>						

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>environmental enhancement, commercial and transport gains are inherent. The site's sustainability credentials can not be challenged with its accessibility generally and its relative proximity to EDDC's largest employment area (Ferndown EI) and the sub region's largest planned area for job generation - the airport.</p> <p>5.11 A scheme of this nature will ensure comprehensive delivery, provision of facilities and infrastructure, creation of a true mixed community and meaningful supply of affordable and varied market homes. With about 2,500 households on the EDDC Housing Register and only 14 affordable dwellings added to EDDC stock last year the position for people in housing need is bad and deteriorating. The 2011 review of the SHMA recorded that the total annual need for affordable properties in the EDDC area was 426.</p> <p>5.12 Efficient and effective use of land should be made to accord with local and national planning policies. Development will be kept clear of airport related noise and safety zones. There is no other site around the periphery of Ferndown and West Parley which can offer this scale of development or bring anything like the direct benefits. The Council is completely correct to utilise this opportunity through FWP6.</p> <p>5.13 At a local level the scheme can deliver facilities which have been called for in local consultation (e.g. CS Issues and Options responses) – allotments, playground, teen facilities and perhaps a health centre. Shopping will greatly improve locally, adding to self-containment and lessening the need to travel. Concern is expressed in the evidence base Profile Information over poor shopping facilities at West Parley and professional studies have shown more is needed.</p> <p>5.14 Through this site West Parley will become a more balanced community with a range of ages, house types, social strata and skills. Locally public transport, already recognised as good, will improve further in long term viability, service frequency and speed through avoiding congestion. Significant wide landscape areas will be aligned where the site lies closest to, or abuts, existing dwellings. New parkland and walking routes will be available to all. Much of the substantial 'New Homes Bonus' can be spent at the behest of local people.</p> <p>5.15 Finally, it is worth underlining that the long established Wyatt Homes is committed to timely delivery of high quality architecturally designed, locally distinctive, development at FWP6 using south east Dorset labour and suppliers.</p> <p>6: Conclusion</p> <p>6.1 The NPPF tests of soundness are unequivocal. To be 'sound' a core strategy should be POSITIVELY PREPARED, JUSTIFIED, EFFECTIVE and consistent with NATIONAL POLICY.</p> <p>6.2 Policy FWP6 is sound on a site specific basis. By including this policy the intended strategy for this part of the Plan area including housing delivery, job generation, transport enhancement and environmental protection can come forward. A major part of the soundly based CS would be delivered.</p>						

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
											6.3 For all the reasons above, FWP6 should continue to be a firm policy in the Submission CS. We look forward to working with the LPA over coming months towards collaborative delivery of this lynchpin new sustainable neighbourhood.							
359553	Mrs Linda Leeding	West Parley Parish Council	CSPS2000	Policy FWP6	No		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	<p>This plan is considered Unsound, in that it is neither Consistent with National Policy, Justified, Effective, or Deliverable.</p> <p>N.P.P.F. 155 calls for “early and meaningful engagement and collaboration with a wide section of the community”.</p> <p>E.D.D.C.s Statement of Community Involvement (part of the Core Strategy evidence base) calls for “active and continuous community involvement” in the planning process.</p> <p>These policies have been consistently ignored. E.D.D.C. has carried out the required formal consultations after plans have been produced, but the prior planning has been behind closed doors and requests for involvement have been turned down. When plans are published it is seen that little or no attention has been paid to community aspirations. For instance, when the West Parley Parish Plan was delivered in 2011 it had no response or acknowledgement from E.D.D.C. When this plan was published on 17 January 2012, it was a complete surprise to District Councillors, Parish Council and Residents alike. The 2010 Core Strategy Options had said building on a similar scale on this site was a “non preferred” option. Moreover the link road was completely new, and the community facilities shown had never been discussed with the community.</p> <p>The scale of this planned development is unsustainable. Taking FWP6 together with FWP7, FWP3 and FWP4 totals 660 houses. If Ferndown and West Parley are regarded as one community, as the planners have done, this is an addition of some 14% to the housing stock. But for West Parley alone the 520 houses in FWP6 and FWP7 represent an overwhelming and unsustainable addition of 32% to West Parley’s existing 1630 houses.</p> <p>West Parley Parish Council response form page 3</p> <p>The District planners have mistakenly treated the two communities as one. This is a serious error, even though Ferndown and West Parley have to be thought about together in some planning terms, for instance roads.</p> <p>The village of West Parley is separate constitutionally from Ferndown, having its own boundaries, own Council and (in 2015) a separate M.P. West Parley has all the elements of a self contained village – churches, village hall, pubs, recreation ground, sports ground, shops. It has a distinctly separate identity. Ferndown is largely a post war dormitory town; West Parley has a long history going back through the Domesday Book to a Saxon church to an Iron Age Hill Fort.</p> <p>The topography of West Parley is also different; although post war housing has joined it to Ferndown at the North, a walk around the South, West and East of West Parley shows it to have a rural environment surrounded by farms, horse paddocks, heathland and the river Stour.</p> <p>West Parley has a sense of community that is strikingly</p>		Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination			506		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
											different from Ferndown. In the last local elections, for instance, the Ferndown turnout was below the national average, whilst in West Parley it was one of the highest nationally. West Parley has an active residents association and over 100 volunteers in teams who litter pick, maintain the public flower displays, clear the pavements and hedges, maintain and improve the woodland, tend the grass verges, and distribute information to all the households. It is submitted that such a rapid increase in West Parley's housing stock by one third will have an unsustainable and adverse effect on a distinct and separate community. We have grave doubts on the effectiveness and deliverability of a link road through FWP6. It would carry major traffic to and from the airport, mineral sites, the Eco waste plant, and the Bournemouth water treatment facility right through the middle of a high density area of housing. Safety would be a major issue. No safety, environmental or traffic flow studies, or costings have been done. We also doubt the deliverability of the necessary SANGs, on which we understand that only initial discussions have taken place.							
361035	Mrs H.L O'Sullivan		CSPS2279	Policy FWP6							I strongly object to the proposed imposition of 500+ houses on West Parley. Increasing the current housing stock by 32%! For the following reasons I would consider the proposal to be not legally compliant and unsound. 1) These developments will seriously erode the green belt gap, designed to prevent urban sprawl and the merger of settlements. West Parley will be a suburb of Bournemouth leaving only a very narrow river corridor between the Bournemouth and Ferndown. 2) Previous documents have also expressed concern with regards flooding resulting from substantial development in the area so close to the river. : "Insufficient weight given in the Strategy to the desirability of maintaining, protecting and wherever possible restoring the rivers and their corridors. Any type of built development close to or within the river corridors will increase existing floor risk." (Quote – Non Preferred Option CS PreSub 08 Ferndown and West Parley Proposals Background Paper) 3) The development is being forced on the area despite the opinions of residents Against the government's policy of not imposing top down planning. The consultation document states there have been numerous consultation meetings with West Parley Residents Association, but little notice seems to have been taken of the opinions expressed by the WRPA. More than 1000 residents contributed to the local parish plan, suggesting 100 new homes would be more realistic. The suggestion is made in the core strategy document that there has been little interest and local response to previous planning documents. Could this be because in the previous planning document, development at West Parley was the "non-preferred option"? Local residents were mislead into thinking a "non-preferred option" meant the council would not want to further pursue development in this					506		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>area and thus there was no need to respond.</p> <p>4) Although just outside the protection zone surrounding the Parley Common heathland the developments, particularly FWP6, are very close to Parley Common. Additional housing and population moving into the area will inevitably cause extra pressure on the rare habitat. Natural England and RSPB have expressed concerns regarding the developments. FWP6 & 7</p> <p>“Natural England – Object. This site offers significant green infrastructure that could remove potential adverse effects (from recreational pressure) on the Dorset heaths and increase the value for biodiversity. Disproportionate ratio of housing to the Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG) proposed.</p> <p>English Heritage – Object. To ensure the national significance of Dudsbury Camp is conserved, its values must first be fully appreciated. Specific detailed evidence must therefore be gathered to inform consideration of the areas suitability, the proximity and the form of any future potential development.</p> <p>RSPB – We agree with the findings of the Habitats Regulations Assessment in connection with the proposed housing sites within these areas. We Object “(Quote – Non Preferred Option CS PreSub 08 Ferndown and West Parley Proposals Background Paper)</p> <p>5) FWP6 development is very close to the flight path. Noise levels from aircraft</p> <p>Are considerable in this area and will only increase as the air traffic increases. This will not make for very pleasant living conditions.</p> <p>6) The proposed roads through the developments will not alleviate the pressure</p> <p>On New Road and the Parley Cross junction. The additional car movements caused by the increase in houses will add to the problems on New Road. Frequently during the day, not just at rush hours, the traffic queues back from the Northbourne Roundabout past the Parley Cross traffic lights back to Ferndown. This situation will not be improved by 2 new junctions feeding into New Road through the two new estates. Added congestion on New Road can only lead to more congestion on Christchurch Road as Parley crossroads try to accommodate the additional traffic.</p> <p>7) The increase of 30% in West Parley housing stock will totally swamp the</p> <p>Current village. Changing a semi rural village into a suburban location.</p> <p>8) A large supermarket will also increase the traffic coming into the area. We are</p> <p>Already served well by supermarkets in Ferndown, and a substantial Tesco express at Parley Cross.</p> <p>9) There does not appear to have been any consideration of additional strain</p> <p>On other local amenities such as schools, doctors, sewerage systems etc.</p>						
474971	Mr Peter Durant		CSPS2209	Policy FWP6							I am writing to protest about the proposed building plans for				506		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>West Parley.</p> <p>I have major concerns about the whole thrust of the proposals. I am appalled at the manner in which East Dorset has carried out substantial consultations in West Parley, and then completely ignored the results. It was not long ago that the Prime Minister stated that it was his intention that local matters should be determined locally. I recognise that East Dorset Council has cynically combined West Parley with Ferndown in their deliberations to justify their plans. This is neither fair nor justifiable. The people of Ferndown are not directly affected by the proposals. The ancient parish of West Parley has throughout history to the present day been regarded as a proper village, with an identity distinct from Ferndown. It appears that East Dorset Council has conveniently ignored this aspect.</p> <p>This leads directly to the first point that I wish to make.</p> <p>1st. The proposed plans would produce a 32% increase in the housing stock of West Parley which would be far in excess of the proposals for other communities in East Dorset.</p> <p>2nd I believe that the proposal to build on Greenbelt land is flawed in a number of regards. The green belt designation was originally set up to avoid the sort of development that is proposed for West Parley. There will be very little to separate West Parley from the northern fringes of Bournemouth if the development goes ahead. The open fields that provide pleasant vistas to the east of New Road, and to the south of Christchurch Road will be replaced by urbanisation. The extent of the additional buildings will create many more vehicle movements at the West Parley junction, and despite the planned diversions, will cause yet more traffic chaos.</p> <p>3rd. The proposed filter roads connecting Christchurch Road to the southern section of New Road will be passing through the proposed urban development, which will almost certainly bring children into close proximity with substantial traffic movements, many of which will be heavy goods vehicles.</p> <p>4th The idea that alterations to the road network will bring about long term easing of congestion is naïve. There is almost certainly a substantial unmet demand for rush hour commuters to travel the east-west, and the north south corridors, which will probably flood these roads if additional road space is provided. The evidence for that is that when the previous alterations were made to the junction, it took just 6 months for the designed capacity to be exceeded by the flood of extra vehicles.</p> <p>5th. The District Council encouraged West Parley to provide a Parish plan. Before this was adopted by the Parish Council, the local citizens were formally consulted. The District Council have ignored it.</p> <p>I have identified most of my points. However, just in case these need to be linked to the planning policy numbering I will respond to these.</p> <p>FWP5 I see no need for an additional supermarket. Any additional local shops be it Baker, Greengrocer or other would fail in any attempt to compete with supermarkets just as they have before. I do not believe that there are enough Plymouth</p>						

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
											<p>Brethren in West Parley to warrant a new church.</p> <p>FWP6 The main reason such a large number of houses are being proposed is so that alterations to the road network can be funded by developers. They should not be being built on greenbelt land for the reasons that I have already identified. The junction is at full capacity throughout the rush hour period. The traffic engineers have agreed on that, so the only way things could get worse is by an extension of the period during which chaos reigns. I believe that alterations to the road network will almost certainly encourage yet more vehicles. Emerging from this is that additional road space is an exercise in futility. So, if the junction remains largely as it is, there is less justification for using greenbelt land.</p> <p>FWP7 The same objections that I identified in my response to FWP6 apply to this.</p> <p>To finish: Various suggestions were made at the meetings for alternative land fit for development. There is the brown field land around Boundary Lane. The water company suggested their site off Old Ham Lane. So there are alternatives around. It appears to me that authorities are fixated about the traffic at West Parley and all the extra housing changes are being made so that changes to the road infrastructure can be funded.</p>							
475502	Mr Richard Croom		CSPS2281	Policy FWP6							<p>We wish to make the following representation, as having lived in Parley since 1985 we are very concerned indeed at the District Council's proposed plans for development.</p> <p>The Core Strategy Response Form included at the back of the Spring EXTRA 2012 edition of eastdorsetnews seeks the views of residents as to whether the document is legally compliant or unsound. However we feel that a much more practical approach is required by the District Council to be aware of the effect the proposed development will have on the lives of the residents of West Parley.</p> <p>The District Council should be more concerned about the detrimental effect the building of 520 additional houses will have upon the environment, and the lives of the existing Parley residents. 1,000 residents of West Parley contributed to the Parish Plan having been encouraged to do so by the District Council, and yet despite the clear message contained in the Plan regarding future building and the effect it would have upon the environment, the residents' views have been ignored.</p> <p>The proposed policies FWP6 and FWP7 to build an additional 520 houses represents a massive increase in the housing stock of 32% which is absolutely ridiculous, and cannot have been thought through properly. The new proposals are very different indeed to the plans originally released in 2010, and quite undemocratically the Parish Council has not been consulted by the District Council.</p> <p>Why has West Parley been selected by the District Council for this totally unacceptable level of development? The number of new houses proposed will be unmanageable and totally disproportionate to the existing housing stock. It is also considerably higher than the proposals put forward by the</p>				506			

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>District Council for Corfe Mullen, Ferndown, Verwood or West Moors.</p> <p>520 additional houses will no doubt mean at least another 500 cars, and probably nearer 700 extra vehicles on our roads that are already very busy especially during commuter and school peak travelling times. Whilst being aware that 2 new link roads are proposed I believe these will not be constructed until half the intended houses have been completed, so the effect upon the existing roads and the residents will surely be chaotic.</p> <p>Referring once again to Policies FWP6 and FWP7 both these sites are I believe part of the existing green belt. Was not the main reason initially for the establishment of the green belt to provide so called Key Gaps between existing towns to counteract urban sprawl?</p> <p>Why has the District Council seen fit to ignore this very vital aspect of Town Planning?</p> <p>The road junction at Parley Cross is already a very busy bottleneck particularly at peak commuter and school travelling times. The proposed development of over 500 houses will exacerbate traffic and environmental problems, and ruin what has been a very pleasant place to live for many years. This will undoubtedly cause a great deal of frustration and unhappiness for the existing residents, and one further point that the District Council seems to have ignored with regard to FWP6 and FWP7 is that many of the proposed new dwellings will be erected directly under the flight path to and from Bournemouth International Airport.</p> <p>We know that many of the residents of West Parley are very upset at the prospect of over 500 additional houses being built, and we urge the District Council to listen to the views being expressed by the residents and the Parish Council, and give urgent and sympathetic re-consideration to the proposed development.</p>						
494600	Mrs Audrey Russell		CSPS2247	Policy FWP6							<p>Initially I would like to state that this the first time that these plans have been made available to local residents, and the proposals that have been put forward in them show that comments made by the public to previous plans appear, in the main, to have been ignored.</p> <p>I live in the area between two of the proposed areas of redevelopment – Coppins Nursery (FWP4) and West Parley crossroads (FWP5, 6 and 7).</p> <p>My concerns regarding the 30 proposed houses at Coppins is that you could, potentially, have 60 vehicles entering and leaving this area via the Christchurch Road. This is a road that is already carrying more traffic than it was designed for, and where it is the norm for the traffic to be travelling in excess of the speed limit. There have been a number of deaths and 'near misses' on this stretch of road, and adding another busy junction will only exacerbate this situation.</p> <p>West Parley is a village, but you are suggesting increasing its housing stock by one third. This will change the whole character of the area and I do not believe that the need for this scale of development in the village has been proved.</p>				506		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description		
											<p>Green Belt was put in place to prevent 'urban sprawl', and yet you are planning to redefine its boundaries to allow just that. An increase in the number of houses in West Parley by 520 will result in an increase in the number of cars – possibly by 1000. New Link roads may appear to ease the flow of traffic through the Parley crossroad junction, but the traffic on the entry roads to the village (Christchurch Road – west and east, and New Road – north and south) will be carrying even more traffic that they do currently. You are just moving the current congestion further away from the junction but not resolving the problem.</p> <p>With the proposed increase in population in the village, I feel that there will be an increased need for medical services (doctors and dentists), and for schools. These do not appear to have been considered in the proposed plan,.</p> <p>I would appreciate you taking these points into consideration before a final decision is made regarding the future of our area</p>								
495662	Mr & Mrs B Abbott		CSPS2287	Policy FWP6							<p>I have lived at West Parley for about 30 years and in that time have seen many changes, not all of them favourable to residents of the area.</p> <p>The proposed plans for additional housing at Dudsbury Heights (Policy FWP7) and at the New Road field (FWP6) would further destroy this once green and quiet village and make it merely a part of the urban sprawl of Bournemouth, Poole & Ferndown.</p> <p>Most people would accept that there is a requirement for some additional housing but what I cannot understand is why prime green belt sites are being used for additional housing when there are spaces for infill and other more suitable sites. Why are such large developments to be inflicted on West Parley? To do so is to destroy countryside that can never be replaced.</p> <p>The plans proposed at New Road, right under the flight path, with a major road route through the centre of the proposed dwellings seems to me to be ill thought out. Not only will the proposed dwellings be subject to noise and environmental pollution from aircraft, they will also suffer from the effects of volumes of traffic. The volume of traffic at Parley is bad enough now and can only be made worse by the proposed developments. Who would want to purchase such properties? Is the idea to have another Tricketts Cross type estate at Parley?</p> <p>To summarise, we object most strongly to the proposals because of the following factors:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Use of prime green belt locations. 2. Unsuitable location for housing under flight path. 3. Unacceptable traffic consequences. 4. Extent of proposed developments. 5. Views of residents expressed at earlier consultations appear to have been completely ignored. <p>Please, please reconsider the proposals.</p>					506			
497056	Mrs Gillian Miles		CSPS2200	Policy FWP6							<p>I wish to object to Policy FWP6 and FWP7 for the following reasons.</p>					506			

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The consultation process is unsatisfactory. Government legislation requires you to consult fully with local communities before setting out proposals, but this has been ignored. West Parley produced, following lengthy consultation with residents, a Parish Plan. East Dorset District Council encouraged the production of this document and over 1000 residents contributed to it, showing that they were overwhelmingly against having more than about 100 houses built in West Parley. This source of information has been ignored by EDDC planners. • To build more than 100 houses in West Parley would create an unbroken urban sprawl from Bournemouth to Ferndown and beyond. West Parley would lose its identity and become just another small part of a very large conurbation. Both of the proposed development sites constitute much valued Green Belt land and provide key gaps between the Bournemouth and Ferndown boundaries. This was the reason for introducing the Green Belt system many years ago. • The Green Belt land enhances the setting of the village and provides a habitat for a number of species of animals and birds, such as badgers, foxes, otters, deer and buzzards. Many local people use the footpaths that cross these fields for exercising dogs and walking. • The proposed new link roads will not ease the traffic problems in West Parley, but merely move the traffic jams to a different location. My husband and I both drive through Parley Cross each day and are all too aware that, at peak times, the traffic queues from Parley Cross often extend for a mile in each direction. If over 500 new homes were to be built, there is the potential for 1000 or so additional vehicles using these roads each day. Similarly, traffic travelling in the direction of Poole often queues back from the mini roundabouts in Longham. Other proposals for housing at Coppins Nursery and Holmwood House would exacerbate these traffic problems even further. • 520 extra houses in West Parley represent an increase in housing of about 32%. This is excessive and is far more than is proposed for any of the other East Dorset communities. Without the provision of additional educational, health and community facilities, the pressure on the existing provision will be unacceptable. • Dudsbury Fort is an important heritage site and the proposed development site at FWP7 is too closely connected to the site for this site to be adequately protected. The proposed development would be detrimental the setting of Dudsbury Fort. • The creation of another supermarket on site FWP6 is totally unnecessary. Various supermarkets already exist within a three mile radius of West Parley, with no fewer than three Tesco Express shops within a one mile radius of Parley Cross. Another supermarket would merely add to the traffic congestion in the area. <p>I appreciate the Council's need to provide housing for the future, but feel that it could be better accommodated elsewhere, perhaps thought a comprehensive redevelopment</p>						

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
											and regeneration of Ferndown town centre. Please reconsider these proposals and listen to the views of us, the local residents.							
498084	Mr P Hartley		CSPS2172	Policy FWP6							<p>I am writing on behalf of myself and my family to voice our disgust and disappointment at the proposals to build over 500 houses and new main roads on beautiful and treasured Green Belt and Key Gap areas in West Parley. It is particularly distressing to us and the local inhabitants as when building in these areas has been proposed in the past, local objections have been so evident that the proposals were retracted. Despite the fact that the local councils should be acting on the behalf of their residents, they appear to be constantly engaging in battles with them, trying to impose actions that are strongly opposed.</p> <p>For clarity, the policies referred to in this letter are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy FWP7 – 220 houses and new road in Dudsbury heights field. • Policy FWP6 – 300 houses, supermarket, shopping centre and link road by New Road field. <p>The additional 520 houses is 32% increase in West Parleys housing stock. This would have an enormous impact on West Parley and is far more than is being imposed on Corfe Mullen, Ferndown, Wimborne and Verwood. With the erosion of the Key Gaps defending West Parley from the urban sprawl from Bournemouth and increasing the population by almost a third, the charm and village feel of West Parley will be completely destroyed and the primary reasons for wanting to live here gone.</p> <p>The new link roads include a new main road with extremely high traffic loads running through the new 300 houses, which is ludicrous due to the inherent dangers that will be imposed on the residents, particularly the children.</p> <p>West Parley does not cope with the current traffic demands with large traffic jams every working day. Any additional housing will increase the traffic causing more problems. Building of the proposed new link roads will not commence until half the houses have been built – there would create a large increase in traffic with no alternative traffic route, potentially for years.</p> <p>These plans are very different form the 2010 plans, but local residents have not been involved or consulted at all in their preparation. West Parley's Parish Plan was encouraged by the District Council with 1000 residents contributing to it, however the District Council has completely ignored it. This sort of behaviour from the local councils is atrocious and destroys all trust from residents and demonstrates that there is no care taken in decision making on behalf of the local inhabitants No doubt the Council is of the opinion that the local populations views are irrelevant, to the point where they are completely ignored – no doubt things would be a lot easier if there were no residents!</p> <p>It has been shown time and again that the residents are strongly against this mutilation of Green Belt, Key Gaps and West Parley, so why do the councils insist on continuingly</p>					506		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
											<p>perusing this agenda. Please do what you are employed to do and act on behalf of your residents and take on board our views and requirements and remove this threat to our over 1000 year old village. Do not destroy West Parley.</p>							
498555	Mrs Della Edwards		CSPS2191	Policy FWP6							<p>I write to object to the core strategy plans with regard to the plan to build 220 houses at Dudsbury Heights, policy number FWP7 and 300 in the New Road field, policy number FWP6, at West Parley. Neither of these proposals I find to be Justified, Effective or Consistent with National Policy. I decline to submit these objections in the biased and deliberately incomprehensible format originally requested. The very nature of these proposals and the manner that they have been put forward to premature consultation is undemocratic and outside government policy. At no point have the people of West Parley been involved in the drawing up of these plans and indeed the publicly funded, council driven Parish Plan that 1000 residents contributed to has been ignored. This document was supposed to the driver for locally led shaping of our village and area. The green belt is not for cheap housing or to be sold to dig the Council out of a financial hole whenever it suits, despite what East Dorset's Alan Breakwell (ex-Chief Executive) claimed at a very public meeting in the council chambers at Furzehill. I quote "the houses will be built, we need the money". These green belt fields are key gaps with our neighbours in Bournemouth and to a lesser degree Ferndown. They fulfil the exact purpose the green belt policy was enacted for, they prevent urban sprawl. I see no exceptional circumstances for sacrificing this exceptional green belt on the altar of cheap housing estates. Parley Cross is already the busiest crossroads in Dorset and yet these proposals would massively increase the volume of cars on this road, a previous local plan warned against any further development until the road system could be improved. Under these proposals half the houses could be built before either link road was started, years of greater misery for not only residents of Parley but all the other commuters who currently use these roads. One of the link roads which would be taking heavy traffic would go right through a housing estate, a concern for safety surely, but then the wisdom of placing family housing beneath a busy flight path seems to have little concern for well-being or possible safety anyway, perhaps this must come secondary to the council when the temptation of large amounts of cash from builders is on the table. There can be few areas, if any, being asked to take on board a massive 32% increase in housing stock and to assimilate so many new people into a existing population in such a way as this proposal suggests. The well being of existing residents, who are tax payers and voters is not being taken into account. Residents here value our semi rural life and object most</p>		Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	My reasons are that I have been involved in fighting the use of this green belt for many years and have an excellent back catalogue of documents and evidence that I feel would be of great use and interest to the inspector. I feel it is necessary to provide the Inspector with all the relevant historical background to the attempts upon this greenbelt and the utter contempt that has been shown to the people and democratic process by the many twists and turns that EDDC have made over the years with regard to the RSS and now this Core Strategy cooked up in secret with Christchurch Borough Council without any local involvement not even our Parish Council.	506			

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>strongly to these attempts to wipe it out.</p> <p>No thought has been given to the wildlife that abounds here or the protected heathland East Dorset is so pleased to boast of, and take grants to maintain, but cares so little for in reality. That there would be hundreds more residents on its doorstep who will no doubt be tramping all over it is of no regard. Please do not think that other token offerings of accessible green space will prevent the SSSI's being abused. Lastly I have no doubt that this will go forward, despite massive opposition from the public, to an examination before a Government Inspector, even though the very information that you referred the public to was incorrect (PPS12). That you have totally ignored the Parish Plan, which used tax payers money to produce, and the fact that until recently East Dorset District Council found proposals with far fewer houses unacceptable (because it was on Green Belt) are two other reasons this strategy is premature and ill founded. I am sure that eventually this strategy will be consigned to the bin where it belongs but I for one would like to know how much of our money has been wasted on the same proposals again and again and will EDDC keep coming back with the same proposals in various formats in the attempt to get the land used until hell freezes over. What is it about this particular green belt? Perhaps a different type of inspection or investigation is required to answer that question. How many more hundreds of thousands of pounds will be spent before EDDC devote some of their time and our money to finding a more acceptable alternative solution. Or shall we do the whole thing again, say in three years!</p> <p>For the record I do wish to participate at the oral examination before the Government Inspector.</p> <p>My reasons are that I have been involved in fighting the use of this green belt for many years and have an excellent back catalogue of documents and evidence that I feel would be of great use and interest to the inspector. I feel it is necessary to provide the Inspector with all the relevant historical background to the attempts upon this greenbelt and the utter contempt that has been shown to the people and democratic process by the many twists and turns that EDDC have made over the years with regard to the RSS and now this Core Strategy cooked up in secret with Christchurch Borough Council without any local involvement not even our Parish Council.</p>						
506116	Mr and Mrs P and SJ Simpson		CSPS2203	Policy FWP6							<p>We would like to object to the proposed housing plans to build 520 houses on the Green Belt land at West Parley for the following reasons:</p> <p>1. This is a 32% increase in the current housing stock for this area and more than any other community is being asked to take making it an unsound and unsustainable proposal. The residents felt that 100 houses would be a realistic increase to the existing 1630 in the area. You have proposed 520 which is ridiculously high and to be built on green belt. As per the PPG2 policy, the whole idea of green belt land is to preserve the character of</p>				506		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>local areas, prevent them from becoming over developed and spoilt plus ensure they remain pleasant areas to live in.</p> <p>2. In the government green belt policy there is a general presumption against inappropriate development, unless very special circumstances can be demonstrated to show that the benefits of the development will outweigh the harm caused to the green belt. PPG2 also sets out a number of examples of what would constitute appropriate or inappropriate development in the green belt.</p> <p>According to PPG2, there are five stated purposes of including land within the green belt:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas • To prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another • To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment • To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns • To assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. <p>Once an area of land has been defined as green belt, opportunities and benefits include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Providing opportunities for access to the open countryside for the urban population • Providing opportunities for outdoor sport and outdoor recreation near urban areas • The retention of attractive landscapes and the enhancement of landscapes, near to where people live • Improvement of damaged and derelict land around towns • The securing of nature conservation interests • The retention of land in agricultural, forestry and related uses. <p>The proposed developments in policy FWP6 & FWP7 would contravene at least the first four listed reasons in section 1 and all the reasons in section 2 for which the areas in West Parley were designated as green belt. Your proposals are therefore, not legally compliant.</p> <p>3. Even with the proposed improvements to the road infrastructure at the Parley</p> <p>Traffic lights, the volume of additional traffic created by the new development would cause even more congestions than we have at present. If we had even one set of road works on any of the access roads leading up to this, the whole area would be grid locked. The proposed new link road from Christchurch Road to New Road runs right through the middle of the 300 houses in FWP6. This would be extremely dangerous for young families not to mention an undesirable place to live with the vast amounts of traffic that will pass through right next to their homes.</p> <p>4. There is no mention of how the demand for local nursery and school places</p> <p>Would be met and what catchments they would come under. Our local schools are already nearly full to capacity and, with the government limits on class sizes, where would the</p>						

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>additional children be placed? I don't see why the education of children of existing local residents should be threatened or compromised by even more demand and competition for local school places. As local government have also proposed 'traveller sites' in the Hurn, Ferndown and Verwood area, these children could also put increased demand on our schools. We feel that we are, to put it mildly, being dumped on from all angles with the types of development proposals local councillors wouldn't want on their own doorsteps.</p> <p>As we know, over development of an area normally leads to an eventual decline in the quality of living and standards maintained. This is not something we are willing to see happen to West Parley which is a an extremely pleasant area to live in, still has village status due to the green belt surrounding it and a good quality of life for the residents. This would be lost if you are allowed to over developed the area as per your proposals.</p> <p>To conclude, whilst we accept that a small development of 100 houses as proposed by the residents is needed, your proposal of 520 houses is ridiculous, unsustainable both for local facilities and the road infrastructure, a destruction of previously protected Green Belt and damaging to the local environment and character of the area that we live in.</p> <p>We hope that a more sensible and realistic approach is taken to any building development proposal approved for West Parley and that you listen carefully to what the local residents actually want.</p>						
508590	Mr Jamie Ball		CSPS2234	Policy FWP6							<p>I oppose your green belt housing proposals in West Parley on the Dudsbury Heights and New Road fields. Essentially the reasons I oppose your plans are as follows:</p> <p>1) Democracy. Fully 80% of residents are against housing on the scale that the District Council proposes (but would accept about 100 houses in sites along the Christchurch road, as West Parley's fair share) This is fully and factually shown in several surveys, including the very widely completed Parish Plan survey. So to inflict these plans on us is the very worst kind of top down planning, completely regardless of local wishes.</p> <p>2) This is being done by a Conservative Council, for goodness sake. Although the Conservative party and Government Ministers have consistently said that their policy is to have communities more involved and to stop top down planning being forced on them.</p> <p>3) The lack of infrastructure for these planned houses, particularly the roads. Our roads are quite inadequate as it is, never mind another few hundred cars being added to them. Parley Cross is over capacity now. There is no money in the local plans for improvements.</p> <p>4) Our Identity. The introduction of the green belts is widely seen as the most important piece of post WW II planning. The top reason given for the green belts was to stop urban sprawl – to stop communities from spreading into each other. The planning term used is the maintenance of what is called a Key Gap between town and</p>				506		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
											<p>villages. All the qualified town planners I have consulted see the two big West Parley fields in question as part of West Parley's Key Gap with Bournemouth.</p> <p>5) The plans under Policy FWP7 has the new link road coming out onto New Road right slap bang where our driveway is which is bound to make it extremely difficult for us to exit our property. Traffic congestion is already at breaking point along New road and peak times of the day and this will not improve with the addition of this new link road. This new link road is not due to be started until half of the houses are built. So until then, which may be years, Parley Cross will have to take hundreds more cars a day, but is already at over capacity.</p> <p>6) The plans under Policy FWP6 has a new link road which will undoubtedly become a cut through and become very dangerous for the new families that will be moving into this area and cause further congestion with traffic coming from the Ferndown direction trying to join New Road but further down nearer to our property. This new link road is not due to be started until half of the houses are built. So until then, which may be years, Parley Cross will have to take hundreds more cars a day, but is already at over capacity.</p> <p>7) The plans under Policy FWP6 for the high density housing will cause us a massive increase in noise and light pollution.</p> <p>8) The plans under Policy FWP6 for the high density and medium density housing will Obviously include a number of young families. There appears to be no plans anywhere for the provision of new schools or new school places. Where are these children going to go to school? I have directly seen how much of a problem this currently is, as only this month, my own Daughter did not receive her place for her catchment middle school!!!! How on earth will that improve once another 320 houses are built 100 meters from where I live????????</p> <p>9) The Policy FWP6 will cause a devaluation of my property, why should I have to suffer This shortfall due to something that is going to be imposed on me? My reason for moving to this area in the first place was for a location that had some rural areas nearby and when I moved here I gladly increased my affordability to accommodate this, this 'nearby rural area' is now going to be taken away from me under these plans and appears to be out of my control.</p> <p>10) I am concerned that the local wildlife regularly seen to use and inhabit the area of the Proposed Policy FWP6, namely pheasants, rabbits, buzzards, birds of prey, badgers and deer will all be pushed out/decimated. If these plans go ahead I, my neighbours and local friends and family will not be voting for any of you in the next District Council Elections in Spring 2015.</p>							
509299	Mr R Moore		CSPS2256	Policy FWP6							I feel I must write and let you know my opinion of your				506			

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>proposals for additional housing in West Parley. As I am sure you are aware, residents in West Parley recently took part in producing a Parish Plan. In it, we realised that some additional housing was needed and in consultation with residents we put forward several proposals. However, it appears that you have not even taken resident's opinions into consideration.</p> <p>You produced plans in 2010 which we were not in agreement with and you were made fully aware of this, yet now two years later you have discarded these plans and submitted others, which, for the residents of West Parley are even worse than the 2010 plans.</p> <p>It seems as if you are determined to wipe West Parley off the map and merge us totally with Bournemouth.</p> <p>The policy proposal FWP6 will totally destroy West Parley as it exists today. I hate to think of the consequences of 300 hundred homes being built on this site. In addition to the proposed unnecessary supermarket, a school and probably a church will also be required and obviously a new road layout. The housing will have to be very cheap too as not many people are going to want to live under the flight path of the ever expanding Bournemouth airport. If this goes ahead in this location you will be sentencing the new residents to a very poor quality of life and I speak from experience having previously lived under the flight path of a small, but growing provincial airport.</p> <p>The shops at Parley Cross are clearly struggling to make ends meet and you are now proposing to build an additional supermarket nearby. Is it your aim to take customers away from the supermarkets in Ferndown and cause them further hardship in these very hard economic times?</p> <p>The proposed new road layout is doomed from the start. The new link roads which even now are badly needed will soon be over capacity with the increase in housing. In a few years time it will be back to where we are now, hopelessly congested.</p> <p>And</p> <p>Whoever came up with the brainwave of not building the roads until half the houses have been built? The mind boggles as to who these experts were.</p> <p>It is blatantly obvious that not enough thought has been given to these proposals and I urge you to reject them and reconsider them in consultation with us – the residents of West Parley. After all we live here and know what we want and what is good for the area.</p>						
511953	Mr and Mrs Alan and Julie Ridout		CSPS2213	Policy FWP6							<p>I wish to object to the building of 220 houses on the FWP 7 and 300 on FWP 6 sites for the u/m reasons:</p> <p>(1) The Consultation process is unsatisfactory.</p> <p>(a) Government legislation requires you to consult fully with local communities before setting out proposals. EDDC planners have ignored this legislation.</p> <p>(b) West Parley has produced, after a lengthy consultation with residents, a well publicised Parish Plan, copies of which were sent to EDDC. In</p>				506		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>this Plan residents are overwhelmingly against having more than about 100 houses built in West Parley. This source of information has been ignored by EDDC planners.</p> <p>(c) EDDC have relied too much on the use of electronic communication to provide Information to residents for this consultation and assumed that all residents in West Parley have access to the internet. This is far from the case and most residents are extremely concerned about the proposals but are unable to find the information they need to consider the proposals effectively.</p> <p>(d) To build more than 100 houses in West Parley would create an unbroken Urban sprawl from Bournemouth to Ferndown and beyond. West Parley would lose its identity and become just another small part of a very large conurbation. Both of the proposed building sites constitute much valued green belt land which provides this break between the Bournemouth and Ferndown boundaries. This was the reason for introducing the Green Belt system many years ago.</p> <p>(d) This land brings the countryside into the village and with it many important And protected species of animals. Sightings of badgers, foxes, otters, deer, buzzards are frequently reported. This improves the quality of life of all residents who regularly use these fields through which official footpaths pass.</p> <p>(e) The 2 new roads proposed around the proposed building sites will be dangerous for children living in the new houses and will not ease the already stretched traffic system in West Parley. Traffic jams will be merely moved further down the main roads. 500 extra houses will bring up to 1000 extra cars all trying to get out of and into West Parley which is already ridiculously over crowded.</p> <p>(e) 520 extra houses in West Parley represents an increase in housing of about 32%. This is excessive and is far more than is proposed for the other East Dorset communities. Without the appropriate infrastructure of adequate school places, doctors, dentists, community centres etc there will be unacceptable pressure on existing provision.</p> <p>Site FWP 7</p> <p>(a) Dudsbury Rings is an important heritage site and this field is to closely connected to the site for the security of this important site to be protected.</p> <p>(b) In winter time and in times of heavy rain the slope of the field causes water to run down hill to flood the unmade and private road, Ridgeway, every time. With heavy traffic, servicing the shops at Parley Cross using Ridgeway every day, the road surface is severely eroded and flooded which makes it very unpleasant for residents who are also responsible for the upkeep of the road. With so much more concrete laid on the field due to the proposed buildings flooding would be even</p>						

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description				
											worse. Site FWP 6 (a) Yet another Supermarket in the area is not needed and will only bring in Much more traffic to bring chaos to the already crowded roads of West Parley. Sufficient supermarkets (Tesco, Asda, Sainsbury 2, Lidl) already exist within 3 mile radius of West Parley and 3 Tesco Express shops exist in a radius of 1 mile of Parley Cross. There is no demand for allotments, orchards etc. West Parley should not be sacrificed by planners' unrealistic dreams and an attempt at social engineering. I urge you to reconsider these proposals and to start talking to the people in West Parley Community who are entitled to have a say in the drawing up of proposals for any increase in housing in their village. Yours faithfully										
512007	Mr & Mrs Neil Hayward		CSPS2220	Policy FWP6							My wife and I find it inconceivable that after all the previous proposals that have been put forward for West Parley, you are now attempting, quite undemocratically, to railroad in policies FWP6 and FWP7 which completely ignore the West Parley Parish plan to which 1000 residents contributed. Not only will these policies exacerbate the current traffic problems at West Parley by increasing the amount of cars generated from the new housing, it will also destroy a huge area of Green Belt Land which currently acts as a Key Gap separating West Parley from Bournemouth. Building these houses and the new link road will destroy the prime countryside between Bournemouth and West Parley. Furthermore the proposed link road is partially being built on the floodplain of the River Stour, which after periods of prolonged rain reaches and covers the area where the link road will start from the New Road end. We are also opposed to the building of a new supermarket. As you are no doubt aware West Parley currently has a Tesco store which is quite adequate for the needs of the local population and there are at least 5 major supermarkets within a 5 mile radius of West Parley. Not only is a new store unnecessary, it will also attract additional traffic to an already saturated road network. Further more both the areas for housing in FWP7, and in particular FWP6 are approximately 1 mile from the end of the runway at Bournemouth Airport. Whilst I am sure that the majority of people who currently live at West Parley are used to the noise that the commercial and other jets make on take off and landing over this area I am sure that will not be the case for the residents of the 520 new houses you are proposing. Whilst we are not completely opposed to development at West Parley, we sincerely hope that your undemocratic policies FWP6 and FWP7 will be scrapped thus preventing the desecration and destruction of West Parley as we know it today.						506				
512134	Mrs		CSPS2224	Policy							I write to voice my objections to the large scale development				506						

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
	Anthea Scott			FWP6							<p>proposed at West Parley – both the 220 houses and new road planned for Dudsbury heights field near the old hill fort – and also the 300 houses, supermarket, shopping centre and link road scheduled to be built on the field at New Road – just south of Parley Cross traffic lights.</p> <p>This junction is already one of the busiest in Dorset, and to add a potential further 1000+ vehicles will make it gridlocked, even more dangerous and extremely harmful to health due to the increase in pollution. At certain times the traffic already backs northwards up New Road as far, if not further than the Porsche garage.</p> <p>The two link roads proposed for policy FWP6 travel straight through an area of “Higher Density” residential - and will be extremely dangerous to the residents, probably young families, who live there.</p> <p>In reality, these link roads will not be constructed to alleviate the congestion at the beginning of the development – they will most likely be built at the end – possibly years away!!</p> <p>In addition, all traffic heading Southwards through Parley Cross still has to travel over the New Road bridge – which is narrow and situated on a road with quite severe bends – so in reality the queues will just move further South.</p> <p>The trees on the South East side of Parley Cross traffic lights are protected – so any alteration to this junction which affects them, or their root system, will require permission.</p> <p>Development on such an enormous scale – increasing the housing stock of our ancient village by a third – will have a detrimental effect on the “Special Character” of West Parley and its residents – many of which have lived here for many years. We</p> <p>Currently enjoy a semi-rural way of life, suffer virtually no anti-social behaviour – and to build all over the green belt and make this junction even busier is just plain wrong.</p> <p>The green belt areas are the crucial lungs between semi-rural East Dorset and neighbouring Bournemouth – to remove this gap by developing these areas would create urban sprawl – and change for ever the village setting which all residents feel is so special about living in West Parley.</p> <p>The potential SANG (FWP7) spends a proportion of every year under water – such a high volume of development so near to the river can only serve to increase the flooding to this area.</p> <p>The area along the River Stour is inhabited by bats – which are protected species – how close is development allowed?</p> <p>The field to the South of Parley Cross traffic lights is frequently used for livestock – is it permitted to build on farm land?</p> <p>Why has West Parley been given such a large proportion of houses to build in relation to its size? Why should we be forced to spoil for ever the entrance to our beautiful village – when it is gone – its gone – we will never again be able to drive home and heave a sigh of relief at leaving the congested over-development behind, and view our green open spaces with joy!!</p>						

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
535509	Mrs S Durant		CSPS2205	Policy FWP6							<p>I am writing with regard to the proposed building plans for West Parley Village.</p> <p>I do not believe that the proposed plans are positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy.</p> <p>Policy FWP6 and FWP7 both involve building extensively on Green Belt land, Green belt land is designated as such for a purpose – it has been identified as valuable open green space which should be left in that condition and not built upon. There is no point in identifying land that should not be built on if you then build on it. This undermines the whole notion of designating land as green belt and means that all other green belt land is not safe from development.</p> <p>While it is clear that the traffic situation at Parley Crossroads is extremely unsatisfactory at the moment it is not clear that building hundreds of additional houses and other buildings in the vicinity is going to alleviate this situation, notwithstanding the changes being proposed at the crossroads itself. The huge number of extra houses plus shops and community buildings will generate a huge number of extra traffic movements. It is possible that the proposed changes to the crossroads and the building of the new link roads will not be sufficient to mitigate the effects of the extra traffic. If this is the case the capacity of the crossroads could be exceeded in a very short time, as happened the last time changes were made to the crossroads.</p> <p>The proposed plans would mean an increase of 32% in the West Parley housing stock – a very large amount and much more than the proposed increase in other areas. There appears to be very little in the way of extra facilities to serve the extra population. There is possible provision for a church for the Plymouth Brethren (a minority religion) but no school or GP surgery.</p> <p>There is substantial disagreement with the proposed developments among the residents of West Parley, but the general feeling is that they are a “fait accompli”.</p>					506		
360082	Mr and Mrs K Healy		CSPS2496	Policy FWP6	No		No	No	No	No	<p>In Background Paper 2, para 2.78, East Dorset District chooses to follow the following principles for upholding the Green Belt:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To prevent neighboring towns from merging into one another and • To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas (or in the words of East Dorset, to maintain an area of open land around the conurbation). <p>We feel that in the choice of urban extension in FWP6, they ignore their own reasons for preserving the Green Belt.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This Green Belt to the east of New Road has such an important function for East Dorset District. The green fields separate it from Bournemouth, and in combination with the open sweep of the hill to the west of New Road, it proclaims East Dorset District to be a rural area. It is very positively separated from Bournemouth. Just leaving the Stour floodplain will not have the same effect • Paragraph 10.1 recognises that West Parley is a separate 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We would like to see a great reduction in housing numbers, from 320 to about 100. • No store, village hall or community centre is necessary as these already exist • With much fewer houses will it be necessary to alter the junction at Parley Cross Roads? The existing junction works quite efficiently. 	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination			506		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>settlement from Ferndown. According to the 2001 census figures on the 'dorsetforyou' website, the total residents of West Parley were 3,532 and the number of properties 1570, we believe there has been little change since that census. The proposed total new dwellings in FWP6 & 7 total 520. This represents an increase of 33%, far too many for the existing residents to absorb. It will have such a negative impact on the existing community. In the NPPF paragraph 69: "The planning system can play an important role in facilitating social interaction and creating healthy, inclusive communities.' These urban extensions will have the opposite effect.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Paragraph 10.2 recognises the tremendous growth around Ferndown which has seen the open heathland between West Parley and Ferndown disappear. Despite this, the residents of West Parley see themselves as forming a separate and distinct settlement with their own Parish Council. Parts of the settlement are very old and of course there is the ancient fort on Dudsbury. • Over time the promenade of local shops has given way to mainly home improvement stores. Within the last couple of years a general store has re-opened. The settlement has a substantial Memorial Hall and a Sports Club, both of which are set in substantial open recreational space. A short way up New Road is a well supported church with a large church hall. • For this reason there is no logic in using valuable Green Belt land to provide what the village already has in abundance. The proposed food store and recreational facilities are not required, possibly an underpass to the facilities that exist may be useful. We can see no reason for the proposed estate to have it's own store and area for community use. In combination with the proposed 320 new homes there is a real threat of the residents of the proposed new estate becoming segregated. The number of new homes must be considerably reduced to protect the settlement from a schism between new and existing residents. • A large developed expanse may lead to a problem with surface water run-off. SUDS may help to alleviate this problem, though this is another example of a potential strain on the ability of the ecosystem to function efficiently in flood control. The cost of supporting the ecosystem may damage the ability of the planners to achieve the level of affordable homes they require. If too much surface water run off hits the Stour, then this could threaten the urban areas further down stream. NPPF paragraph 103, development should not impact on flood risk and increase it elsewhere. • In the Sustainability Appraisal it was considered that the new through road would reduce pollution by reducing congestion. Pollution may be reduced at Parley Cross but for the residents on the proposed estate, they will enjoy neither tranquility or a pollution free atmosphere as they will be surrounded by roads. • The SA marks the impact on historic buildings as zero. Surely this enormous development would have a detrimental impact on the old Parley Church and houses. 						

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description		
											<p>• We feel that the dismissal of all the objections to this site in the Issues and Options indicates that this decision was already taken subject to the Sustainability Appraisal and ecological surveys.</p> <p>It will be vital to carry out ecological surveys and flood risk assessments before any development takes place.</p> <p>For a more detailed and statistical response, please see Issues and Options, December 2010, submitted by Janet Healy, Paul Timberlake and Kevin Healy, policy FWP4 the land to the east of New Road.</p>								
489582	Mr John Swift		CSPS2337	Policy FWP6							<p>I wish to register my strong objection to the proposal for more housing than the number already rejected, for the reasons listed below.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposal is to build in the 'green belt' area that we have left. Even the Government has back-pedalled on this and insists on Councils doing their utmost to find 'brown field sites'. Building in any green belt area is a slippery slope towards having a complete disregard for the term. If, indeed, it really doesn't mean anything then we should do away with calling it green belt which at least would be a lot more honest. 2. West Parley residents had already completed a survey, re. Housing proposals in the area, with the overwhelming majority objecting to the number of houses then proposed. Completely ignoring that survey Councillors then issued these new proposals which include a huge increase in the number of houses over that already rejected. This is very confusing and I am sure a lot of people find it difficult to understand the reasoning involved. Maybe this is by design. 3. So far in this plan all I have seen is, more houses, more people, more roads, more cars, more Supermarkets. Where are the Doctors, Dentists, Fire Stations, Clinics, Police etc. to cope with this? Penny's Hill Practice (Doctors Surgery) is already quite appalling in the time it takes to see your Doctor (quite often two weeks). Glenmoor Road Surgery is currently doing all it can to dissuade new patients from joining as it does not wish to end up like Penny's Hill, which it is fast doing. 4. Please, please do not say that you are including 'affordable housing'. In the current climate, along with the comparatively low wage level in this area, 'affordable housing' would have to be property selling for under £100,000. Even then most people would be unlikely to obtain a mortgage. If I am wrong in this then please publish the number and cost of these 'affordable houses' along with the mortgage providers that are willing to provide mortgages to the young first time buyers you say you are trying to attract 5. Finally, please do not, just for political reasons, keep toeing the 'Official Government Line'. Of course there is an argument for more housing, more roads, more infrastructure etc. But there always will be. Unless someone, somewhere takes a stand. We cannot keep on building and expanding indefinitely as, by definition, the whole of the country would eventually be concreted over. We need a change of Policy. Please help by rejecting this latest build, build, build Government dictate by 					506			

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											respecting the wishes of the people that a) you have been elected to represent and b) live in the area concerned.						
489898	Mrs Elizabeth Daw		CSPS2395	Policy FWP6							<p>I have lived in West Parley for 32 years and found it a very pleasant place to live. I would like to make a few observations about the proposed changes to the area. Parley required more houses to accommodate a growing population. Young people require places to live and the area requires a mix of young people with families as well as the elderly population we have at present, Unfortunately in recent years West Parley has become a community of NIMBY's.</p> <p>I would be against vast housing estates with high density housing and would not want any encroachment on our precious green belt. Infrastructure will be required – roads etc. before any houses are contemplated. The two new relief roads proposed will certainly be needed to relieve pressure on Parley Cross traffic.</p> <p>We need shops that people can go into and a supermarket would bring convenience and trade to the area. We do not need any more take-aways, kitchen & bathroom showrooms, hairdressers and beauty shops.</p> <p>People should appreciate the convenience of living so near to our International Airport yet w have constant complaints about aircraft noise.</p> <p>We need to get rid of the NIMBY attitude – the “new brooms” who want to change things – spending large amounts of ratepayers money on “improvement projects” and allow West Parley to be the peaceful place it used to be.</p> <p>The historic church is the only church in the area with any character but unfortunately the population has moved away from it over the years. A new cemetery would, however, be worthwhile so that local people can be laid to rest where they have lived instead of being interred in another town with which they have no connection.</p>				506		
490866	Mr and Mrs D Wright		CSPS2388	Policy FWP6							<p>I am writing this letter rather than the form you issued as I do not understand the jargon you use. It would be helpful if you used everyday language as other professions now do and doubtless as you would wish your doctor, dentist or solicitor to speak to you.</p> <p>Frankly I am disgusted by the lack of notice taken of the wishes of local residents in this very extensive scheme which amounts to top down planning. These schemes FWP6 & 7 will, if passed, completely alter the nature of the village in which we now live and I have lived in for decades. This area is a key gap between Bournemouth and West Parley designed to prevent urban sprawl. We were assured that the green belt was inviolate but now our present councillors seem to feel free to impose their own arrogant ambitions regardless of the community's wishes they pretend to represent. Is it any wonder that so few vote at elections?</p> <p>My objections are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The infrastructure is insufficient to support such a vast housing increase (schools, approach roads etc.). • We do not need another supermarket or church. What planet do these planners live on? 				506		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • These schemes are out of proportion with what is proposed for other areas. • I do not trust the authorities to stop with these schemes; we were told the road diversion at the west of the airport was only for safety and not to extend the runway for larger plans. The authorities lied over this so why not again? <p>I do hope the views of the local population will be respected; by this I do not mean the wider East Dorset region who remain unaffected by the plans. With my lack of trust in the integrity of the planners I suspect that a survey of the wider area will be cited to falsify the claims that the schemes are supported by 90% of the population.</p> <p>I can only hope that local authorities are not in a close relationship with large developers who stand to gain so much from the schemes. I am not opposed to any new residential building however, such as at the former Coppins Nursery or Dormy Hotel sites. The latter did seem to have a very good plan which for some reason was turned down.</p>						
491252	Mrs Margaret Wareham		CSPS2502	Policy FWP6							<p>Regarding the proposals for West Parley it would lose its identity and be come just another small part of a very large conurbation.as both proposed building sites are on green belt which provides the break between Bournemouth and Ferndown boundaries.</p> <p>This land brings the countryside into the village and we have many protected species of animals. This improves the quality of life for all residents who regularly use the the fields and official footpaths.</p> <p>The new roads will not ease the traffic jams it will just be moved down the road and we do not have the infrastructure for more houses.</p> <p>Dudsbury rings is an important heritage site and needs to be protected.</p> <p>In winter and when there is heavy rain the slopes in the field cause water to rundown hill to flood the unmade road the Ridgeway the road surface is severely eroded and floods which makes it very unpleasant. With so much more concrete laid on the fields flooding would be even worst.</p> <p>So I urge you to reconsider the proposals for West Parley.</p>				506		
491272	Mr and Mrs D Steel		CSPS2314	Policy FWP6							<p>I am writing in response to the Core Strategy Pre-submission Consultation. I refer to the three policies identified above and would like to express my concerns that these policies are neither effective nor sound.</p> <p>FWP6 and FWP7</p> <p>The number of houses identified as being built appears to increase the village size by more than 30%. This does not sound like a balanced increase, or in keeping with national requirements. The needs of any proposed residents (with the exception of more large scale retail) are not identified, such as schooling. This does not seem to have been considered in the planning, and I assume that, if it is required as an afterthought, may then be built on a further green field space!</p> <p>The proposed building areas are on current agricultural and green belt areas that provide a break with the Bournemouth conurbation. To remove these areas for housing erodes a</p>				506		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>resource that can never be recovered.</p> <p>Travel</p> <p>As for travel considerations on page 109 of the Core Strategy Pre-Submission April 2012 Christchurch and East Dorset, section 10.13 identifies that there are “severe problems” with Ferndown Town Centre with the sheer volume of through traffic, and section 10.14 highlights from the Census 2001 statistics that 85% of local commuters were car drivers or passengers. These 2 factors would indicate a heavy burden on the local road infrastructure. They do refer to a “regular and frequent bus service”, however, since living in West Parley since 2001 and working in Christchurch, there has never been a bus service to provide an alternative to car transport based on scheduling and cost.</p> <p>In section 10.10 it identifies that residents make use of Bournemouth and Poole Hospitals but again there is no suitable bus routes from Ferndown to Bournemouth Hospital without travelling into Bournemouth and back out which is not suitable for patients. I appreciate that the local planning authorities cannot mandate bus routes, but they have to consider the impacts of no routes, or where routes are remove. At the moment the bus routes are ideal for those wishing to commute to Bournemouth and Poole town centres which therefore implies that West Parley is a being sucked into the town of Bournemouth.</p> <p>The two identified relief roads to remove congestion at Parley Cross will make no difference to the commute times and when problems occur on the A338 Spur road cause tailbacks stretching to the northern boundary of the village.</p> <p>Policy FWP5</p> <p>The provision of a large retail complex to rejuvenate the West Parley village will be as successful as that within the central Ferndown. Currently the centre of Ferndown is dominated by Estate Agents and banks, and is not an ideal shopping experience. Tesco has reduced the viability of other retail opportunities.</p> <p>There is no specific identification of what shops and services are to be provided or there viability. Has analysis been made as to how they will compete against those provided by Castle Point which is further along the road (but only accessible by car)?</p> <p>I provide the concerns above to be included in your consultation phase of the Core Strategy Consultation phase.</p>						
497944	Mrs G Salway		CSPS2402	Policy FWP6							<p>I wish to express the following points regarding the FWP6 and FWP7 relating to the proposal to build 520 houses in West Parley. We were not consulted regarding these new plans and the whole inference is that everything is planned and ready to go, with Council Officials openly saying when all these houses are built and not if they are built. Personally I have written and completed forms at least three times objecting to similar proposals and I feel that no notice is being taken of our views and our rights to be listened to without prejudice have been totally ignored.</p> <p>I am writing yet again to express my concern about the</p>				506		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
											<p>number of houses proposed for West Parley and to say again that we would accept about 100 new houses being built, as I do appreciate the need for more housing locally, but not to an increase of 520 houses (with no doubt more later) which would be an increase of 325 OF THE West Parley housing stock.</p> <p>Please stop and think what this means.</p> <p>I wish to object to the proposals outlined in FWP6 and FWP7 on the following grounds:-</p> <p>1) The Green Belt land would be lost forever. The fields are the "Key Gaps" between Bournemouth and West Parley and Ferndown; they are the only factor which stops the wholesale spread of Bournemouth, and without the fields West Parley and Ferndown would be joined to Bournemouth and the rights and benefits of being under Dorset County Council would disappear forever.</p> <p>2) The fact that no new road system will be introduced or even considered until half the proposed houses have been built would mean that 260 houses will have been built before any action can be taken to alleviate the traffic problems which will inevitably have increased by then. Presumably if the houses are not selling, - with the present economic problems the whole future is very uncertain, - the developers will cut back on their building and the infrastructure will never be built; presumably this will also be true for the remainder of the proposed infrastructure – Surgery, Clinic etc.</p> <p>3) The proposed road through the middle of FWP6 would run close to or through areas with young children, which would be extremely dangerous. Similarly the proposal to build a road from Christchurch Road to New road through, or adjacent to, the development in FWP7 is full of danger.</p> <p>4) The land in FWP7 is on a hill (which is why it was chosen for the Dudsbury Ironage fort) and as such has several springs which run down the hillside in wet weather, and the proposed developments would encourage subsidence and the possibility of flooding which would be detrimental to the whole of West Parley, particularly to the area around Ridgeway and behind the present shops.</p> <p>West Parley was mentioned in the Doomsday Book, it has a character and rural atmosphere that would be ruined forever by the proposed developments. We do care what happens to West Parley. Please review and reconsider the current proposals and take the wishes of the current residents into consideration before it is to late.</p>							
498008	Mr John Salway		CSPS2404	Policy FWP6							<p>It is noticeable that there is now a huge increase, 32%, in the proposed housing development in the West Parley area. Interestingly housing proposal policy FWP6 omits the additional future houses that were first shown on the East Dorset District Council's initial submission. No doubt these will be driven through by the councils officials once housing in FWP7 and FWP6 is processed with the old dishonest planning comment, "We are only infilling".</p> <p>FWP7 the proposed housing (220) on the Dudsbury fields will over-shadow West Parley and effectively wipes out this green</p>				506			

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>belt area. Springs run under the Dudsbury fields and without adequate drainage systems for this, subsidence in properties below this new projected FWP7 housing will occur.</p> <p>FWP6 current proposed houses (300) and supermarket, and obvious future additional houses, effectively removes this green belt area. FWP6 and FWP7 green belts, formed a Key Gap with Bournemouth, and maintained West Parley's historic village status. Why destroy a designated green belt area and make West Parley village part of a large conurbation? West Parley's roads are already congested and these proposals, a large increase in housing and population, can only make a bad situation worse. The two proposed link roads shown in FWP7 and FWP6, when they are built, "part way through this development"?, will do nothing to ease this. Link main roads running through housing estates are very dangerous for young families. My wife and myself have had to register in Kinson for a Doctor and West Moors for a Dentist. Where is the proposed increase in facilities for these new residents (Doctors, Dentists, Clinics etc.)? I am supposed to live in a democracy and this has once again proved to me not to be the case. The East Dorset District Councils officials have virtually ignored the West Parley's residents wishes, and they have also virtually ignored the West Parley's Parish Councillors' Parish Plan. They have shown by their consultation formats that they are determined to drive policies FWP7 and FWP6 through by whatever means possible.</p> <p>Once proposals FWP7 and FWP6 are being carried out the Green Belt is effectively lost and West Parley adjoins Bournemouth and should come under its control. As part of a large conurbation there is no need to duplicate paid council posts and cost savings can be made. As the East Dorset District Council officials have virtually ignored the West Parley's Parish councillors Plan, why waste council tax on these district Council posts and administration? These proposals by the paid District Council officials, have I believe, been made as unfriendly and as difficult as possible for the West Parley residents to respond, as follows:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. West Parley Residents Association held a written Poll of residents and they overwhelmingly opposed the proposals in FWP7 and FWP6m but agreed to a limited number of infill new houses This was submitted to the East Dorset Councils officials and ignored. 2. First official consultation document 4-10-2010 to 24-12-2010. Deliberately used unfriendly. Each objection to be submitted on a separate form by only one person. Finally I obtained these forms, but it proved necessary to have an aggressive argument with a council official before these were reluctantly supplied. The East Dorset District Council exhibition at the West Parley Memorial hall then supplied a more condensed consultation form, but none of the original official ones. The published official results were interesting when compared to the original Parley Residents Association figures. I wonder how these two official Consultation documents were interpreted? 						

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>3. Second official consultation document, "noticeable how Ferndown residents were now included". They outnumber West Parley residents by two to one, but these proposals would have little effect on them apart from traffic congestion.</p> <p>4. We have now yet another "so called used friendly consultation Document". We have been informed by our Parish Councillors that the East Dorset District Council have agreed that ordinary written letters are acceptable instead of the official forms and format. After consultation procedures details in points 1, 2, and 3 above I now await to see how acceptable a written letter will be, and these results will be interpreted?</p>						
500570	Mr J.D Head		CSPS2313	Policy FWP6							<p>I wish to comment on the plans that the District Council have put forward for the development in West Parley.</p> <p>POLICY FWP6</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ⊘ Not justified, no credible evidence has been produced to show that this increase in housing is required to be made in West Parley on green belt land ⊘ Against national planning policy. New Road field is a) green belt, b) grade 2 farm land. Under the new planning policy neither land can be used for development unless there is a proven local need. As I have said above no local need exists in West Parley. ⊘ The green belt in FWP7 and FWP6 form part of the important "key gap" with Bournemouth, this is why they were green belt in the first place. Removing them and then just adding a few bits here and there to compensate does not comply with the rules regarding this matter. ⊘ The proposed 3,000 sq metre supermarket is far bigger than would be required by a community the size of West Parley needs even after the 500 houses are built. This means it is effectively an out of town supermarket which is against government policy. <p>There are already a large number of supermarkets within a very small radius with a Morrisons proposed for Christchurch and permission has already been granted for a large Tesco at Kinson, just across the river. With the growth in internet shopping and the growing public distaste for the corporate greed of the large supermarket chains this will in the long term be a "white elephant" and in the short term will kill off the remaining small shops in the area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ⊘ If the developer has to build 50% affordable homes and hand them over at cost price, plus build roads, and pay all the other contributions expected of him this development as it stands is not viable. It is clear to me in view of this and the size of the supermarket proposed the real number of houses will be need to be much higher. This has all the appearance of a chance to breach the "green belt" by the District Council on behalf of the developers, so once it has been allowed they will just keep on cramming properties in until they can do no more. Double, treble or even more than the 500 that is being suggested now <p>This means as it stands the policy is not effective ie not deliverable & not able to be monitored.</p>				506		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>⊞ The road layout proposed I think has to be a joke! It will not make one jot of difference to the total journey times going north, south east or west. The proposed road in FWP6 goes through the middle of the new estate. This will be highly dangerous for all the young families in the affordable housing. A series of junctions are proposed, these will cause the traffic to speed up and slow down creating more pollution and increasing the fuel consumption of the vehicles involved, especially HGV's using this road. The extra junctions on New Rd South will just add to the congestion south of Parley Cross not ease it. The congestion at the fire station traffic lights in Ferndown will increase, the length of wait is already longer than at Parley Cross, so a major alteration involving demolition of surrounding buildings will be needed here at some point to ease the traffic flow, The 500 extra houses will create a minimum of 1000 Extra car movements per day. (One car per household going in and out once a day). These new roads were described to me by the Council Officer at the public display that was held in Parley as "not a rat run". If it is not a "rat run" what is it?</p> <p>This extra traffic will create the need for not only junction improvements at the north of New Road, but at the south and at both ends of Christchurch Rd. It will also mean local traffic trying to access the existing parade of shops will have to travel ½ a mile to go 100 yards due to the banning of left and right turns at Parley Cross.</p> <p>⊞ Above all else the residents and Parish Council have been totally ignored in this matter. The Parish Plan contributed to by the majority of the residents said that Parley could take about 100 extra home scattered around in small groups and as infill development. There was no asking for a supermarket or for that matter a Plymouth Brethren chapel. Road improvements were asked for but what is proposed will not be road improvements as I have outlined above. As 50% of the houses can be built before the new roads are built congestion will only get worse before it gets better if at all. No one not even the local district councillors knew about these plans until they were published. This is "top down" planning which is against government policy</p>						
500906	Mr and Mrs Scholes		CSPS2369	Policy FWP6							<p>We are writing to you as we wish to object to the building of the following: FWP 7 220 houses Dudsbury Rings is an important heritage site and building close to it will compromise the safety of it for future generations. Ridgeway gets flooded in winter due to the slope of the proposed site ... Tarmac will only make matters worse. FWP 6 300 houses WE DO NOT NEED ANOTHER SUPERMARKET. We have 4 major supermarkets in a radius of 3 miles plus express outlets. The reasons we are objecting are as follows: We eel the consultation process is not satisfactory • Legislation requires full consultation with local communities which has been ignored by EDDC planner</p>				506		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
											<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A full and considered consultation with residents produced a parish plan which was sent to EDDC and as resident we clearly told them that we were strongly against any more than a total of 2100 houses in West Parley. This has been ignored. • Reliance on electronic communication is flawed. It has been assumed that most resident in west parley communicate by email and have access to the internet. We have a large elderly population many of whom quite possibly are not connected to the internet. I am sure many of these residents are very concerned by the proposals. • The proposals would mean that there would be no green belt and green space separating us from the urban sprawl of Bournemouth. We moved here to live in a semi rural more open and green environment. We pay higher council tax for this pleasure ... why should we if we just become an extension of the Bournemouth conurbation. West Parley will lose its identity. WE NEED THE GREEN BELT. PLEASE KEEP THE GREEN BELT. We should be protecting the wildlife as we have protected species in the locality; this is not only important for the environment but for our quality of life also. WE DO NOT WANT MORE SHOPPING. If you want to build please build us a more modern village hall. • Traffic congestion is already bad enough at peak times. The proposed new roads will not help and extra housing means extra traffic. • A 32% (520) increase in housing which you propose for West Parley is excessive and out of proportion to other parishes. We don't have the infrastructure for such an increase. <p>PLEASE, please, please reconsider. The West Parley community is entitled to their say. Listen to us. We have made our thoughts very clear to the West Parley Parish Council and residents association.</p> <p>DON'T MAKE US AN EXTENSION OF BOURNEMOUTH. KEEP THE GREEN BELT. Honour the land and the wildlife. Please don't sacrifice the wellbeing of current residents.</p>							
501502	Mr Michael Wareham										<p>Regarding the proposals for West Parley it would lose its identity and become just another small part of a very large conurbation. As both proposed building sites are on green belt which provides the break between Bournemouth and Ferndown boundaries.</p> <p>This land brings the countryside into the village and we have many protected species of animals. This improves the quality of life for all residents who regularly use the fields and official footpaths.</p> <p>The new roads will not ease the traffic jams it will just be moved down the road and we do not have the infrastructure for more houses.</p> <p>Dudsbury Rings is an important heritage site and needs to be protected.</p> <p>In winter and when there is heavy rain the slopes in the field cause water to run down hill to flood the unmade road the Ridgeway the road surface is severely eroded and floods which makes it very unpleasant. With so much more concrete</p>					506		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
											laid on the fields flooding would be even worst. As we have heard on the news about floods in many villages due to heavy rain. So I urge you to reconsider the proposals for Dudsbury Rings West Parley.							
659520	Mrs Julie Ridout		CSPS2217	Policy FWP6							<p>I wish to object to the building of 220 houses on the FWP 7 and 300 on FWP 6 sites for the u/m reasons:</p> <p>(1) The Consultation process is unsatisfactory.</p> <p>(a) Government legislation requires you to consult fully with local communities before setting out proposals. EDDC planners have ignored this legislation.</p> <p>(b) West Parley has produced, after a lengthy consultation with residents, a well publicised Parish Plan, copies of which were sent to EDDC. In this Plan residents are overwhelmingly against having more than about 100 houses built in West Parley. This source of information has been ignored by EDDC planners.</p> <p>(c) EDDC have relied too much on the use of electronic communication to provide information to residents for this consultation and assumed that all residents in West Parley have access to the internet. This is far from the case and most residents are extremely concerned about the proposals but are unable to find the information they need to consider the proposals effectively.</p> <p>(d) To build more than 100 houses in West Parley would create an unbroken Urban sprawl from Bournemouth to Ferndown and beyond. West Parley would lose its identity and become just another small part of a very large conurbation. Both of the proposed building sites constitute much valued green belt land which provides this break between the Bournemouth and Ferndown boundaries. This was the reason for introducing the Green Belt system many years ago.</p> <p>(d) This land brings the countryside into the village and with it many important And protected species of animals. Sightings of badgers, foxes, otters, deer, buzzards are frequently reported. This improves the quality of life of all residents who regularly use these fields through which official footpaths pass.</p> <p>(e) The 2 new roads proposed around the proposed building sites will be dangerous for children living in the new houses and will not ease the already stretched traffic system in West Parley. Traffic jams will be merely moved further down the main roads. 500 extra houses will bring up to 1000 extra cars all trying to get out of and into West Parley which is already ridiculously over crowded.</p> <p>(e) 520 extra houses in West Parley represents an increase in housing of about 32%. This is excessive and is far more than is proposed for the other East Dorset communities. Without the appropriate infrastructure of adequate school places, doctors, dentists,</p>				506			

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>community centres etc there will be unacceptable pressure on existing provision.</p> <p>Site FWP 7</p> <p>(a) Dudsbury Rings is an important heritage site and this field is to closely connected to the site for the security of this important site to be protected.</p> <p>(b) In winter time and in times of heavy rain the slope of the field causes water to run down hill to flood the unmade and private road, Ridgeway, every time. With heavy traffic, servicing the shops at Parley Cross using Ridgeway every day, the road surface is severely eroded and flooded which makes it very unpleasant for residents who are also responsible for the upkeep of the road. With so much more concrete laid on the field due to the proposed buildings flooding would be even worse.</p> <p>Site FWP 6</p> <p>(a) Yet another Supermarket in the area is not needed and will only bring in Much more traffic to bring chaos to the already crowded roads of West Parley. Sufficient supermarkets (Tesco, Asda, Sainsbury 2, Lidl) already exist within 3 mile radius of West Parley and 3 Tesco Express shops exist in a radius of 1 mile of Parley Cross. There is no demand for allotments, orchards etc.</p> <p>West Parley should not be sacrificed by planners' unrealistic dreams and an attempt at social engineering. I urge you to reconsider these proposals and to start talking to the people in West Parley Community who are entitled to have a say in the drawing up of proposals for any increase in housing in their village.</p> <p>Yours faithfully</p>						
659580	J S & P W Torok		CSPS2276	Policy FWP6							<p>I object to the proposed large scale development at Parley Cross and Dudsbury Heights. The reason being that the volume of traffic is overwhelming already without any more. This is a green belt area but how can we protect our environment when this is taken away from us?</p> <p>When we expressed our opinions regarding the plan, The District Council ignored them.</p> <p>I hope our opinion will be considered and you reconsider this large scale building development plan.</p>				506		
360116	Mr A G King		CSPS2575	Policy FWP6							<p>I wish to place my concerns about the planning proposals for West Parley on record. In writing I am mindful of pages 220 of the Core Strategy Document and 57 of the National Policy Framework Document, plus the now superseded Government Document PPS12.</p> <p>I am a resident of Church Lane, West Parley and was attracted to the area due to its separate identity from Bournemouth and to a lesser extent the remainder of Ferndown. This separation is achieved by the open spaces that exist between West Parley and the rest of the conurbation. If building is allowed on these vital open spaces West Parley will lose its character and the conurbation will</p>				506		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>become yet more dense and overbuilt. There are presently a number of these Green Lungs in the West Parley area and they all appear to be under threat. A green belt has been in force in this area for many years but it now seems that at the very time its protection is needed it is being treated as a mere inconvenience.</p> <p>The planning proposals for West Parley would increase the population of the area by nearly a third which is a disproportionate part of the burden expected of the conurbation fringe. Increases in housing equals increases in traffic and the capacity of New Road is already near its maximum. The development on Dudsbury Heights (FWP7) has the advantage of being hidden from general view however 220 houses seems an enormous development whilst 300 houses on the New Road site (FWP6) will just turn the place into a town.</p> <p>I am mindful that there has been considerable "consultation" on this matter but it is becoming apparent that this is no more than window dressing. Proposal FWP6 and FWP7 are far more extensive than previously indicated and appear to have been foisted upon the area by local government with scant regard for local feeling. The Parish Council has genuinely consulted residents and the Parish Plan is a worthy document which I urgently ask the East Dorset District Council to fully respect when making decisions which will affect this community.</p>						
503019	Mr David Schofield		CSPS2367	Policy FWP6							<p>We wish to object to the scale and position of the proposed housing development for West Parley, in particular Policy FWP&, the proposal to build 220 or so houses in the Dudsbury Heights green belt and also FWP6 to build 300 houses and a shopping centre in the New Road field. We were not consulted about the changes from the 2010 plan. The village can take some houses but to overload us in this way is just too much. It is essential that we keep our green belt and key gaps with Bournemouth. The threat to the heathland is of major concern and new open spaces will not distract people away from it.</p> <p>The policies are not sound in that they were adapted in response to initial concerns about the infrastructure being able to cope. The answer to which appears to be to change the proposal without proper consultation and propose building more houses to pay for the infrastructure, twisted logic to say the least.</p> <p>We do not believe it is consistent with National Policy which prevents building on the green belt except in exceptional circumstances. We believe this is not the case.</p> <p>We would accept 100 houses or so as ribbon development along main roads.</p>				506		
503040	Mrs Kathleen Schofield		CSPS2378	Policy FWP6							<p>We wish to object to the scale and position of the proposed housing development for West Parley, in particular Policy FWP&, the proposal to build 220 or so houses in the Dudsbury Heights green belt and also FWP6 to build 300 houses and a shopping centre in the New Road field. We were not consulted about the changes from the 2010 plan.</p>				506		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>The village can take some houses but to overload us in this way is just too much. It is essential that we keep our green belt and key gaps with Bournemouth. The threat to the heathland is of major concern and new open spaces will not distract people away from it.</p> <p>The policies are not sound in that they were adapted in response to initial concerns about the infrastructure being able to cope. The answer to which appears to be to change the proposal without proper consultation and propose building more houses to pay for the infrastructure, twisted logic to say the least.</p> <p>We do not believe it is consistent with National Policy which prevents building on the green belt except in exceptional circumstances. We believe this is not the case.</p>						
503395	Mr Ian Davis		CSPS2317	Policy FWP6	No		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	<p>Policy FWP6 – East of New Road, West Parley. This plan is considered Unsound, in that it is neither Consistent with National Policy, Justified, Effective or Deliverable.</p> <p>N.P.P.F. 155 Please refer to the previous text between the asterisks, but as before, these policies have been consistently ignored by EDDC, with little or no consideration for what the majority of residents would like in the village.</p> <p>The district planners have mistakenly treated Ferndown and West Parley as one community, yes I agree with some things for example, roads, rubbish and brown bin collections etc. However, West Parley, with a current housing stock of approx. 1600 ish homes, is separate constitutionally from Ferndown, having its own boundaries, own council, and in 2015 a separate M.P.</p> <p>We have All the elements of a self contained village, starting with a vibrant sense of community, living within the residents, we have more than a 100 volunteers that do countless jobs within the village, we have two churches, four pubs, a village hall, a sports ground and a club house, many small shops and two Tesco Express supermarkets, several livery businesses and one first school.</p> <p>West Parley has a long history, going back through the Domesday Book, a Saxon Church and an Iron Age Hill Fort, over 2150 years old, formed and fortified before the birth of Jesus Christ.</p> <p>Ferndown is totally different, being a post war dormitory town. For the planners to suggest a further 520 homes in West Parley, in FWP6 and FWP7, this represents a huge 32% increase in housing stock to 2150. This would create an average of 800 more vehicles, (representing an extra 2.5 km of traffic in West Parley), and 200 children, all requiring transport to nursery, pre school or first school out of the area, as there are no plans for new facilities in Parley.</p> <p>I believe that this planning policy is totally unsustainable, and requires a lot more thought.</p>				506		
503763	K S Turner		CSPS2486	Policy FWP6							THIS IS GREEN BELT THE ROADS ARE OVERCROWDED FWP6 HIGH DENSITY HOUSING, BUILT ON A FLIGHT PATH. NOISE AND POPULATION FROM ASCENDING AND DESCENDING PLANES, LIVE LIKE THAT FOR A SHORT				506		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>TIME. AND JUST FOR GOOD MEASURE PUT A ROAD THROUGH THE MIDDLE TO CARRY TO MUCH TRAFFIC. IDEAL FOR FAMILIES.. TRAFFIC. FOR AIRPORT FACTORIES, OFFICES, OTHER THAN AIRPORT. LARGE LORRIES FOR SAND AND GRAVEL EXTRACTION FOR WASTE DISPOSAL, BUSES COACHES, ETC. TO AND FROM BOURNEMOUTH BY PASS. TO CHRISTCHURCH TO RINGWOOD TO BOURNEMOUTH HOSPITAL IF ANYTHING HAPPENS ON EITHER THE A338 OR A31 WHICH IS FREQUENTLY NEW RD COMES TO A STAND STILL. INFRASTRUCTURE. SEWAGE, FLOODING, SCHOOLS, HEALTH CARE ETC. MAY BE 50 HOUSES BECAUSE PEOPLE MATTER BUT NOT A NEW TOWN IN A FIELD. PLEASE COME AND LIVE HERE FOR 6 MONTH BEFORE YOU PUSH THIS THROUGH. HOW ABOUT USING THE DORMY SITE WITH SENSIBLE PLANNING.</p>						
508605	Miss Janet Ames		CSPS2572	Policy FWP6							<p>(1) I note you wish to build on the Stour Valley Flood plain. Please note that properties built on the river edge have increased the water flow & washed away sand and gravel near the black house on Mudeford Sandbank. That area in front and near the black house was a place where Fishermen pulled up their nets before W.WarII – I am a witness! There are now boulders put there to prevent some erosion. I suggest you consult the oceanography dept at Soton University before increasing the river flow. (60% of building land will be covered by hoses, roads etc & water has to go somewhere). If Mudeford sandbank is washed away, then a large part of historic Christchurch will go too. (2) The picture of Parley shops shows that very little parking will be available – so no-one will be able to shop there. (3) A seat outside the Chip shop will have a lovely outlook of busy traffic (a lot goes to Hurn) not exactly the spot for anyone to enjoy except intoxicated youngsters!</p>				506		
508852	Mrs L.A. Cheshire		CSPS2512	Policy FWP6							<p>I wish to advise you of my strong objections to the proposals to erect 220 houses on the FWP 7 site together with a further 300 on the FWP 6 site. The extent of the proposed building is not only excessive for this area but, in my view, also ill conceived. Consultation: I understand that current Government legislation requires you to consult fully with the local communities involved and yet patently this has NOT happened to date. In fact, it would appear that the views of these communities are actually being steadfastly overlooked. I, therefore, feel that the ongoing process is far from satisfactory and have even to question its legality. In the absence of any of this direct consultation</p>				506		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>required by law, West Parley went ahead and conducted its own survey of residents' views and produced a comprehensive Parish Plan, copies of which were duly forwarded to EDDC. Despite the fact that it categorically showed West Parley 'en masse' to be opposed to the erection of any total exceeding 100 houses, this valuable information gathered straight from the people on site, i.e. the residents themselves, has so far apparently been ignored by EDDC planners.</p> <p>Construction knock-on effects: I have attended a variety of meetings locally on the subject of the proposals – meetings which have compounded my concerns even further rather than allaying fears. The intended erection of 520 additional houses in the village of West Parley represents a massive 32% increase in housing and is a vast, totally out of proportion increase for a small community and greater by far than those increases put forward for other East Dorset area. Without considerable financial investment (and where would that come from in these straitened times?) West Parley is currently lacking in much of the appropriate infrastructure that this increase in population would require – school places, doctors, dentists, community centres etc – with the result that existing services will be unable to meet all the needs. The inevitable erosion of the Green Belt caused by the advent of this quantity of new homes would signal the death knell of West Parley, which would be submerged inexorably into an urban sprawl extending from Bournemouth in the south towards Ferndown and even beyond. Our village would cease to exist. The Green Belt was introduced many years ago to prevent exactly this scenario, i.e. the absorption of the countryside into conurbations. Both sites proposed for the new construction are at present part of this much treasured Green Belt land, which is home to so many animals, birds, flora and fauna and all of which improve the quality of life for one and all. SOf course, the building of vast quantities of houses will also result in a correspondingly large increase in the number of cars on our already overloaded local roads, which are even at the this time acknowledged to be at bursting point. The two new roads planned will do little to ease congestion – they will merely move the traffic jams further along. Plus it seems they and their traffic will be directed through the two new 'estates' with their medium and high density housing and resulting children. Is that not an idea born of madness? – or just desperation?!</p> <p>Site FWP 7 – individual issues: 1) It's acknowledged that heritage site of Dudsbury Rings is one of the considerable importance and the field in question is far too close for its retention and safe protection. 2) The field itself slopes considerably and as a result heavy rainfall at any time of the year cascades downhill flooding Ridgeway – an unmade and private road, which already suffers adverse effects from the heavy traffic using daily it as an exit onto Christchurch Road after servicing the shops at Parley Cross. The road surface is severely eroded and flooded which makes it very unpleasant for residents who are</p>						

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
											<p>also responsible for its upkeep. Once the field is built upon, there will be far less open ground to absorb rain and flooding would inevitably become even more of a problem.</p> <p>Site FWP 6 – individual issues:</p> <p>(1) To be truthful, West Parley has little requirement for yet another supermarket. A Tesco's Express is already available to us on the parade at the crossroads plus there are two more of these sited within 1 mile. Even within a 3 mile radius we are well served by a variety of the larger main outlets, i.e. 2 Tesco's, 2 Sainsburys, Asda and Lidl – more than enough to cater for everyone's needs. The construction of a further supermarket will only add yet again to the traffic and bring ever more chaos to the already crowded roads of West Parley.</p> <p>(2) Currently allotments and orchards etc are not a major need in the area.</p> <p>Conclusion:</p> <p>I beg you to reconsider your proposals and take into account at long last the views and wishes of the residents of West Parley. You MUST NOT dismiss this small community out of hand, simply to 'meet quotas' and 'tick boxes'. We are people who genuinely love where we have chosen to live and we only have the welfare of our area at heart. We, not you, are the ones who stand to lose most in this matter. Please talk to us. Please listen to us. Remember that throughout this country we are rightly proud of our democracy and have exercised our electoral right to choose those who govern us both nationally and locally. Those people now need to take OUR wishes into consideration – not ride roughshod over us. WeS are entitled to have our say.</p> <p>An acknowledgement to confirm, receipt, reading and understanding of this letter would be much appreciated.</p>							
508966	Mrs Mansell		CSPS2571	Policy FWP6							<p>I wish to object to the building of 220 houses on the FWP7 and 300 on FWP6 sites at West Parley for the following reasons.</p> <p>In my opinion 32% increase in houses in the village is in excess and more than in any other location in East Dorset communities. Added to these there are 30 houses proposed at Coppins and 110 at Holmwood both in the area. A small amount of houses eg. 100 would be acceptable although I am against building on Green Belt. We do not want to create urban sprawl. The Green Belt is also home to protected species of animals The field next to the river is a flood plain which could be of concern in building a new road.</p> <p>Secondly the construction of 2 new roads would not solve the traffic problems – it would just move the traffic to the new junctions. The roads through the new estates would be dangerous 'rat runs' for the residents. As the roads are not to be built until half the houses are finished what happens to the extra traffic until then?</p> <p>Thirdly where would the extra residents go to school – dentists – doctors etc. these are already full to capacity. Is another supermarket necessary – we have many in our area and another on FWP6 would only add to the congestion on</p>				506			

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
											the roads. The proposal of a High Street also seems unnecessary as we are a village not a town. Another point is the restrictions to turning right and left at the crossroads, this would divert airport traffic through the estates causing more traffic problems. I was under the impression the field where 300 houses are proposed is a safety net for the airport. To end I believe the consultation process is unsatisfactory and I feel the residents of Parley village are entitled to have a say in the drawing up of proposals for development of their village.							
509811	Mrs J Waugh		CSPS2562	Policy FWP6							I attended the West Parley Meeting to explain what was planned for West Parley in the future. I found very little which we residents had voted for in our Parish Plan. This was completely ignored. West Parley seem to have taken the brunt of the plans by using our precious Green Belt. This is totally in excess of Corfe Mullen, Ferndown and Wimborne. Apparently the Green Belt was designed to stop the urban sprawl of Kinson and Bournemouth from reaching this very different area. We have all bought bungalows because we like the area and they will be almost worthless should this all come about. Although I can certainly hear the traffic at peak times from our junction, the busyist in Dorset apparently, most of the time we have a very quiet little road of bungalows. The road at the top is unmade and not good to drive a small car over most of the time and it has no through road which has been blocked off. I hope that this new road from Christchurch Road to New Road which is planned with not come along here. 220 houses are planned for Dudsbury Heights also which would be completely devastating. (FWP7) As far as the Green Belt is concerned the other side of New Road where Tesco has already put in their bid and which will no doubt be a very profitable source for them and for the Developer who will have the benefit of the 300 houses. I am not against young people being able to buy houses reasonably but I am if they are to be occupied by immigrants with no knowledge of English and no jobs. (Policy FWP6) As you see I do not completely advocate your plans although I realise it is necessary to have some building space but not to the inconvenience of the present residents.					506		
509843	Mr and Mrs Brian and Dorothy Adams		CSPS2591	Policy FWP6							WEST PARLEY HOUSING Fair shares – Ferndown contribution from far afield. Without these 'remote centres' the Ferndown commitment would be zero. Meanwhile look at the possibility of West Parley being overwhelmed. The rural nature of the village would be destroyed and those we trusted to look after our interests would be held forever responsible for this. Act now and stop this madness – a few more houses maybe, but this! West Parley is a quiet village and the prospect of swamping the area with new builds with its consequent traffic and noise fills me with horror. A lot of the houses will be beneath the fly path which I would					506		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description		
											think could be a problem especially with the noise and any accidents which could happen especially the Christchurch Road and New Road areas. Our roads also are extremely busy with cars queuing regularly. I do not think that so many houses should be built in this area and we want to keep WP as a village and not joined up with Bournemouth.								
509897	Mrs Rachel Harding		CSPS2553	Policy FWP6							I am writing to object to the large and unwelcome plans for our green belt in West Parley. I refer to policy FWP6 which is for 300 houses, supermarket, shopping centre and link road which is planned for the New Road Field. This proposal is very different to the 2010 plans and we feel the roads and infrastructure around this area would be totally inadequate to cope with this. Christchurch Road and West Parley traffic lights junction are already exceptionally busy, how would this road cope with all the extra traffic, it is over capacity already. I understand that the proposal for the new link road will not be started until half the new houses have been built. This link road will go through the middle of the 300 new homes. Do you think that this is acceptable for these families and their children. 520 more houses are proposed to be built at West Parley and Dudsbury Heights, this is a 32% increase to our housing stock, this is excessive and unacceptable and way in excess of what is being imposed in Corfe Mullen, Ferndown, Wimborne or Verwood. The West Parley Parish plan was encouraged by the District Council, but the Council have virtually ignored it.					506			
512129	Mr J.R Chesshire		CSPS2609	Policy FWP6							I wish to record that I strongly object to the proposals to build 300 houses on the FWP 6 site and 220 houses on the FWP 7 site. Far too many for the area, ill conceived, and the cost to eventually put right the Highway plans will far outweigh the original costs which will create chaos in an admittedly already way overstretched area. I believe the consultation process to be not only unsatisfactory, but I question the legality in as much as Government Legislation requires you to fully consult with local communities. When did this happen? You have transparently appeared to ignore our objections on several occasions and in particular our Parish Plan. The village of West Parley will cease to be with the erosion of Green Belt areas and just become part of the Bournemouth to Ferndown urban sprawl. From meetings I have attended it is obvious that a new supermarket is unnecessary, new filter roads unworkable, with the vast increase in lorry and car traffic the existing problems are moved 'up the road'! Where is the sense in that? FWP 7 site is too near to Dudsbury rings, unsuitable because of the rare and prolific wildlife in the area and the field is a virtual floodplain in wet weather. Recently rainwater has poured into the Ridgeway and Elm Tree Walk. Building and the dreaded concrete even with better drainage will not					506			

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
											<p>solve the problem.</p> <p>I urge you to reconsider these proposals and listen to the local community before its to late. Don't dismiss our concerns as the rantings of old pensioners or NIMBY cranks. If you have a pride in your work, rather than just a job, make sure you don't regret your decisions. There is always a higher authority which includes Nature which will show man the error of his ways.</p> <p>An acknowledgement of this letter would be courteous – thank you.</p>							
512459	Sandra Davis		CSPS2356	Policy FWP6	No		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	<p>Policy FWP6 – East of New Road, West Parley.</p> <p>This plan is considered Unsound, in that it is neither Consistent with National Policy, Justified, Effective or Deliverable.</p> <p>N.P.P.F. 155 Please refer to the previous text between the asterisks, but as before, these policies have been consistently ignored by EDDC, with little or no consideration for what the majority of residents would like in the village.</p> <p>The district planners have mistakenly treated Ferndown and West Parley as one community, yes I agree with some things for example, roads, rubbish and brown bin collections etc. However, West Parley, with a current housing stock of approx. 1600 ish homes, is separate constitutionally from Ferndown, having its own boundaries, own council, and in 2015 a separate M.P.</p> <p>We have All the elements of a self contained village, starting with a vibrant sense of community, living within the residents, we have more than a 100 volunteers that do countless jobs within the village, we have two churches, four pubs, a village hall, a sports ground and a club house, many small shops and two Tesco Express supermarkets, several livery businesses and one first school.</p> <p>West Parley has a long history, going back through the Doomsday Book, a Saxon Church and an Iron Age Hill Fort, over 2150 years old, formed and fortified before the birth of Jesus Christ.</p> <p>Ferndown is totally different, being a post war dormitory town. For the planners to suggest a further 520 homes in West Parley, in FWP6 and FWP7, this represents a huge 32% increase in housing stock to 2150. This would create an average of 800 more vehicles, (representing an extra 2.5 km of traffic in West Parley), and 200 children, all requiring transport to nursery, pre school or first school out of the area, as there are no plans for new facilities in Parley.</p> <p>I believe that this planning policy is totally unsustainable, and requires a lot more thought.</p>				506			
535574	Mr and Mrs Ralph Williams		CSPS2301	Policy FWP6							<p>I write to registry my formal objection to the building of 200 houses on the FWP 7, 320 houses and 33,000 sq.ft Foodstore on FWP 6 and to Major Enhancements to the West Parley Village Centre FWP 5 sites for the following under mentioned reasons, some of the points below also apply to Coppins Nursery FWP 6 (corrected to FWP4 by F.P. officer) which is more suited to an elderly care facility. The points raised below are by no means extensive and having read the</p>	<p>Consult with local residents fully take into account the views of the vast majority and amend plans accordingly also the views of P.C. not taken into account this</p>	<p>Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination</p>	<p>To express concerns and present arguments on the lack of sustainability, loss of Green Belt and lack of Transport Policy.</p>	506			

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>councils proposals and accompanying documents which are contradicting and lack robust evidence as a result The Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy Plan is therefore Unsound and Non-Compliant.</p> <p>The Consultation process is unsatisfactory.</p> <p>The Planning system is there to enable Sustainable Development to ensure the right development takes place in the right locations. It is there to protect Green Belt Land and ensure homes are provided on the right sites to meet the needs of both the established community and the people who are likely to live in the proposed new homes. Local Plans must take account of local concerns and wishes of the local population as required by the new Localism legislation. No account has been taken to current Government legislation that requires any L.A. to consult fully with local communities before setting out proposals. EDDC planners have ignored this legislation and failed to consult.</p> <p>West Parley P.C. has produced, following a lengthy consultation with residents, a well publicised Parish Plan, copies of which were sent to EDDC. In this Plan residents are overwhelmingly against having no more than about 100 houses built in West Parley. This information, contrary to new legislation, has been ignored by EDDC planners and the results have not been represented in any of the draft reports. To build more than 100 houses in the Village of West Parley would create an unbroken urban sprawl from Bournemouth to Ferndown with West Parley losing its unique identity and become just another small part of a very large conurbation.</p> <p>Green Belt Considerations.</p> <p>These proposals are in direct conflict with current green belt national planning policy CSIDE1, indeed the L.A. has itself successfully used that policy at planning appeals which has been upheld the planning inspectorate, if challenge is the L.A. expecting that given past decisions the planning inspectorate will change this view on green belt policy. Certainly it will be a major consideration if these proposals are called in by the Secretary of State.</p> <p>No tree survey has been carried out particularly in relation to FWP7 or considerations given to the habitat of many protected species of animals which inhabit this site that has established trees, hedge rows and stream that have remained unaltered for 100 of years. Also this area contains public footpaths with associated rights of way. English Nature do not appear to have been consulted in regard to this site nor it would seem have the Rivers Authority. Dudsbury Rings is an important heritage site and this proposed development is too close to this monument not for it to have an impact on protected heritage site. There is no evidence that English Heritage has been consulted in this regard.</p> <p>Sustainability</p> <p>Sustainability should be the mainstay of any planning policy and on FWP5, FWP6, FWP7 and FWP4 the proposals fails to demonstrate that any of these sites are sustainable.</p> <p>To include a un-needed 3300 sp ft supermarket in the plans for FWP6 will not make this site appropriate for housing. It will</p>	concluded that 100 new homes are acceptable in West Parley. Probably on FWP6 in a smaller scale with No Supermarket					

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>add considerably to traffic congestion.</p> <p>Lack of consideration for families that will live in these proposed house and their children’s education needs are not address, Parley First School has little or no capacity is over 1.5 miles from these sites and no mention is made of middle or upper schools both in Ferndown and over 2.5 miles away with little or no public transport, putting aside the danger of the number of main roads to be negotiated the increase in car usage will again add to traffic congestion.</p> <p>Transport</p> <p>Transport seems largely to be ignored and no full traffic survey has been conducted to support or refute these plans. The B3073 crossing New Road from the Airport to Longham at peak times is already operating way beyond its capacity as is New Road. No amount of improvements to Parley Cross will improve the situation. To add 560 new Homes to these roads plus a super market with 22 car space when also adding the proposed increase in traffic at the airport the potential to add in the region of 1000 new cars to this junction is totally un- sustainable and unpractical for both the existing and the would be residents of these proposed developments. The 2 new roads proposed around the proposed building sites will only move congestion from one point to another and do not address the underlying problems of the current over capacity of New Road and the B3073. The industrial estate at the Airport supports over 2000 workers the majority of which in the main commute by car, most with single occupancy and this number is set to increase. This already causes major congestion at peck times The two proposed new roads will not alleviate the problem.</p> <p>With regard to the proposed road too the West from New Road and part of FWP7 this appears to cut across an existing Flood Plain and this issue has not been addressed by way of a Flood Risk Assessment, discussions with the Rivers Authority or an Environmental Report. This site is know to flood in winger and with the changes in climate the situation is unlikely to improve. No evidence that the Environmental Agency has been consulted on this matter. Covering more of this land with a large scale development will only compound the situation.</p> <p>Infrastructure.</p> <p>No evidence is supplied to support on how Surface and Foul Drainage will be accommodated or Gas, Water and Electricity and if the existing local infrastructure can support this addition 560 homes and a new Food Store.</p> <p>Site FWP 6</p> <p>Another Supermarket in the area is not needed and will only bring in as mentioned much more traffic and delivers to the already overcrowded roads of West Parley. Sufficient supermarkets already exist within 3 mile radius of West Parley and 3 Tesco Express shops exist in a radius of 1 mile of Parley Cross. Also there appears no demand for allotments or orchards. Adequate public open space is already available in the village.</p> <p>Environmental Issues</p>						

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>No consideration appears of have been given to the impact that noise will have on these proposed sites due to the location in relation to the flight path to and from Bournemouth Airport. There is no evidence that any sound test have been carried or other environmental issues have been addressed in having large developments close to an expanding airport. Needs Survey and consideration for alternative Brownfield sites</p> <p>There seems little or no evidence that these number of homes are needed in this location and no supporting evidence to justify 50% affordable. Many undeveloped sites are available in the Ferndown area much closer to schools and local amenities some are Brownfield sites these have the potential to deliver hundreds of homes and that is without the windfall sites that will certainly occur. No consideration has been given to alternatives sites.</p> <p>All the sites above in there present form are totally Unsustainable please I would urge both the elected members and the officers of the council not to dismiss the local residents of the Village of West Parley and deny us our democratic right to have a say in plans that will have a impact massively on the environment in which we live.</p> <p>Site in present form is not sustainable.</p> <p>No needs survey to justify new supermarket</p> <p>Borro Happold B.3073 Corridor Study 2011 is lacking in detail and has no traffic survey or detail how to fully resolve Traffic Issues</p>						
535965	Mr & Mrs Harry Ford		CSPS2400	Policy FWP6							<p>Policies FWP6 and FWP7</p> <p>Firstly, we would like to say that this whole process has been made so complex that it is clearly not written with residents in mind. The official consultation response form is not user friendly and very few will be able to complete this as requested on line. For this reason we have written this letter instead.</p> <p>As residents of West Parley we object to the above mentioned proposals. To lose much of our valuable Green Belt is unacceptable. It is not just green belt they are Key Gaps with Bournemouth. The proposed plans will completely change West Parley's identity and it will lose its village appeal. This was one of the reasons that we moved here in the first place. The proposals are totally inappropriate and improper to West Parley which already has some of the most congested traffic routes in the area. We understand that the link roads will not be constructed until half the houses have been constructed thereby adding further to the problems that the proposed plans will bring. We are quite prepared to accept our share of the housing needs but the proposed 520 new homes is completely out of proportion to the size of West Parley (+32%) and far more than the number proposed for other sites in the surrounding area.</p> <p>Such a development would place pressure on medical services and schools. Our local schools are already oversubscribed. We have children from West Parley being refused entry to all 3 local primary schools (Parley first,</p>				506		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
											Hampreston and Ferndown First) and Ferndown Middle school is also turning away our local children. Having a young daughter, this is of great importance to us. No more commercial outlets are required in this area, especially as future retail trends indicate increased shopping on the internet, out of town supermarkets and retail centres. We are very lucky to have the shops that we already have including: post office, pharmacy, hairdressers, barbers, boutique, Tesco supermarket, beauty salon, veterinary services, kitchen, tiles, bathroom outlets, sewing shop, chiropody and traditional fish and chips, etc. It would appear that the 'West Parley Parish Plan' that was contributed to by 1000 residents has been virtually ignored by the District Council. We do hope that you will now take ours and other local residents views into account.							
610626	Mr and Mrs Hamilton		CSPS2398	Policy FWP6							Please put a stop to the over development, pollution and traffic nightmares in the West Parley area.				506			
656342	Peter Rees		CSPS2521	Policy FWP6							I am writing to express my deep concern at the plan to increase West Parley Housing stock by 520 houses, a 32% increase. The attraction of West Parley as a place to live is the surrounding green fields which separate us from the Bournemouth conurbation. This green belt, it seems is to be desecrated by the massive building plans which are being considered, especially the plans designated FWP6 and FWP7. Parley cross roads already seems to be at the limit of traffic capacity at certain times, so yet more traffic, possibly hundreds more cars per day will make it intolerable. I understand that 2 new link roads are to be built, but only after half the houses have been built and that may mean many years of traffic congestion. I was one of a 1000 residents who contributed to the West Parley Parish Plan, but it appears the District Council has virtually ignored it. Are our wishes actually being represented or is the democratic principal dead? Please consider and respect the wishes of the existing residents.					506		
656350	D A Cook and J.B Randall		CSPS2525	Policy FWP6							We are absolutely against the above proposals which would appear to have been compiled by people who know nothing about West Parley. West Parley has already grown extensively from the village it was, but it has retained its "cosy" feel with green belt areas which are so important in this country as a whole. We do not want a continuous town/city running all the way along the south. We MUST keep our green "Key Gaps". The traffic in New Road and Christchurch Road is already horrendous. 520 more houses, as proposed, will add in excess of 500 more cars. Even social and "affordable" housing generates at least 1 car per household and, in many cases, there will be 2. The effect of all these extra vehicles will be widespread. The road past the Airport is already a nightmare and not only at commuter times. We travel that road frequently, at different times of day and it is almost always really busy. Parley Cross will have long queues of traffic and pedestrians trying to cross the road will find it near					506		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
											impossible. Holiday traffic will make things even worse. How are public services and schools going to cope with this huge influx of people? Utility services are already overloaded, schools are fully subscribed, Doctors and Dentists, too, will be strained beyond the limit. Please reconsider the whole situation. We none of us mind a small number of new houses, maybe infilling of large plots, but not greenbelt. Greenbelt areas were provided to prevent building of large estates and for the benefit of the people who chose to buy their homes in a semi-rural setting.							
656361	Mrs E Hutchings-Clarke		CSPS2529	Policy FWP6							To The Policy Planning Consultation. Im not sure where to start, so I will begin with a little family background. We live at the top of Dudsbury Hill opposite the Dudsbury Pub entrance. Our house was built in 1930 &* my grandparents owned the property from new. Two years later my father was born in our house & grew up here. Over the years weve heard some fantastic stories about his childhood & adventures he & his friends have had in the surrounding areas & especially over the river. He has certainly seen some changes. Being a builder he built his own bungalow two doors away from his parents home on a piece of land they owned. As time went by he married my mum. His father sadly passed away but his mother stayed & worked in the house & area. As children my sister & I spent most weekends at the house with my Grandmother. We can remember looking out of the top front room bedroom over looking Christchurch road & counting the cars coming up from Parley cross (as it was then called) we would count maybe 10 in half an hour. We counted more rabbits in the field opposite than cars on the road. When my Grandmother died in the house my father kept the house, it was empty for 13 years until we moved in. While I realize things must changed my point is that area has changed considerably already. West Parley was some farms & a church at the end of Church lane. Parley Cross was the crossroads where the shops are & We don't know why Dudsbury lost its name, this is the area going up the hill from the Crossroads to the boundary with Longham. We were very upset when a sign saying Welcome to West Parley was erected as we feel Dudsbury is now lost & swallowed up into West Parley. When we asked the council about the sign they just said "There's not enough room for too many signs". We really feel West Parley is going to be swallowed up & become a suburb of Bournemouth, this would be a great shame as West Parley & Dudsbury are very historical places. Referring to policy FWP7 the 220 houses & the new road planned for the Dudsbury Heights field near the hill fort. I am very concerned about the houses here as they are going to be built opposite us. The road at the moment cant cope, some days its taken me at least 5 mins to get out of my drive & onto Christchurch road. About 500 more cars would be trying to use the same road & this would be mayhem! You may say put traffic lights in or some other traffic calming system but then				506			

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
											<p>you loose the village feel we all love & want to live in. Also I have to ask what about our house prices? Surely this will de-value them? The new road that is proposed to come out onto Christchurch Road near us will cause more hold ups & be even more chaotic.</p> <p>Referring to policy FWP6 300 houses, shopping centre & new road.</p> <p>Our road systems cant cope at the moment so why make a congested area even more congested? There will be at least 600 more cars. We will need more schools, Doctors, Dentists etc. While this will mean more jobs it will also mean more chaos & a less village feel.</p> <p>Summing up we will have nearly 1000 more cars on the roads in this area alone. . Its just the Parley area but the whole area including Ferndown, North borne, Longham & Canford Bottom. More houses mean more cars & people.</p> <p>I need to ask two questions</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Do the people proposing this building & expansion live in the area? If not would they be so willing to have a town built around their village? 2. Why hasn't the Dormy site been built on? <p>Also If we build on Green belt land that was there in the first place to stop Urban Sprawl we cant get this land back! Once its gone.</p>							
656363	Mrs Gwen Wells		CSPS2533	Policy FWP6							<p>I was horrified to read how you are proposing to solve the "problems" of Parley X roads, and this without any consultation with the local people which is against the Government's new policy. (We all have a say in how our local environment is handled). This just came out of the blue which just is not on. Parley as everybody knows is a green belt dividing area between Ferndown & Bournemouth. To destroy this would not only destroy for ever the semi-rural character of Parley & Dudsbury – just in one fell swoop – It is a busy X Roads but not any worse than other Junctions around here (I have lived here all my life). It is one of those things if you live in East Dorset. You would do away with everything that keeps it a pleasant semi-rural to live in. Do away with the fields, Hedges, trees and even verges, build more shops, 300 houses new Rds and you have another town. A few small steps of green here and there do not make an area a pleasant division between large areas of town. It takes the green belt and that is what has saved Parley & Dudsbury. We have had lovely shops at Parley X but they have had to close because of lack of support. Most people do their shopping in the large super markets and there are plenty around & shopping outlets everywhere. The only way to create a division between Ferndown & Bournemouth would be to leave Parley alone & I'm sure people would rather wait a few minutes at the lights than see the whole are ruined. There is no alternative and if the local people & Council had been consulted (as is their right) then this would have been obvious. We live around here because we like it as it is. These schemes to make traffic move faster is no answer and would call for more problems than they solve.</p>					506		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
656366	Mr & Mrs B Brunnsden		CSPS2537	Policy FWP6							<p>Once again the Residents of West Parley have been put into a very poor position regarding the proposed building on the Green Belt.</p> <p>Have the powers to be really thought out all the points which the residents are constantly putting forward.</p> <p>We all appreciate we shall have to have some building in the area but surely not the level proposed.</p> <p>The policies FWP6 and FWP7 are what the District Council thinks are food for us. So different from what we were originally consulted on.</p> <p>We read link roads will not be started until some of the houses are built. How come? Lorries etc. will be using already congested roads. Very dangerous.</p> <p>The New Road and Dudsbury heights fields are at the best Key Gaps between linking Bournemouth and West Parley. It looks to us in the future it will be lone gigantic building area with us joining directly onto the outskirts of Bournemouth.</p> <p>An increase of 32 per cent in housing stock in West Parley seems we consider to be very excessive.</p> <p>How can the area support this. Do we get more Doctors, Dentists etc. for all the new residents and how about schooling.</p> <p>We really feel there needs to be a lot more consultations and notice taken from the residents before any of the proposed plans can go a head.</p>				506		
656372	Mrs M C Rees		CSPS2556	Policy FWP6							<p>Please register my objections to the Core Strategy Pre-Submission. I am particularly concerned with the two planning proposals known as FWP6 and FWP7. These two proposals would lead to a massive and unsustainable increase in the size of West Parley. They are ill thought out and have been developed without the support or even the consultation of the local community. They bear little resemblance to the proposals originally consulted upon. West Parley Parish Council have been ignored, as have the wishes of the West Parley residents.</p> <p>These proposals would destroy whole tracts of the Green Belt. Such unforgivable vandalism would diminish Dorset and would also choke West Parley cross roads with even more traffic. West Parley's status as an independent village, separate and distinct from Bournemouth would be seriously compromised. The proposed population increase would amount to 32% increase in the size of the village in a relatively short period. Such an increase would be wholly unsustainable and would seriously damage if not destroy the village.</p> <p>The Green Belt should only be encroached upon under exceptional circumstances. It most certainly should not be discarded because the local council find it an inconvenience.</p> <p>The Green belt areas you plan to destroy are Key Gaps separating West Parley from Bournemouth. They must remain sacrosanct.</p> <p>West Parley is a small village that already has to contend with the notorious West Parley cross roads. According to these two proposals, new link roads will not even be started until</p>				506		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											half of this proposed new build on Green Belt land has been completed. Yet Parley Cross roads are already over capacity. Please rethink these divisive and environmentally damaging proposals.						
656376	Mr and Mrs W D Pyke		CSPS2567	Policy FWP6							<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We consider that the 220 houses planned for Dudsbury heights to be extremely detrimental to the well-being of existing residents in that it will considerably add to traffic congestion & rob the area of its distinctive feature of providing a “green space” between Bournemouth and Ferndown. Many of the residents of West Parley (including ourselves) will have been drawn to this area by the existence of this green space (and will have considered it to be reasonably protected by being a “Key Gap”) We therefore wish to register our objection to Policy FWP7. • We consider Policy FWP6 to be ill considered to give scant consideration to the impact of traffic on the already congested New Road. • We are concerned that you appear to have taken little heed of West Parley’s Parish plan and treat this area, already robbed of open recreational space by the building on Poor Common, is being asked to bear a disproportionate burden to that being imposed on other areas of East Dorset. 				506		
656382	Mr & Mrs D G Moody		CSPS2576	Policy FWP6							<p>SUBJECT: The desecration of West Parley</p> <p>To whom it may concern,</p> <p>As long term residents of West Parley we are appalled at the proposal to build 520 houses in the village.</p> <p>Our property fronts onto New Road, and over the last 52 years we have lived here the traffic has increased by 10,0005</p> <p>At times it is life threatening to get in or out of our own property.</p> <p>To build 300 houses and shops on the Green Belt directly under the flight path of a greatly expanding airport defies credibility and the extra traffic joining New Road is a recipe for chaos.</p> <p>If the thought of ever increasing council tax revenues drives the District Council, think again, big brother Bournemouth and over the past century every village and parish adjoining the old boundary has been swallowed up, including Kinson when that expanded.</p> <p>Overrule documents PPSD, the core strategy and all the other documents!</p> <p>Listen to the concerns of West Parley residents and their Parish Council, and do your best for them.</p> <p>After all we love living here and are well aware of the pitfalls the proposed development will cause.</p> <p>Concerned West Parley residents</p>				506		
656402	Mrs Jean Williams		CSPS2565	Policy FWP6							I am writing with my views on the building and drastic changes you are suggesting for West Parley. Firstly though I would say how under hand and undemocratic you have been. You seem to fo ignored The west parley residents and then only given us 12 weeks to respond. The plans that you have put forward are completely different from anything you put forward in your 2010 plans and have not involved the				506		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>residents or the parish council.</p> <p>I do realise that there may have to be a small amount of building in the area (although I do not want any, I think West Parley is a big enough village0. To help the economy, create work and homes but I feel 520 houses an increase of 32% in one small village is way too much. Plus another 30 dwellings at Coppins and 110 at Holmwood which is just over a mile up the road.</p> <p>Where are all the services to accommodate 660 dwellings. The schools in Ferndown are full. There is a waiting list at Parley First School. I have to wait a week for a doctors appointment now, and there is no dentist and there is no mention from you at all of increasing these services.</p> <p>We do not need a new HIGH Street this is a village not a town. Shops are empty everywhere. Before Tesco took on the shop at the cross it was empty for 2 years and that was before the recession. No one wanted it.</p> <p>You have not said what there is going to be for all the children moving into the area, are they just going to hang around the streets? Another recipe for disaster.</p> <p>This whole area is important to wild life and you are taking 6,6% of our green belt in West Parley alone which is a huge amount..</p> <p>The fields near the bridge is a flood plain which regularly floods plus the water runs down the Ridgeway from the top fields.</p> <p>The fields in West Parley and Dudsbury Heights are key gaps to separate us from Bournemouth and prevent urban sprawl, without this we will just become part of Bournemouth.</p> <p>The new link roads will just become (rat runs) going through housing estates which will be a big danger to all that live there. Also you say about the new shops, the link roads will be taking the traffic away from the shops and there will be no trade. People will just not bother with it. You have not said anything about car parking either.</p> <p>What happened to the gyratory in your last set of plans??????????</p> <p>If the new roads are not going to be built until half the houses are built how is West Parley going to copy with all the traffic that 660 houses will bring.</p> <p>32% increase in houses in West Parley is way more than is being imposed on Corfe Mullen, Ferndown, Wimborne or Verwood. Maybe you could explain to me why.</p> <p>West Parley is on the flight path for the airport and I always thought that that fields in this area were a safety net for the airport. A prime example last year was the Red Arrow crash. If this all goes ahead.</p> <p>Where are the children going to go to school.? Will I be dead before I can get a doctors appointment? The green belt was put in place to safeguard our countryside and you are taking it away. What happens in 10-20-30 years time. Will you take more. What will happen to our green and pleasant land and the green English countryside ???</p>						
656444	Mrs Eileen Walters		CSPS2586	Policy FWP6							I have attended meetings held in West Parley Memorial Hall				506		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description						
											where I have studied detailed planning maps and listened to all the arguments and discussions from the floor which confirmed my reasons for writing to you. West Parley is a delight to live in, and I cannot condone the turmoil which all these plans will cause. Traffic is sure to cause unbelievable chaos – 500 (at least) more cars – buses to take children to school – delivery vans and yet more shops – more buses to provide the elderly. I really don't need to go on listing all the ideas the District Council has seemed to think we need, without any consultation with West Parley Parish Council and residents. How high handed of you to assume we will allow such a carve up without a word. I hope you will accept very seriously the fact that we know best those, that live here, that your plans are not even Viable and would destroy this beautiful area, We cannot educate hundreds more children – we haven't enough schooling to Accommodate then – I doubt If any of my thoughts as a resident have even green sensibly considered – please consider them now.												
656453	M Smith		CSPS2588	Policy FWP6							I am writing at your request because I don't think West Parley can take all these proposed changes. First I object to the building of 220 houses at Dudsbury Heights. This is a beautiful area of countryside and all these houses will generate so much traffic it will be too much for Christchurch Road to cope with, especially with the houses to be built at Coppins. I also think the houses supermarket etc proposed for Parley Cross is really not going to be of any be of any benefit without a school NHS facilities etc. It would take a great deal of infrastructure to sort out traffic, its just ridiculous. I may say I have lived here for 40 years now and brought up three daughters who all went to local schools and I appreciate that if people had objected to the building of this estate I would not be living here now but I still think the current proposals are too much for this area, so I would like to see some compromises. Good luck with the consultation					506							
656475	Mrs M Hovell		CSPS2590	Policy FWP6							I am completely & utterly opposed to both Policy FWP7 & FWP6. I was born in ?? was country – Farnham Common, Bucks but spent all my working life in a suburb of London, so it was a joy to retire to West Parley, where I could spend my remaining years in a very pleasant location. The thought of all those houses being built in Dudsbury Heights FWP7 and another load under FWP6 is appalling & it would turn West Parley into a horrible urban sprawl. Keep West Parley as it is & do not turn it into a horrid little town.					506							
656481	J Church		CSPS2597	Policy FWP6							NO MORE HOUSES FOR DUDSBURY HEIGHTS FIELD NEAR OLD HILL FORT FWP6 NO TO 300 HOUSES AND SUPERMARKET SHOPPING CENTRE					506							

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											NO TO THE NEW LINK ROAD NO MORE CARS WANTED IN THIS AREA.						
656489	Mrs Barbara MacFarlane		CSPS2599	Policy FWP6		No				No	<p>I have lived in West Parley since 1948 when my parents moved into New Road when I was 2 yrs old. There have been many changes in all those years. The shops at Parley Cross, with 2 large Blue Cedars outside of Mrs ??? sweet shop, taken down replaced the removed - natural progress, But the Green Belt areas were always sacrosanct and the serious consideration of putting 300 houses onto such a site (FWP6) is reprehensible – when these areas of Green Belt are ploughed away forever West Parley will be a lot worse for it – not only that precious site, but the Dudsbury Heights field near the Old Hill fort which is an area of great interest and Beauty to all who are familiar with it.</p> <p>These “proposed” sites will not only cause even worse congestion to Christchurch Rd and New Rd during months, if not years of the development of these sites, causing unbearable Rush Hour congestion which is certainly dreadful at present.</p> <p>What about our Parish Plan encouraged by the District Council? Why are they choosing to ignore the wishes of more than 1000 residents and our excellent Parish Council – who are these handful of (paid) people who take over our neighborhoods making decisions which don’t affect them – where are the Link Rds? They can’t possibly decrease the traffic that filters onto the Christchurch Rd – New Rd, so perhaps even more of our precious Green Belt land will be taken to satisfy even more traffic. This cannot be justified under any circumstances.</p> <p>Im sure that being “ consistent with National Policy” in West Parleys case is unsound and eventually ineffective, as such developments with presumably houses that will have at least four people in residence possibly 1 – 4 cars in each. Children who have to be scooled, medical services - fire brigade, ambulances etc etc. No wonder a new Supermarket & shopping centre are also thrown into the mix (as if we don’t have enough of those already!) bringing even more traffic into West Parley and beyond.</p> <p>I do hope that these comments will be at least taken into account when making decisions that affect so many people, who really care about the area in which we’ve chosen to live and in which our children and Grandchildren have been blessed to enjoy the woods, fields and Commonland as their playground.</p>				506		
656499	Mr R J Leaper		CSPS2613	Policy FWP6							<p>Consultation to the Green Belt Plans</p> <p>Not so long ago, the river Stour was straightened, houses were demolished and services were put in place, to take a new road across from Redhill Avenue direct to Hurn. A brilliant traffic relieving development at the time, and would be even more so today to relieve us of the problems at Parley Cross.</p> <p>Why are you not pushing for this now? It is logical solution to the problems that are being proposed for the area. A huge percentage of the traffic coming to Parley Cross go to Hurn. A</p>				506		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>huge percentage of that traffic could use that new road, if it was there. Why can't you see this? Why are you not doing some about it? It doesn't take a wise may to see the logic of it.</p> <p>As for the housing proposed it would be a crime to allow it to happen. To destroy Parley as we know it just to satisfy Politicians needs for extra housing, to house a rising population who are not even true British, and you know what I am saying, even if our Politicians are too afraid to say it. Keep Parley as it is, don't let people in London who haven't got a clue about us, ruin Parley for ever for us, who love it for the way it is.</p>						
656503	Mrs O Knowelden		CSPS2615	Policy FWP6							<p>Thank you for giving us the opportunity to give our views on the Green Belt Plan.</p> <p>There won't be a "Green Belt" with all the plans that are being put forward.</p> <p>I have lived in West Parley since 1954 – my husband died in 2006. I am 85yrs old! Now I have seen this area grow since then from a lovely small village to the part of a bigger town of Ferndown. Now there will be no space between us and North Bournemouth.</p> <p>I hate to think of more roads at Parley Cross to make it difficult to cross to get to more shops. We certainly need more shops at Parley as the 1st Parade was, but after TESCO & SAINSBURY came, they all went (well, nearly). No more of these, thank you!!</p> <p>My son & family now live here & they don't need more traffic & NOISE it is bad enough with traffic, sirens & aircraft!!</p> <p>Please keep the GREEN BELT in this lovely area.</p>				506		
656520	Joyce Woolnough		CSPS2545	Policy FWP6							<p>As residents of West Parley, we would like to draw your attention to our comments regarding some of the Policies under consultation:</p> <p>Ref: Policy FWP6 (Plans for 300 houses, supermarket and shopping centre & link road)</p> <p>Ref: Policy FWP7 (Plans for 220 houses and the new Road)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The New Road and Dudsbury heights fields are not just green belt; they are "Key Gaps" with Bournemouth, there to prevent urban sprawl. We want to remain as West Parley – the policies above will join our conurbations and create urban sprawl a contradiction in terms. • Why are we having a 32% increase in our housing stock? Our Parish Plan clearly outlined our aspirations, a plan encouraged by the District Council; it appears that as residents we have been ridiculed, as these have not been considered at all. We are meant to live in a democratic society – we have not been consulted during the preparation of these new plans at all! • Both link roads will cause more congestion, during construction of the properties and more so after completion once occupied. We live on the main Christchurch Road, and have seen an increase in traffic since we moved here 4 years ago. 				506		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
											<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More noise, pollution and more industrial vehicles on this road already in 4 years, surely this is will increase the problems we already have a) with the ignorance of speed restrictions by drivers, b) no crossings midway for the pedestrians and horse riders c) more cyclists on our service road more hazards to create accidents d) more airport traffic. • No regard for our wildlife and any endangered species that will be affected. • What's it going to be like at Parley Cross, more congestion on all main roads backing up causing more delays at many more times of the day. • All with the added problem of a new shopping parade and the parking, entry and exit dilemmas associated with these amenities, in an area already over its capacity. • How will it affect local businesses already in situ at Parley Cross • As for link roads passing through urban areas, surely this has not been thought through from a safety aspect for residents particularly for young children or the elderly. • Where are the children from families taking residence in these new homes going to school are their enough places in our existing local education facilities? • What plans have been thought for welfare, medical and dentistry requirements & local transport? <p>On 14th February we sent a e-mail to 35 Councillors, we received replies from Cllr J Wilson, Cllr S Lugg, Cllr B Manuel and Spencer Flower, only 4, that's only 11%. Its obvious where the other 31 votes are"! You're definitely not listening to us residents, is this because it does not effect each of you personally where you live? Please consider our views we really do care about where we live in West Parley.</p>							
360190	Mr John Cullen	Barrack Road (West Parley) Residents Association	CSPS2685	Policy FWP6	No		Yes	Yes			<p>Significant increase in housing proposed well in excess of Parish Plan suggestions for sustained expansion. Housing strategy document does not suggest specific numbers of houses needed in East Dorset and the number proposed for this area and FWP7 are put forward as enough housing to pay for cost of road improvements / SANGs at this site and a contribution to affordable housing that has been acknowledged is likely to be built elsewhere anyway. Large HGVs would need to use link road and sample drawings of likely layout around housing do not look realistic. Spreads effect of heavy traffic even more around the village. Significant amount of green belt lost. Looks like a plan to ruin a 2000 year old village to overcome current public funding shortagesfor social housing and road.</p>				506			
360910	Mrs Fiona Baker		CSPS2633	Policy FWP6	No		Yes	Yes	Yes		<p>In response to the East Dorset and Christchurch Pre-submission Consultation, I would like to make the following observations that are specifically relevant to policies FWP5, FWP6 Fwp7 and the related maps. In their current format, these policies are inter-related and will not work independently, therefore my comments will apply to these three policies. With regard to the new road layout, I consider the proposals</p>		Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	I am happy to take part as a resident.	506	2256149_0_1.pdf		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
											<p>to be unsound, ineffective and unjustified due to the lack of detail within the plans and the consultation document. Specifically, the scheme cannot be justified, as the proposal is based on reducing the impact of traffic at Parley Cross, reducing the three lanes on the New Road South side of the junction to one. This is predicated on a new link road from New Road to Christchurch Road. The current road layout utilises three lanes in the northbound direction, yet the consultation does not address how the traffic using these lanes will be pushed back further along New Road towards Northbourne.</p> <p>The consultation does not propose new slip lanes to turn left into the new road, that will as the existing road layout confirms, is necessary to aid the movement of traffic. I believe that a slip road will be necessary, back toward the iron bridge but this will be necessary infrastructure if this plan is to go ahead. However this would be extremely expensive and have a high impact on the environment. This is a flood plain area supplied by watercourses draining from the fields and springs in the nearby field.</p> <p>The pre-submission document makes it clear that the proposals should be in line with national planning policy. The document does not state whether the plans are in line with Planning Policy Statement 25 – Flood management through spatial strategy. As stated above, the proposed road will be crossing the flood plain (which floods frequently and is well known to local residents). However, at the open evenings held at Parley Memorial Hall, the planning team denied the road would be going across the flood plain. Having lived at the above address for more than twelve years, I have seen the fields flood on many occasions, that affect the fields up to the current bridle way and has once flooded New Road itself, resulting in road closure.</p> <p>I have attached photograph, taken in April and May 2012 that provide evidence of the extent of the flooding on these fields and the drainage ditches that would be affected by the building of any slip road on the proposed site. One of these photographs was taken from my window, and importantly for my family, indicates how close this new road will be to our property. The link road will provide an unnecessary impact on the area and the case for the road is unjustified, therefore the consultation is in effective</p> <p>Policy FWP76 identifies a requirement for 200 new homes, but in my view the consultation has not justified the requirements for these homes or the number of homes identified. FWP6 identifies a requirement for 320 new homes my view the consultation has not justified the requirements for these homes or the number of homes identified. This policy also identifies a new food store and the provision for focal buildings, but with very little or no detail to justify the need, and have not provided details for other key community services, in particular, the provision of increased local school places. The link road on this side of the development will have an unnecessary intrusion and the details for the plan have not been justified.</p>							

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>The areas affected by these policies are currently green belt, all be it for agricultural use. The policies for these areas proposed suitable alternative green space, but the green spaces proposed are currently green spaces. How can the proposals be considered sound when the alternatives are currently green.</p> <p>It is noted that Dorset County Council, as the Transport Authority has requested a larger scheme in order to justify a major transportation solution. How can the proposals be considered sound when the scale of the development is based on the road layout and not a justified need for the number of houses?</p> <p>On a personal level, I object to the plans produced on the basis that my home will be directly and substantially affected by the impact of the new road layout. Access to our property is already difficult with traffic on New Road, but based on the plan proposals presented and discussed with your consultants at the open evening, we will be squeezed between two additional sets of traffic controls on New Road (between the 2 proposed link roads) that will be less than ¼ mile apart and only ½ mile from Parley Cross lights, that will undoubtedly further hinder access to our property. This will, in my view substantially affect the value of our property as well as the views our property enjoys and impact our quality of life through additional traffic flow, noise and airborne pollution. Finally, I would like to register objection to the consultation feedback form and process. The language in the plan feedback form is intimidating, requesting residents respond on whether the proposals are 1) legal and 2) sound. One would assume that the Council would have put the proposals through a thorough legal view before presenting this to the public. For the definition of sound, I was referred to the Council's web site, where there was a huge number of documents and thousands of pages, which to object to 'soundness' properly, requires you to review all the surveys and findings and understand 'soundness' from a planning professional perspective – like most Parley residents, I am neither a lawyer or a planning professional, so felt immediately baffled on what grounds I could raise my objections. Furthermore, many Parley residents are elderly and do not have access to or experience of a computer, but online is recommended at the 'easiest' way to make representation. Residents are required to complete a separate sheet for each policy representation (Parley Residents are impacted by a minimum of 3 policies). This process has clearly not been designed to make it easy or to encourage feedback. Thankfully, letters of objection will now be allowed and I hope the Council will this time now listen and acknowledge residents concerns.</p>						
361011	Ms Mary Mogg		CSPS2580	Policy FWP6							<p>I am writing with my views which strongly oppose the proposed housing at West Parley, the reasons for this are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The green belt fields separate Bournemouth from East Dorset and should be retained to prevent urban sprawl; • The field where houses are proposed under policy FWP7 at 				506		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
											Dudsbury heights is not suitable due to the slope of the field which is bound to result in flooding at the lower levels; • Policy FWP6 where 300 houses and a shopping centre is proposed is totally unsuitable with such a large number of houses, and moreover high numbers of social housing; • Finally, the residents of West Parley gave their views on previous housing proposals are were unanimously against such large numbers of houses. Why ask us again if you are going to ignore our views. Small numbers of houses are acceptable on brown field sites but to build on lovely green fields is sacrilege. West Parley should not be swamped with such large numbers of houses.							
475517	Mrs Sarah Collins		CSPS2624	Policy FWP6	No		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	According to the BBC on 27 March 2012, the government said policies such as those protecting the Green Belt, sites of special scientific interest, national parks and other areas could not “be overridden by the presumption”. Local Plans should meet objectively assessed needs, according to para 14 of the NPPF. The development of your strategy has not been carried out in proper cooperation with residents, whose views have been sought, but then largely ignored, or skewed. For example, there were about 3 comments on allotments, yet they have been included in the strategy. For a further example, during the Issues and Options Consultation 2010/11, residents said, as quoted in the council’s own leaflet. ‘We will need additional medical facilities and schools for the influx of new residents.’ On this basis, the proposals are neither justified, nor consistent with National Policy. Nor is the document effective because it will not be deliverable if there are insufficient school places for the children Residents asked for ‘food shops that people can go into as it used to be 25/30 years ago – a butcher, baker, greengrocer etc. The provision of a superstore in FWP6 rides roughshod over this evidence and is therefore not justified because it is not founded on a robust and credible evidence base. Again according to para 14 of the NPPF, permission should not be granted if any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole. The paragraphs from 79 onwards concerning protecting the green belt show that development should be restricted, that ‘As with previous Green Belt policy, inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances.’ These circumstances are not ‘very special’ and have not taken into consideration reasonable alternatives. The strategy is thus inflexible and not effective. Paragraph 72 of NPPF states: The Government attaches great importance to ensuring that a sufficient choice of school places is available to meet the needs of existing and new communities. Local planning authorities should take a proactive, positive and collaborative approach to meeting this requirement, and to development					506		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>that will widen choice in education. They should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Give great weight to the need to create, expand or alter schools; and • Work with schools promoters to identify and resolve key planning issues before applications are submitted. <p>None of this has been planned for and goes against national planning policy and is not deliverable, therefore not effective. Furthermore, during the Issues and Options Consultation 2010/11, residents said, as quoted in the council's own leaflet, 'We will need additional medical facilities and schools for the influx of new residents.' On this basis, the proposals are neither justified, nor consistent with National Policy.</p> <p>Paragraph 75 states that planning policies should protect and enhance public rights of way and access. Local authorities should seek opportunities to provide better facilities for users, for example by adding links to existing rights of way networks including National Trails.</p> <p>The proposed link road crosses the Stour Valley Walk, far from protecting and enhancing access and facilities to this trail. Again, your strategy is not consistent with national policy. Concerning the green belt, your strategies are inconsistent with National Policy.</p> <p>According to Paragraph 79. The Government attaches great importance to Green Belts. The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence.</p> <p>Paragraph 87. As with previous Green Belt policy, inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances.</p> <p>88. When considering any planning application, local planning authorities would ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt. 'Very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.</p> <p>There is no consideration in the strategy that clearly outweighs the potential harm to the Green Belt. Your strategy is thus not consistent with national policy, it is not founded on a robust and credible evidence base, because you have ignored the evidence which said, quoted in your consultation document 'We should try at all costs to preserve the Green Belt' and nor have other more appropriate strategies been put forward, such as developing the brown field site previously occupied by the Dormy hotel</p> <p>Quoting the figure that 99.5% of East Dorset's green belt will be protected is meaningless when you plan to encroach on West Parley's Green Belt by adding a huge 32% increase in our housing stock. New Road and Dudsbury Heights fields are Key Gaps with Bournemouth.</p> <p>Environmental impact includes removal of oak trees with TPOs on them, destruction of grade 2 agricultural land, the destruction of a bat reserve in the area of the proposed new link road. All going against national policy, all harmful to the</p>						

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											green belt and all should be preserved. We should not be prepared to sacrifice these for a strategy that is not necessary, not justified, not effective and not consistent with national policy and that has ignored findings from the survey of local residents, rendering it undemocratic.						
475526	Mr Geoffrey Dark		CSPS2611	Policy FWP6	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	<p>Not Justified because there is no evidence that the views of the local community and others who may have a stake in the area have been taken into account. The two new link roads and the reshaping of the shopping area on New Road have not been part of any previous consultation, so the document is not justified on these grounds.</p> <p>Not Effective because the plans are not deliverable as currently shown. They are uneconomic as 50% of the housing will have to be 'social', meaning they have to be sold to a Housing Association at cost price and, with the many levies that will have to be imposed to cover infrastructure such as new link roads and Heathland Mitigation the sums are not viable.</p> <p>Not consistent with national policy because the Plan is contrary to Core Planning as set out in NPPF, which states that a plan should be genuinely "plan-led" empowering local people to shape their surroundings with succinct local and neighbourhood plans, setting out a positive vision for the future". Moreover, the need has not been proved which would allow valuable Green Belt land, which serves the purpose of stopping urban sprawl, to be rolled back to allow housing. Finally, it is unlikely that there are enough First and Middle School places for the children of the new homes but the document ignores this issue for West Parley – if there could be a need to build a new school, details of its possible location should have been included in the document.</p> <p>Questions 6 & 7</p> <p>Policy FWP6 is a proposal to build 320 houses (minimum of 50% affordable), a supermarket, shopping centre and link road on the field alongside New Road in spite of the fact that this is green belt land. This land provides a Key Gap between West Parley and Bournemouth which is considered of extreme importance, since West Parley is a village of ancient origin with a far longer history than Bournemouth. These Key Gaps were introduced in order to prevent urban sprawl and this was the principal reason for having a green belt in the first place, so it is against all reason that the District Council now suggests that houses should be built on this important natural area. It is of vital importance, therefore, that West Parley does not become a mere suburb of Bournemouth but that it retains its own identity through the preservation of the green belt land that currently exists.</p> <p>It is also extremely important to make the point that West Parley recently published its Parish Plan, following encouragement to do so by the District Council. Over 1000 residents, a large percentage of the total population of West Parley, contributed to this plan and their overriding decision was that no more than 100 houses could be built in West Parley without damaging the character of the village and that</p>	On the above grounds, I strongly object to the proposals described in FWP6.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		506		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description		
											these should, in general, be built on brown belt land. It appears that the District Council has virtually ignored the Parish Plan and the views of so many households. The policies FWP6 and FWP7 have been formulated by the District Council without any involvement or consultation in their preparation with the West Parley Parish Council or the residents of West Parley. Such action is, in my opinion, undemocratic and takes no account of the opinions of residents who have expressed themselves so strongly in rejecting the District Council's plan for building of a total of 520 houses, representing an additional 32% increase in West Parley's housing stock, which would be excessive, damaging and far greater than the increases being suggested for neighbouring towns and parishes including Corfe Mullen, Wimborne Ferndown and Verwood. On the above grounds, I strongly object to the proposals described in FWP6.								
476561	Mr Kevin Horton		CSPS2554	Policy FWP6	No			No		No	(NOTE: Please see the attachment to this text for the correct formatting of this response) Appeal Against Proposed "Draft Core Strategy Pre-submission Report" 1 Introduction Since West Parley is my neighbourhood, most of my comments are directed at the plans for that area. In October 2010 the East Dorset District Council (EDDC) issued a range of future planning "Options" in their "Core Strategy Options" document. Most would consider that an "Option" meant that there was a choice and that not all options would necessarily remain. In early 2012 the "Draft Core Strategy Pre-submission Report" was issued and accepted on the 5th March at a public meeting where the public could not make any verbal representation. In this new report, all "Options" numbers have been replaced with "Policy" numbers and a decision to apply every option has been taken. I believe that the Draft Core Strategy Pre-submission Report (hereafter called "the Report") has many serious faults and should not have even gone out to consultation in its present form. Our local EDDC councillors seem reluctant to challenge the planning officers because they consider the officers should be the "experts" on what is best and practicable. This view seems to prevail even when they are aware that their local constituents are very much against the proposals. The report itself is not well written with inadequate references to any of the evidential material. I would expect a 192 page document to contain many references to specific areas in supporting documents, but there are none. To thoroughly check all the deductions that have no specific references for validity would constitute a full time job which would take possibly longer than the public consultation time available. Consequently the public, like the Councillors, are expected to take much of the facts presented on trust. To what extent is there an urgent requirement for housing? How is this need expected to grow over the next 15 years? These facts are left					506	2250795_0_1.pdf		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>for us to guess. Where are the full results of environmental impact surveys for these proposed plans, particularly building on Dudsbury Heights (FWP7)?</p> <p>Clearly the Parley Cross junction does need improving, but this should not be achieved by vastly increasing the local population along with their associated vehicles and hoping the developers will pay for extra roads. Increasing the number of houses around Parley Cross will greatly increase the traffic and congestion in Christchurch Road between Haskins roundabout and Dudsbury which will not be eased by any extra roads planned around Parley Cross.</p> <p>2 Is the Report Consistent with National Policy?</p> <p>2.1 Bottom Up Planning & Localism</p> <p>The government have made it clear that their vision for future planning involves requests from Local communities that will be passed up the local government hierarchy to be finally adopted into the Council's Local Plan (see RIBA1 at end of letter). This is not the case with this Report and few in the local community have been consulted. The Report says on the first page, paragraph 1.15</p> <p>"The Core Strategy has been in preparation for a number of years. This has involved considerable community consultation, the collection of evidence and working with partners, including other Local Planning Authorities, service providers, town and parish councils, community groups, the Local Strategic Partnerships, businesses, government organisations and developers/agents."</p> <p>However the West Parley Parish Council have been totally sidelined and their Parish Plan that outlined the local people's ideas for the future of their neighbourhood totally neglected – there are no mentions of any Parish Plans anywhere in the Report (nothing in section 1.17 Evidence Base – Parish Plans are clearly not important to the EDDC).</p> <p>2.2 The Green Belt and its Protection</p> <p>The Green Belt has been established in England to protect against urban sprawl. Much of the land was set aside many years ago, with the intention that it should not be changed, removed or even increased, but in many places this report says "the Green Belt boundary will be amended" As if it's an appropriate thing to do. One councillor said at a public meeting "Rest assured we shall never build on the Green Belt – we shall just change its boundaries!"</p> <p>When discussing changing boundaries with my local MP Christopher Chope, he made it clear that in his words "the Green Belt was Sacrosanct". You can't go rolling it back, cut a bit off here, add a bit back there just to suit the whims of the local council. So even adding to the Green Belt (see section 11.27) is against government policy. If Councils are allowed to take small bits of Green Belt for housing whenever they think fit where will this end? Clearly, eventually there will be no green belt left or a belt so thin that it is of little use.</p> <p>I should like to refer to these paragraphs in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF 27-March 2012) Para 83:</p>						

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>“Once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances”</p> <p>Para 87: “As with previous Green Belt policy, inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances” So what are these exceptional circumstances? Paragraph 89 of NPPF lists these special circumstances, showing the inappropriateness of excessive building in the West Parley area. I have put my comments in bold text.</p> <p>Para 89: A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt. Exceptions to this are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Buildings for agriculture and forestry; (Not applicable) • Provision of appropriate facilities for outdoor sport, outdoor recreation and for cemeteries, as long as it preserves the openness of the Green Belt and does not conflict with the purposes of including land within it; (Not applicable) • The extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building; (Not applicable). • The replacement of a building, provided the new building is in the same use and not materially larger than the one it replaces; (Not applicable) • Limited infilling in villages, and limited affordable housing for local community needs under policies set out in the Local Plan; (Not applicable because of the large extent of proposed housing) or • Limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed sited (brownfield land), whether redundant or in continuing use (excluding temporary buildings) which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development (Not applicable) <p>So none of these exclusion criteria pass, therefore the construction of these houses in the Green Belt area around West Parley are inappropriate according to the Government’s NPPF.</p> <p>However, the EDDC say in the Report in section 3 Objective 1: “The Green Belt will be retained and protected, except for strategic release of land to provide new housing, and for employment development in East Dorset and at Bournemouth Airport”. That “except for” effectively cancels the first part of the sentence. So if it is strategic (important to an overall plan), involves building new houses or buildings for employment – the greenbelt will not be retained and protected. That means that the EDDC will give lip-service to protecting the Green Belt, but in practice, if they want to build houses or industrial estates anywhere, they will – if this Report is approved they have already granted themselves that permission.</p> <p>3 Is the Report Justified? The Report cannot be justified even by the Council’s own advisors.</p>						

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>In 2010, the suggestion involving developing all the available land south east o Parley Cross was referred to as the “Non Preferred Option FWP 5”. The reasons for this were given by the EDDC:</p> <p>“Developing the whole area would result in a large number of homes. The consultants undertaking the Habitats Regulations Assessment have concerns over the impact of such a large population living so close to Parley Common Special Protected Area (SPA) which could not be mitigated. Parley Cross is a very busy traffic dominated junction. Possible improvements to this junction could result in a pedestrian unfriendly environment and not one around which a new community should be based.” (Page 19 of Ferndown and West Parley Housing and Town Centre Options)</p> <p>Are these reasons no longer valid? If so what has changed? I suggest the opinions of the previous consultants are still very valid and this points to the inadequate consideration of the environmental impact of these now ‘policies’ contained in the Report.</p> <p>4 Is the Report Positively Prepared?</p> <p>Around 30 years ago, it was suggested that a Super Store (I am told it was ASDA) should be built at Parley Cross. This was quite sensibly turned down. The existing grocery store at Parley Cross has seen many owners – Spar, Circle K, Coop, and finally Tesco. Tesco seem to be holding on, maybe because they are a massive nation-wide company, but all the previous stores struggled hard to make a living. If a new supermarket is built opposite, it is goodbye to the local shops - they might as well pack up and go, completely changing the rural character of our area.</p> <p>The Report refers to what I call the beautiful fields to the east of New Road which give the area such an open and rural feel as “This is a flat featureless area ...” (10.36) as if it were worthless and building on it would be doing us all a favour; yet much of our best protected heath land is also “flat and featureless” but very valuable environmentally.</p> <p>Those living in the housing estate planned for east of New Road will be living in the centre of a huge gyratory system with busy traffic rushing by on all sides. The traffic flow will be impeded by no less than 5 consecutive roundabouts on the FWP6 link road. Children wishing to cross to the “Potential SANGS” or the Memorial Hall playground would take their lives in their hands – it is a recipe for accidents and to provide adequate crossings / traffic lights would cause even more congestion to traffic than we experience already.</p> <p>The Report says in 10.32 “West Parley Village Centre is presently compromised by a poor urban environment, dominated by roads and hardstanding”. Most locals I have spoken to do not want West Parley made more “urban” and dominated by houses as well as roads!</p> <p>The proposed houses in the Parley Cross area are in the direct flight path from Bournemouth International Airport whose air traffic is set to increase. Although the potential for an air accident is very remote, currently much of the land under the flight path is non-inhabited Green Belt with the flight</p>						

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
											<p>path continuing over the River Stour. It does not make sense to knowingly add houses directly under this flight path which may one day be a subject of a catastrophe.</p> <p>Finally, I have reason to believe that the fields opposite the shops at West Parley are Grade 1 Agricultural land and therefore should not be built on. A bill has recently been presented to Parliament by Laura Sandys (South Thanet, Conservative) which seeks to protect Grade 1 agricultural land. The bill "Planning (Grade 1 Agricultural Land Protection)", although not yet law, shows the direction that responsible Councils should be looking to satisfy future requirements.</p> <p>5 Summary</p> <p>In conclusion, I urge you to reject the "Draft Core Strategy Pre-submission Report" plan in its present form as unsound and not fit for purpose. The main cause of these inadequacies is the lack of consultation with those that really matter – the residents that have to live and work in the creation that the EDDC intend to make. Property developers and Councillors living remote to the area may agree with this Report but the majority of the locals do not see it that way. When there are public meetings concerning West Parley, the halls are packed. People take this matter seriously and don't want their environment spoilt for themselves and future generations. Most local people have a car and are quite happy to travel to the main supermarkets at Ferndown. Many young people who like the buzz of a city are happy to live in Bournemouth and would not want extra housing in West Parley. Too much of the EDDC decisions are made behind closed doors. We need true democracy here, and the local people's view must be considered by the EDDC so that a report may be produced that will truly reflect the wishes of the local residents.</p>							
491139	Mr & Mrs SJ Dixon-Gough		CSPS2579	Policy FWP6		No				No	<p>We refer to your core Strategy Pre-submission Consultation document regarding the planning for the future of West Parley Village and can say from the outset that, we believe, not a lot of thought has gone into the document and absolutely no consideration has been given to the current residents of West Parley. The whole issue including the proposed construction of two housing estates and a road system, which borders on the nonsensical and dangerous, has prompted us to respond. We have lived at the above address since 2007 and moved into the area to be closer to the countryside and a bit more peaceful than our previous address in Bournemouth. We have both worked hard over numerous years to realise this position and intend to spend our semi and permanent retirements with "like minded" people.</p> <p>We knew from the outset that in order to turn right out of Parley Close onto Christchurch Road and towards Parley Cross was a minor irritation, due to traffic flow but were prepared to put up with this as it seemed that the main times for major tailbacks were during the "rush-hours" in the morning and in the evening. At other times driver inconsideration is aggravating but it is acceptable. We are now threatened with new housing estates being built</p>				506			

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>at West Parley and Dudsbury. The obvious worry is the increase of traffic flow to the area. We are aware that the junction at Parley Cross is reputed to be the busiest in the County and looking at the proposed road scheme for the new estates this will make, not only the junction but, the whole area the busiest and possibly the most dangerous traffic area in the County.</p> <p>We are completely bemused by the proposals of preventing vehicles from turning left from Christchurch Road (East) into New Road (South), and from turning right, from New Road (South) into Christchurch Road (East). This will push all vehicles wanting to travel these routes through a housing estate. This will include heavy goods vehicles from the waste sites, the gravel extraction site, the airport and miscellaneous other articulated lorries, heavy articulated lorries, heavy goods vehicles, coaches and local traffic. Creating a great deal of unnecessary pollution for proposed residents as well as a greater risk of accidents and damage. A similar danger will be at Dudsbury. This is totally unacceptable and completely ridiculous. It would appear that you intend to speed up traffic going straight ahead at the traffic lights in all directions only to create three further "bottle-necks" less than half a mile from the lights. This I suggest will cause far more problems than it solves. (Especially from a personal point of view in trying to leave and gain entrance to Parley Close as it is a recorded fact that to turn right from a main road onto a side road is one, if not the most hazardous traffic manoeuvre in the highway code) Has anyone bothered to monitor the traffic flow through this junction throughout a whole day and then try to predict the impact that the proposed scheme will have on the area for the whole community?</p> <p>The proposed housing estate at New Road/Christchurch Road causes problems of its' own. As we understand the situation, West Parley does not have a housing problem so can we ask where the occupants, to inhabit these proposed developments, are coming from? We attended a "road show" at Parley Memorial Hall where these proposals were discussed. We were told that on this proposed housing estate, there would be 50% social housing ie:- houses that are rented by the Council and/or various housing associations. Why has this number got to be so high? Research in other areas have found – and this was recently featured on a television documentary – that it is a mistake to put so many houses/people of that bracket all together on one estate. The occupants do not feel part of the community or the neighbourhood. The documentary even showed people from these type of estates, around the country, saying that they didn't want to live in these areas as they can turn into "No go" areas and living there can form a stigma and an absolute nightmare for a majority of residents. Youngsters do not want to live in the countryside, they want to be closer to settled towns with all their amenities, there is no employment here for them. All around the country these types of estates are being demolished so why is this Council proposing to build one in West Parley and Dudsbury? At another meeting</p>						

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>we were told that in order to get so many houses on this land and make it profitable for the developers, the houses will have to be smaller than what is being shown. This the developer openly said at the meeting to a packed audience, This in itself will cause problems. You are proposing to increase the population of West Parley by 32% It may have escaped your notice that a vast majority of properties in this area are bungalows and you intend to build two storey properties. Looking at the plan for West Parley Village and especially at the above mentioned site you have plans for another supermarket in the Village. WHY? The location of it is on a junction. SHY? There is already a supermarket in the village and there are bigger supermarkets in the area if required. Can you tell us when deliveries will be made and where the delivery point is? (a further traffic hazard and more pollution for the proposed estate we suggest). You have mentioned on the map a feature "Potential SANG". I again have to ask WHY, when there is already an area in existence, which you intend to cover in concrete. This area is a possible floodplain and a flight path to the airport. Where is your thinking? What is a local centre? Could it be a building or area to attract the ASBO collectors, graffiti artists and alcohol abusers (it is next to a proposed supermarket and a ready supply of alcohol and litter) You are intending to degrade a very nice and peaceful area..</p> <p>Can you tell me where the residents of these proposed developments will receive medical and dental care? Where will their employment be? Where are their traffic links with the bigger centres? And can you enlighten us on the involvement of the Plymouth Bretheren who, we understand, have already purchased land on this proposed site?</p> <p>You requested a West Parley Parish Plan, which was completed by about 1000 residents. From your latest communications you have paid not one jot of recognition to this. Where are the environmental studies, feasibility studies and historical studies into the area? Where are these results published, if indeed you have any?</p> <p>According to Central Government, green belt land should be for life (you obviously think differently) There are brown sites throughout this and national areas to solve the so called housing crisis without removing green belt land.</p> <p>In conclusion, we have to say that your proposals are NOT PROVEN, UNSOUND and toally against National policy and the wishes and rights of the local community</p>						
491163	Mr Butterfield		CSPS2568	Policy FWP6							<p>I wish to express my views on the building of 520 new houses in West Parley. I am totally against building on green belt – I thought this was introduced to prevent the spread of urban sprawl. This land is home to important and protected species of animals. It is enjoyed by residents who walk these fields by official footpaths. I understand the need for new homes but surely 32% increase is excessive and the losing of 6.6% of green belt from West Parley is unacceptable.</p> <p>With regard to the construction of 2 new roads creating 4 new junctions on extremely busy roads is ridiculous. The traffic</p>				506		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											problems would not be solved by this proposal. What happened to the idea of a gyratory system at the crossroads? I believe the residents of West Parley are entitled to have their views listened to and should have more input in the development of the village.						
491173	Ms G Burningham		CSPS2595	Policy FWP6							I am writing yet again, although I don't think the Council takes any notice, and has already decided what it doing before anyone get to hear it. My points are once again To much Traffic at Parley Cross, we don't need anymore shops as there always seems to be empty ones already. To add two more roads will make even more traffic. More people need more, doctors dentists and for the children more schools. I haven't heard anything about that. The Green areas you take can never be replaced.				506		
494723	Mr D Brittain		CSPS2549	Policy FWP6	No	No	No	No	No	No	We moved to this area of West Parley just over two years ago to live among quiet like minded mature people, without too many children running around. Now, we find that suddenly the District Council propose to build three hundred & twenty houses East of New road, West Parley, plus a further two hundred homes West of New Road, with a minimum of 50% being affordable, which is a whopping 32% increase for West Parley. This is totally unacceptable to us, particularly as over half of the new properties would be affordable. If we had wanted to live near a Council Estate, we would have moved to West Howe, not West Parley. Where is the proof that these houses are actually needed. This land is green belt Land, which are "key gaps" between West Parley & Bournemouth, to prevent "urban sprawl" which is the very thing that you are now proposing, without, may I add, even the decency to consult us until this late stage. You cannot just "move" green belt land to where it suits you. The land is used as agricultural land at the moment, & it is against national policy to build on such land. A 32% increase in housing also brings problems with traffic, schools, employment & health. Where are these people coming from to fill five hundred & twenty houses? That is over one thousand people plus children. Most councils are demolishing such estates, not building them. Putting main roads through a housing estate is utter madness, & very dangerous for children. The District Council has totally ignored the wishes of local residents, & in fact, held meetings, & made decisions where residents were not even allowed to speak. This, alone, makes the proposals unsound, & undemocratic. One thousand residents responded to the West Parley Parish plan which was totally ignored. I submit to you that these proposals are unsound, unproven against National Policy, & certainly against the wishes of the local community.		Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	Yes I wish to participate at the oral examination because the wishes of local residents has been totally ignored.	506		
494736	Mr & Mrs S Cox		CSPS2538	Policy FWP6							Building of 220 houses on the FWP 7 and 300 on FWP 6 sites.				506		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>I am writing to object strongly to your proposals for the above. Being a resident I already have to tolerate traffic chaos travelling to and fro from any direction to my home, whether on foot or by car. At congestion periods it can take up to an hour to get home from the airport! Your plans to add and alter directions of existing roads would be inadequate to cope with the amount of new home owners vehicles. You are simply adding further chaos and congestion to an already exhausted infrastructure.</p> <p>To destroy Green Belt land for yet another supermarket, concrete complex is totally unacceptable and a waste of money when we have so many within 1-3 mile radius. Doctors Surgery's and schools in the area are full to capacity; could they really cope with a further multi influx of persons? Your proposal is ludicrous and warrants serious reconsideration.</p>						
495680	Mr J M Brown		CSPS2584	Policy FWP6							<p>I view with alarm your proposals for the building of 520 houses on Green belt land in West Parley, which is a massive increase over what the local residents considered was reasonable. I recall that a survey carried out by the Parish Council, concluded that up to 200 would still retain the village nature of this area.</p> <p>I In order to impose this vastly increased number, you propose to infill the essential strips of Green Belt, which had been retained for the express purpose of avoiding urban sprawl from the Bournemouth. . Furthermore, you propose to further carve up this area by a road network to service this urban sprawl, which will destroy for even the essential charm of West Parley as a village on the edge of Ferndown.</p> <p>I would like to know on whose authority you are imposing your plans in this area? Under the present government's policy of the adoption of Localism, plans must be with the support of the residents, and not to alienate them or ride roughshod over them, where there is clearly no support.</p> <p>I can only see this ending up with a full judicial review, in order to place a limit on your grandiose plans for West Parley.</p>				506		
498270	Mr and Mrs P Herrington		CSPS2542	Policy FWP6							<p>As residents of West Parley, we would like to draw your attention to our comments regarding some of the Policies under consultation:</p> <p>Ref: Policy FWP6 (Plans for 300 houses, supermarket and shopping centre & link road)</p> <p>Ref: Policy FWP7 (Plans for 220 houses and the new Road)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The New Road and Dudsbury heights fields are not just green belt; they are "Key Gaps" with Bournemouth, there to prevent urban sprawl. We want to remain as West Parley – the policies above will join our conurbations and create urban sprawl a contradiction in terms. • Why are we having a 32% increase in our housing stock? Our Parish Plan clearly outlined our aspirations, a plan encouraged by the District Council; it appears that as residents we have been ridiculed, as these have not been considered at all. We are meant to live in a democratic society 				506		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>– we have not been consulted during the preparation of these new plans at all!</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Both link roads will cause more congestion, during construction of the properties and more so after completion once occupied. We live on the main Christchurch Road, and have seen an increase in traffic since we moved here 4 years ago. • More noise, pollution and more industrial vehicles on this road already in 4 years, surely this is will increase the problems we already have a) with the ignorance of speed restrictions by drivers, b) no crossings midway for the pedestrians and horse riders c) more cyclists on our service road more hazards to create accidents d) more airport traffic. • No regard for our wildlife and any endangered species that will be affected. • What's it going to be like at Parley Cross, more congestion on all main roads backing up causing more delays at many more times of the day. • All with the added problem of a new shopping parade and the parking, entry and exit dilemmas associated with these amenities, in an area already over its capacity. • How will it affect local businesses already in situ at Parley Cross • As for link roads passing through urban areas, surely this has not been thought through from a safety aspect for residents particularly for young children or the elderly. • Where are the children from families taking residence in these new homes going to school are their enough places in our existing local education facilities? • What plans have been thought for welfare, medical and dentistry requirements & local transport? <p>On 14th February we sent a e-mail to 35 Councillors, we received replies from Cllr J Wilson, Cllr S Lugg, Cllr B Manuel and Spencer Flower, only 4, that's only 11%. Its obvious where the other 31 votes are"! You're definitely not listening to us residents, is this because it does not effect each of you personally where you live? Please consider our views we really do care about where we live in West Parley.</p>						
498446	Mr W A Murphy		CSPS2594	Policy FWP6							<p>The website consultation facility was unusable to the lay person and therefore of little use. Previous consultations appear to have been ignored. I have, therefore, chosen to make my comments by letter.</p> <p>I object strongly to Policy FWP6 for the development of some 300 houses and the new road on the New Road field:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This area is a Key Gap part of Green Belt policy and was designed to prevent the very sort of urban sprawl the development will achieve. This should not happen • This development will increase traffic on already seriously congested roads which are prone to accidents of which I have first-hand experience. The delay in the construction of the proposed link roads will only exacerbate the situation. • No-one seems to have considered the noise pollution from aircraft from Bournemouth Airport which has expansion plans 				506		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
											and whose flight path passes more or less over the development. This is where aircraft engines are emitting their maximum noise signature. This is only building in trouble for the future especially in 'affordable' houses.. • The plans make no allowance for the additional strain which will be placed on the existing infrastructure, schools, etc. which are already at capacity. • There is no need for an additional supermarket. We are adequately supplied by local Sainsbury's, Tesco, Lidl and Waitrose. There are also sufficient smaller local shops whose livelihood will be destroyed by such a development. I ask that you take these objections into consideration when making your decision							
498455	Mrs Rosemary Dark		CSPS2606	Policy FWP6	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Not Justified because there is no evidence that the views of the local community and others who may have a stake in the area have been taken into account. The two new link roads and the reshaping of the shopping area on New Road have not been part of any previous consultation, so the document is not justified on these grounds. Not Effective because the plans are not deliverable as currently shown. They are uneconomic as 50% of the housing will have to be 'social', meaning they have to be sold to a Housing Association at cost price and, with the many levies that will have to be imposed to cover infrastructure such as new link roads and Heathland Mitigation the sums are not viable. Not consistent with national policy because the Plan is contrary to Core Planning as set out in NPPF, which states that a plan should be genuinely "plan-led" empowering local people to shape their surroundings with succinct local and neighbourhood plans, setting out a positive vision for the future". Moreover, the need has not been proved which would allow valuable Green Belt land, which serves the purpose of stopping urban sprawl, to be rolled back to allow housing. Finally, it is unlikely that there are enough First and Middle School places for the children of the new homes but the document ignores this issue for West Parley – if there could be a need to build a new school, details of its possible location should have been included in the document. Questions 6 & 7 Policy FWP6 is a proposal to build 320 houses (minimum of 50% affordable), a supermarket, shopping centre and link road on the field alongside New Road in spite of the fact that this is green belt land. This land provides a Key Gap between West Parley and Bournemouth which is considered of extreme importance, since West Parley is a village of ancient origin with a far longer history than Bournemouth. These Key Gaps were introduced in order to prevent urban sprawl and this was the principal reason for having a green belt in the first place, so it is against all reason that the District Council now suggests that houses should be built on this important natural area. It is of vital importance, therefore, that West Parley does not become a mere suburb of Bournemouth but that it retains its own identity through the preservation of the green belt land	On the above grounds, I strongly object to the proposals described in FWP6.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		506			

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
											<p>that currently exists.</p> <p>It is also extremely important to make the point that West Parley recently published its Parish Plan, following encouragement to do so by the District Council. Over 1000 residents, a large percentage of the total population of West Parley, contributed to this plan and their overriding decision was that no more than 100 houses could be built in West Parley without damaging the character of the village and that these should, in general, be built on brown belt land. It appears that the District Council has virtually ignored the Parish Plan and the views of so many households.</p> <p>The policies FWP6 and FWP7 have been formulated by the District Council without any involvement or consultation in their preparation with the West Parley Parish Council or the residents of West Parley. Such action is, in my opinion, undemocratic and takes no account of the opinions of residents who have expressed themselves so strongly in rejecting the District Council's plan for building of a total of 520 houses, representing an additional 32% increase in West Parley's housing stock, which would be excessive, damaging and far greater than the increases being suggested for neighbouring towns and parishes including Corfe Mullen, Wimborne Ferndown and Verwood.</p> <p>On the above grounds, I strongly object to the proposals described in FWP6.</p>							
499745	Mr M C Tompkins		CSPS2602	Policy FWP6							<p>My concerns & Objections to the Developments on "Green Belt" land at FWP7 & FWP6 are as follows:</p> <p>Low cost "Affordable Housing Estates" would not be compatible with the 'Non Estate' residential properties at West Parley Village.</p> <p>Problems caused by raising the height of the abnormal high water table levels at West Parley Village and surrounding areas may destroy the workings of water wells at West Parley. The "Green Belt" agricultural land absorbs a large quantity of water before draining into meadow land near FWP7 and FWP6 within the Stour Valley.</p> <p>Any developments will cause un-controlled surface water "Run Off". Expensive to over load the current surface water and sewage systems</p> <p>It is un-necessary to saturate West Parley Village with the proposed 520 houses. A massive increase of 32% to housing stock in the "Green Belt" at West Parley Village.</p> <p>It is bad planning to subject a further 1,500 people to "polluted air" and high noise levels caused by aircraft movements over & close to the areas FWP7 and FWP6</p> <p>Approximately 80% of West Parley Village residents do not want the East Dorset District Council "Top Down" planning for the "Green Belt" areas FWP7 and FWP6.</p>					506		
500818	Mr J Ladd		CSPS2519	Policy FWP6							<p>I want to register my objection to the proposals for a substantial increase in the housing density at West Parley. Policies FWP6 and FWP7</p> <p>For FWP6, 300 planned houses with roads and shops to be built on present Green Belt land is preposterous. What is the point of the term Green Belt if it is to be ignored? This</p>					506		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>particular area forms the last barrier of fields between Bournemouth and Ferndown/West Parley.</p> <p>The traffic levels at Parley Cross are already high and with an extra estimated 500-1000 cars (with FWP7) using the roads, the situation will only get much worse.</p> <p>For FWP7, 220 planned houses close to an ancient hill fort is also folly. We should protect sites like this, not leave them open to danger from building works.</p> <p>Furthermore a substantial amount of concrete and tarmac at this site will lead to the possibility of flooding on the roads and houses below.</p> <p>West Parley Parish Council has requested residents' opinions about the proposed development and a substantial majority are not in favour of this. Notice should be taken of these views.</p> <p>The development also means almost a third increase on the number of houses: the village cannot tolerate that sort of increase.</p> <p>I urge all members of the Planning Committee to take heed of the points and not just file them to gather dust.</p>						
501234	Dr A Grieve		CSPS2617	Policy FWP6							<p>I write to express my extreme concern about the housing plans for West Parley.</p> <p>An increase of 32% in the local housing stock will place an unsupportable load on infrastructure.</p> <p>West Parley has a current pollution of 3600 and the ?? plans will raise this to around 5000</p> <p>Housing is of course needed and West Parley must make its contribution but not at the expense of spoiling everything that makes it a quiet and attractive place to live.</p> <p>I beg you to reconsider these plans</p>				506		
501822	Mr Stephen Collins		CSPS2629	Policy FWP6	No					Yes	<p>I argue against the strategy on the basis of protecting the Green Belt, a desire embedded in national planning policy, with which the strategy is inconsistent.</p> <p>Traditional shops and affordable housing are desirable, but not 'very special circumstances' worth the sacrifice of our important 'Key Gap' Green Belt. The proposal for a superstore is not justified as it is not based on any evidence, indeed the Issues and Options consultation found evidence for the requirement of tradition independent food shops.</p> <p>FWP6 closes up the Key Gap with Bournemouth and is therefore inconsistent with national policy which provides to prevent urban sprawl.</p> <p>The strategy is not justified because other, more appropriate alternatives have not been considered and it is not the most appropriate strategy. Government wishes to prefer brown field development and we have an ideal site available on the former Dormy hotel land.</p> <p>The impact on the green belt would be so adverse as to outweigh any perceived benefits and so destroying it is inconsistent with national policy. Indeed this strategy fails on so many counts of tests of soundness that one wonders how it ever got to this stage.</p> <p>Furthermore, if this strategy were implemented, there would be building on or removal of trees with TPOs. There is a bat</p>				506		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>reserve in the areas of the proposed link road. Grade 2 agricultural land will be lost – again, going against national policy.</p> <p>Roads pass through or close to housing estates. Children playing outside will be in danger from the traffic. To drive to Chine Walk from New Road coming from Bournemouth, I would have to turn left into the link road, circumvent the estate, and then turn right into heavy Christchurch Road traffic before taking a left turn into Chine Walk. The statistics for delays and for road traffic accidents occurring when turning right from a minor road into a major one show how ludicrous the idea to close the left turn filter lane at Parley Cross. Furthermore, the link road will take heavy traffic across the Stour Valley Way, not improving access to nor enhancing nor protecting a national trail – again, against national policy. The strategy is also undemocratic, because, though you may have taken a survey of local people, you have largely ignored it. Local people said ‘we should try at all costs to preserve the Green Belt. Yet you are proposing a massive 32% increase in West Parley’s housing stock. Whether you talk of preserving 99.5% of East Dorset’s Green Belt or not, that is irrelevant when the cost to West Parley is so disproportionately high. SANG is no compensation when we already have Green Belt and when residents said ‘please keep West Parley and surrounding areas pleasant to live in, by limiting the density of all these options. Councils are elected. They work for the electorate. They do not ride roughshod over the expressed opinions, requirements and needs of the community they were elected to serve.</p>						
501826	Mr Gordon Hunt		CSPS2627	Policy FWP6							<p>Please accept my painting as my contribution to the Parley Planning debate.</p> <p>I have lived in the area since 1997 and have been impressed by the activities of Parley parish to maintain the parish by planting flowers and picking up litter etc.</p> <p>Many of the roads in the area are still country lanes and the limited number of river crossings generates traffic chaos In the event of accidents etc. i.e. at the Black water intersection. I ride an electric bike, but many routes are suicidal e.g. riding down the Ringwood Rd to Poole.</p> <p>Parley is a beautiful area and I don’t like to see valuable farmland given over to housing.</p> <p>I appreciate that additional housing is required, but I am sure there is plenty non agricultural land. We have to Import 40% of our food!</p> <p>The land is on the flight path to Hurn airport and there have been three air accidents close to the airport while I have lived here. The Dornier twin engine ed aircraft is the biggest offender as it is very noisy and circles at low altitude many days of the week.</p> <p>The proposed link road to Longham crosses an area that floods regularly and is close to an iron age complex at Dudsbury.</p> <p>I trust my comments are helpful and constructive.</p>				506	2257592_0_1.pdf 2257601_0_1.pdf 2257622_0_1.pdf	
503518	C		CSPS2550	Policy							We write to set out our objections to the above, which we trust				506		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
	Skipton			FWP6							<p>will be taken notice of:- Policy FWP7 (220 houses on Dudsbury Heights) and FWP6 (300 houses on the fields on the south east of the New Road/Christchurch Road junction).</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This is a proposed increase in the housing stock of 520 dwellings (32%), which is unsustainable and completely out of proportion to the size of West Parley. Further it is very different to the proposals in the 2010 plans upon which no further discussion, to my knowledge, has taken place. 2. The proposed link roads will not be built until approx. 50% of the houses have themselves been built. This will cause absolute chaos at the New Road/Christchurch Road junction. If any of you have actually tried to travel through this junction during business hours, let alone the rush hours, you will realise that even now it is far overstretched with queues back to the airport in one direction, Longham mini roundabouts in another, New Road bridge and Glenmoor Road in others. I still do not see the proposed road changes being adequate to handle the additional traffic caused by 520 houses and a shopping development. 3. The proposed land to be built on is not any old bit of "green belt" but an essential gap between West Parley and Bournemouth. It is essential that these gaps are maintained to avoid a hideous urban sprawl along this part of the country and to maintain the village atmosphere of West Parley rather than have it subsumed into a huge conurbation. 4. The parish plan was put together with contributions from over 1000 residents and this plan has basically been totally ignored by the District Council when putting together this development proposal. 5. Finally this proposed increase in housing stock is far in excess of that proposed for other areas of Dorset (ie Verwood, Wimborne, Ferndown and Corfe Mullen). We have spent some considerable time and effort in putting down our feelings towards these proposals in an effort to have our voices heard. <p>You were elected as councillors by the local residents to represent them and their wishes for the area, however, we have to say that, as in all cases of political matters, our views, along with other like-minded residents, will undoubtedly be totally ignored and the councillors/politicians will go ahead and do their own thing as usual.</p>						
503689	Mr and Mrs Dunnings		CSPS2559	Policy FWP6							<p>I am writing in connection with the above as I found your questionnaire to be legally biased, and I am not legally trained.</p> <p>First I would like to point out the fact that the development of FWP6 is under the flight path, I cannot see many people wanting to purchase and we do not wish this area to be turned into a slum of the future.</p> <p>Secondly, building generally on green belt I would have thought is illegal, we must reserve our green pastures which are a joy to this country.</p> <p>Thirdly, I have lived in this area for nearly forty years and feel the planners do not know the area very well. The two</p>				506		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description					
											<p>proposed roads enter New Road and Christchurch Road, both of which are extremely busy and quite often congested. New Road traffic blocks at Northbourne roundabout, the queue passing through West Parley well up to Ferndown. Christchurch Road blocks regularly at Longham roundabouts, traffic attempting to pass through Longham, where there is a very narrow bridge, traffic backs well into Ferndown. Fourthly, the schools are full, doctors surgeries appear to be overflowing, I personally feel that with so very many extra cars from the proposed FWP6 and FWP7 sites, plus more houses planned for a site further up Christchurch Road, the old garden centre, let alone the proposed development on what was the Dormy Hotel in New Road, is asking far too much for a small village to accommodate.</p> <p>I would also make the obvious comment that with all the increased traffic (each new house having at least one or two cars, the emergency services, ambulance, fire and police will encounter great difficulties leading to long delays, with tragic results.</p> <p>I appreciate that our young people need homes, but with the lack of work in the area, many blocks of flats are now available having replaced large houses plus smaller properties.</p>											
503869	Mrs Jean Khan		CSPS2523	Policy FWP6	No		Yes				<p>I wish to stress the following points regarding the Core Strategy plans for Policy FWP6 and Policy FWP7. As to why I think these plans are impractical and unjustified.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Movement of Green Belt to suit development plans. This is contrary to legislation and maintenance of Green Belt land. This reduces the gap between Northbourne and West Parley Village. The New Road and Dudsbury Heights fields are Key Gaps with Bournemouth to prevent urban sprawl. 2. The EDDC have ignored the views of the Parish Council and the residents of West Parley who contributed to the Parish Plan. 520 new houses is a 32% increase in West Parley's housing stock. This is excessive compared to other areas in Dorset. 3. WE DO NOT HAVE ADEQUATE SCHOOLS AND MEDICAL FACILITIES TO COPE WITH THIS. West Parley school is already overflowing and the Pennys Hill Practice in Ferndown is already pushed to its limit. 4. 520 new homes mean another 1000 cars in the vicinity, West Parley Cross Roads already one of the most congested local areas. This can only cause more chaos. 5. Affordable housing means houses with no garages. Cars parked anywhere I must presume. 6. In the 1980's Tesco applied to build a Supermarket on the Green Belt area. The application was turned down. Now Policy FWP6 suggests 300 houses and a supermarket and shops. Yet an application for flats on the opposite side of the road was rejected on grounds of accessibility. The EDDC appears to have one law for itself and one law for everyone else. 7. The newly proposed link road from Christchurch Road New Road goes straight through of the middle of the new High 					506						

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
											Density housing estate, this will surely be dangerous for young families living there, and what about the noise? 8. The two new link roads will not be started until half the houses are built, this means the roads at West Parley Cross will be taking hundreds of more cars a day. How can we copy with this? I respectfully submit what I hope are valid points regarding the FWP6 and FWP7 CORE STRATEGY PLANS, AND AS TO WHY THEY SHOULD NOT PROCEED. I HOPE SOME GOOD SENSE WILL PREVAIL SOMEWHERE!!							
509543	Mrs Beryl MacDonald		CSPS2700	Policy FWP6							I wish to object to the building of 220 houses on the FWP 7 and 300 on FWP6 sites for the u/m reasons: (1) The Consultation process is unsatisfactory. (a) Government legislation requires you to consult fully with local communities before setting out proposals. EDDC planners ignored this legislation. (b) West Parley has produced, after a lengthy consultation with residents, a well publicised Parish Plan, copies of which were sent to EDDC. In this Plan residents are overwhelmingly against having more than about 100 houses built in West Parley. This source of information has been ignored by EDDC planners. (c) EDDC have relied too much on the use of electronic communication to provide information to residents for this consultation and assumed that all residents in West Parley have access to the internet. This is far from the case and most residents are extremely concerned about the proposals but are unable to find the information they need to consider the proposals effectively. (d) To build more than 100 houses in West Parley would create an unbroken urban sprawl from Bournemouth to Ferndown and beyond. West Parley would lose its identity and become just another small part of a very large conurbation. Both of the proposed building sites constitute much valued green belt land which provides this break between the Bournemouth and Ferndown boundaries. This was the reason for introducing the Green Belt system many years ago. This land brings the countryside into the village and with it many important land protected species of animals. Sightings of badgers, foxes, otters, deer, buzzards are frequently reported. This improves the quality of life of all residents who regularly use these fields through which official footpaths pass. (e) The 2 new roads proposed around the proposed building sites will be dangerous for children living in the new houses and will not ease the already stretched traffic system in West Parley. Traffic jams will be merely moved further down the main roads. 500 extra houses will bring up to 1000 extra cars all trying to get out of and into West Parley which is already ridiculously over crowded. (e) 520 extra houses in West Parley represents an increase in housing of about 32%. This is excessive and if far more than is proposed for the other East Dorset communities. Without					506		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
											<p>the appropriate infrastructure of adequate school places, doctors, dentists, community centres etc there will be unacceptable pressure on existing provision.</p> <p>Site FWP7</p> <p>(a) Dudsbury Rings is an important heritage site and this field is too closely connected to the site for the security of this important site to be protected.</p> <p>(b) In winter time and in times of heavy rain the slope of the field causes water to run down hill to flood the unmade and private road, Ridgeway, every time. With heavy traffic, servicing the shops at Parley Cross using Ridgway every day, the road surface is severely eroded and flooded which makes it very unpleasant for residents who are also responsible for the upkeep of the road. With so much more concrete laid on the field due to the proposed buildings flooding would be even worse.</p> <p>Site FWP 6</p> <p>(a) Yet another Supermarket in the area is not needed and will only bring in much more traffic to bring chaos to the already crowded roads of West Parley. Sufficient supermarkets (Tesco, Asda, Sainsbury 2 Lidl) already exist within 3 mile radius of West Parley and 3 Tesco Express shops exist in a radius of 1 mile of Parley Cross. There is no demand for allotments, orchards etc.</p> <p>West Parley should not be sacrificed by planners' unrealistic dreams and an attempt at social engineering. I urge you to reconsider these proposals and to start talking to the people in West Parley Community who are entitled to have a say in the drawing up of proposals for any increase in housing in their village.</p>							
511916	Mr Craig Baker		CSPS2641	Policy FWP6	No		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	<p>In response to the East Dorset and Christchurch Pre-submission Consultation, I would like to make the following observations that are specifically relevant to policies FWP5, FWP6 FWP7 and the related maps. In their current format, these policies are inter-related and will not work independently, therefore my comments will apply to these three policies.</p> <p>With regard to the new road layout, I consider the proposals to be unsound, ineffective and unjustified due to the lack of detail within the plans and the consultation document. Specifically, the scheme cannot be justified, as the proposal is based on reducing the impact of traffic at Parley Cross, reducing the tree lanes on the New Road South side of the junction to one. This is predicated on a new link road from New Road to Christchurch Road. The current road layout utilises three lanes in the northbound direction, yet the consultation does not address how the traffic using these lanes will be pushed back further along New Road towards Northbourne.</p> <p>The consultation does not propose new slip lanes to turn left into the new road, that will as the existing road layout confirms, is necessary to aid the movement of traffic. I believe that a slip road will be necessary, back toward the iron bridge but this will be necessary infrastructure if this plan is to go</p>				506	2255992_0_1.pdf 2255991_0_1.pdf		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>ahead. However this would be extremely expensive and have a high impact on the environment. This is a flood plain area supplied by watercourses draining from the fields and springs in the nearby field.</p> <p>The pre-submission document makes it clear that the proposals should be in line with national planning policy. The document does not state whether the plans are in line with Planning Policy Statement 25 – Flood management through spatial strategy. As stated above, the proposed road will be crossing the flood plain (which floods frequently and is well known to local residents). However, at the open evenings held at Parley Memorial Hall, the planning team denied the road would be going across the flood plain. Having lived at the above address for more than twelve years, I have seen the fields flood on many occasions, that affect the fields up to the current bridle way and has once flooded New Road itself, resulting in road closure.</p> <p>I have attached photograph, taken in April and May 2012 that provide evidence of the extent of the flooding on these fields and the drainage ditches that would be affected by the building of any slip road on the proposed site. One of these photographs was taken from my window, and importantly for my family, indicates how close this new road will be to our property. The link road will provide an unnecessary impact on the area and the case for the road is unjustified, therefore the consultation is in effective.</p> <p>Policy FWP7 identifies a requirement for 200 new homes, but in my view the consultation has not justified the requirements for these homes or the number of homes identified.</p> <p>FWP6 identifies a requirement for 320 homes my view the consultation has not justified the requirements for these homes or the number of homes identified. This policy also identifies a new food store and the provision for focal buildings, but with very little or no detail to justify the need, and have not provided details for other key community services, in particular, the provision of increased local school places. The link road on this side of the development will have an unnecessary intrusion and the details for the plan have not been justified.</p> <p>The areas affected by these policies are currently green belt, all be it for agricultural use. The policies for these areas proposes suitable alternative green space, but the green spaces proposed are currently green spaces. How can the proposals be considered sound when the alternatives are currently green?</p> <p>It is noted that Dorset County Council, as the Transport Authority has requested a larger scheme in order to justify a major transportation solution. How can the proposals be considered sound when the scale of the development is based on the road layout and not a justified need for the number of houses?</p> <p>On a personal level, I object to the plans produced on the basis that my home will be directly and substantially affected by the impact of the new road layout. Access to our property is already difficult with traffic on New Road, but based on the</p>						

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
											plan proposals presented and discussed with your consultants at the open evening, we will be squeezed between two additional sets of traffic controls on New Road (between the 2 proposed link Roads) that will be less than ¼ mile apart and only ½ mile from Parley Cross lights, that will undoubtedly further hinder access to our property. This will, in my view substantially affect the value of our property as well as the views our property enjoys and impact our quality of life through additional traffic flow, noise and airborne pollution.							
512344	Mr M Wyeth		CSPS2662	Policy FWP6	No		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	<p>This scheme does not fulfil the “Tests of Soundness” for the following reasons.</p> <p>Not Justified</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Where is the evidence that so many houses in one area are required? - Where are the jobs - Where are the facilities to meet such a large increase in housing. ie schools and doctors etc. - No consideration to Parish Plan – 80% of West Parley residents do not want housing estates on the Green Belt. - District Council did not listen to what we wanted and there was no consultation. - District Plan 520 houses – increase of 32% on West Parley’s housing stock and far more than any other community is being asked to take. - The meeting to approve plans on 5 March 2012 was undemocratic as the public were barred from speaking and not even held in East Dorset. <p>Not Effective</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The plan is not deliverable without firstly instigating the major road infrastructure required. We have been informed this will not happen before the building commences due to lack of funds - The plan is not flexible because there are no reasonable alternatives proposed. Yet again not enough consultation in this Planning process. - Too many unanswered questions that would make this plan unable to be monitored and not enough expertise in the planning department to monitor it. <p>National Policy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - This plan is not consistent with National Policy on building on GREEN BELT. - No consultation with West Parley Residents. - Full support of local member of parliament who opposes the scheme as not consistent with National Policy. 				506			
512406	Mr and Mrs PE and JA Coward		CSPS2695	Policy FWP6							<p>We wish to raise a number of points relating to the proposed changes to West Parley as per Policies FWP6 and FWP7. Although not politically nor ‘NIMBY’ motivated, we have been closely following the proposals for the area in which we live. Firstly, we cannot understand why the ‘Green Belt Areas’ at New Road and Dudsbury Heights have to be taken over for housing and roads. The green areas are the main aspect that differentiates West Parley from the Borough of Bournemouth. With the proposed increase in housing stock and the use of the Greenland for that purpose is a backward step. Checking</p>				506			

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>the proposals, alternatives have been suggested for suitable areas of natural green space[S.A.N.G.] if this is the case, one can envisage that if this present green belt is not sacrosanct, the proposed new areas are likely to be taken over at some future date also.</p> <p>The proposals indicate a new housing stock for West Parley of over 30% to what is already in place and is being unjustly forced upon the area. Compared to proposals for areas such as Corfe Mullen, Wimborne and others, West Parley is being treated as the poor relation.</p> <p>The West Parley Parish Council has been outspoken as to the merits or otherwise of the projected plans for West Parley. Many residents consider that the Parish Council are 'spot on' when it comes to the concerns of the general populace. It seems that some from a higher tier of local government appear to think they know better than the West Parley residents and parish councillors. The 2010 proposals/plans are different to the current proposals from the East Dorset and Dorset County Councils and as far as we can tell, the local voices of opposition have not been listened to nor consulted at all.</p> <p>We do understand that new housing is necessary for the area, but the 'Dormy Hotel' site has been empty for years with little progress for a large area of ground that should have been considered first without recourse to the green belt land at New Road proposed in Policy FWP7. In addition, the 'Coppins' site in Christchurch Road has already been earmarked for additional housing.</p> <p>If there has to be new housing in either FWP6 or FWP7, the lesser of the 2 evils would be the houses on Dudsbury Heights field (FWP7). At least the planners and highways departments have considered a link road for that location which could be workable. The proposal for FWP7 shows that the link road to be located at the edge of the proposed new housing stock, which if built, would be the correct location for it to be situated.</p> <p>The proposal for the new link road between New Road and Christchurch Road (FWP6) is a disaster waiting to happen. Plans for this link road indicate that it is to be built directly in the middle of the proposed new housing estate. One can imagine that if constructed in its proposed form, there will be a campaign from the new population asking for a link road around the estate as it will be dangerous for all especially children. The current traffic from New Road to Christchurch Road and the Hurn Industrial estate is very busy with all sorts and sizes of vehicular traffic. This proposal will not be a 'residents only' route and we fear that if this proposal goes ahead, some in high office will have their consciences pricking when the inevitable happens.</p> <p>We also consider that the creation of link roads will cause problems. At a recent road-show, there were conversations with staff from the highways and planning departments. We were told that traffic lights would be installed at both ends of the link roads and coordinated to 'keep the traffic moving' and 'away from the Parley crossroads'. If traffic lights are installed,</p>						

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>we believe that the result would be gridlock in a short space of time. One only has to look at Ferndown town centre and Wimborne Road East to West Moors to see that the traffic lights are not coordinated now, so we fear for the village of West Parley.</p> <p>In addition, if the link roads are to be built, it should be guaranteed that they are in place BEFORE any housing construction commences. We do not want West Parley to be an apparent building site for a significant time, where traffic is stalled because alternative routes are not in place. Parley Crossroads may be over capacity, but at least everyone receives a turn at the traffic lighted crossroads and although slow, the traffic does, in general keep moving, especially when the filters are in operation. We also feel that if restrictions are put into place as to vehicular traffic movements at the centre of Parley Cross then some motorists will endeavour to find alternative routes, which will mean busier traffic in residential areas in and around the outskirts of Parley.</p> <p>Please bear in mind too that the shops at Parley are doing their best in difficult circumstances. Parking there is a concern, particularly as some drivers are using the Bournemouth airport car parks when going on holiday. Restricted time parking [if policed] would assist in creating space for the shop users. It should be borne in mind that drivers already attempt to use this area as a 'rat run' and this type of use will increase if the new proposals FWP6 and FWP7 are accepted and put into place.</p> <p>In summary, we would like to reiterate the main points of our letter: -</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Retain as much of the 'Green Belt' as much as possible. If the 'Green Belt' is used now, alternatives are likely to be taken over in the future too as the precedent will have been made. 2) Plans for FWP6 should not go ahead. 3) If there is to be development, let it be policy FWP7 4) If either or both schemes are to go ahead, build the link roads before any houses are erected. You should ensure that they are positioned at the edge of any development, not in the middle of residential housing. 5) Reconsider the Parley Crossroads through routes. Narrowing the junctions will not be good for the area traffic nor the environment. 6) Listen to the views of the residents of West Parley and bear in mind that those who remain silent are not necessarily in agreement with the current proposals. 						
515878	Mr & Mrs G Ball		CSPS2701	Policy FWP6							<p>We are writing to you to object to both of the above planning proposals. We are very concerned about the proposed 520 homes that could be built in West Parley. As a very small parish we will not be able to accommodate these extra families and as the 2 new link roads will not be started until half the houses are built then that will mean extra build up on our roads. We live on the main Christchurch Road and as it stands at the moment, the traffic in the morning is at a virtual</p>				506		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
											standstill. It takes us approximately 15-20 mins to get to Parley lights. Also, the new proposed link road is going to go through the middle of 300 houses, surely this will be a risk to the young families with young children. We do not want our Green Belt built upon. We moved here to escape the built up town environment, we wanted open green fields around us, somewhere for us to walk our dogs and to see horses grazing. This is going to disappear! Please do not take this away from us; this is the only enjoyment we have. Young families grow up and this constitutes in youngsters hanging around pubs, supermarkets, under age drinking and drugs. We live opposite a pub and we do not want to tolerate any more anti social behaviour, which will also be a strain on our police. Our homes will be 'at risk' and house prices will plummet. We worked hard to move to this affluent area and we do not want social housing here. We pay a lot of council tax and to have people move here on benefits that will not have to pay is unacceptable. I worked in social housing for 14 years and I am fully aware of the problems that housing estates can have if not managed and monitored correctly. West Parley is a close knit community which houses a lot of elderly people. We fear that an influx of young families will take over and we will lose our elderly forever.							
656218	Dr and Mrs G and S Dudding		CSPS2658	Policy FWP6							It has been brought to our notice the recommendations by District Council for developments in East Dorset and in particular the plans for West Parley. One major reason we moved to West Parley ten years ago was the presence of the Green Belt which gave West Parley its own special character. Policies FWP6 and 7 propose to develop Green Belt which would seem unlawful and contrary to National and local opinion. Parley heath, a special conservation area would receive a very negative impact by the increased volume of people using this area. Traffic, at saturation levels already, would not be ameliorated by the proposals – the so called 'link road' would have minimal effect at Parley Cross roads, as any regular user of this stretch of road would be able to tell you. All would agree that traffic has grown exponentially and in addition it should be remembered that Parley is the chosen route of emergency services, fire, police and ambulance – a source of considerable noise pollution with excessive siren use. A programme of increased housing by 520 houses in this area would seem a grossly excessive expansion by any standard – a 32% increase in current housing stock. We do not wish to be connected to Bournemouth by urban sprawl. In terms of the Green Belt policy abuses as planned, I would wholeheartedly support a legal challenge even if I have to pay for it. We all know that there are many other brown field sites available for development but West Parley is chosen for				506			

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											perceived ease of development and no doubt some financial incentive which has yet to be declared.						
656399	Mrs R J Cook		CSPS2696	Policy FWP6							I am writing about the proposed plans – Policy No’s FWP5, FWP6 and FWP7. I think it very sad when you are talking about covering all this green land with Houses etc. I came home to live just because of the green. I could see and also the mild life on it. With the increase in Traffic to the already overloaded roads. No I do not agree with these plans.				506		
656519	Mr Derek Pitts		CSPS2668	Policy FWP6							Plans to build on green belt at West Parley – Policy FWP6 and Policy FWP7 I object to both plans in their entirety. The West Parley green belt must be be preserved. i) It helps define why the area is such a nice place to live in. ii) Protects the parish from urban sprawl; and encroachment from pro-development interests acting against the wishes of the residents. This development will be a bad thing for West Parley. i) It will destroy the unique character of the area. ii) Pushed through without consultation. It completely ignores a West Parley Parish Plan supported by over a thousand residents. iii) The proposal to build over five hundred houses, a supermarket and other as yet other unspecified development, will condemn residents to an open-ended time scale of intrusion and disruption. iv) Major road alterations will cause massive congestion around Parley Cross into the foreseeable future. If the District Council believe their proposals are in the best interests of West Parley’s residents they have an odd way of showing it. They appear to have an agenda of their own with proposals that can only downgrade what is for the present a lovely place to live. Meanwhile major companies like Taylor Wimpey waiting in the wings on land they own adjacent to Poor Common, must be rubbing their hand in glee.				506		
656524	Mr Alan Bishop		CSPS2547	Policy FWP6							As residents of West Parley, we would like to draw your attention to our comments regarding some of the Policies under consultation: Ref: Policy FWP6 (Plans for 300 houses, supermarket and shopping centre & link road) Ref: Policy FWP7 (Plans for 220 houses and the new Road) • The New Road and Dudsbury heights fields are not just green belt; they are “Key Gaps” with Bournemouth, there to prevent urban sprawl. We want to remain as West Parley – the policies above will join our conurbations and create urban sprawl a contradiction in terms. • Why are we having a 32% increase in our housing stock? Our Parish Plan clearly outlined our aspirations, a plan encouraged by the District Council; it appears that as residents we have been ridiculed, as these have not been				506		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>considered at all. We are meant to live in a democratic society – we have not been consulted during the preparation of these new plans at all!</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Both link roads will cause more congestion, during construction of the properties and more so after completion once occupied. We live on the main Christchurch Road, and have seen an increase in traffic since we moved here 4 years ago. • More noise, pollution and more industrial vehicles on this road already in 4 years, surely this will increase the problems we already have a) with the ignorance of speed restrictions by drivers, b) no crossings midway for the pedestrians and horse riders c) more cyclists on our service road more hazards to create accidents d) more airport traffic. • No regard for our wildlife and any endangered species that will be affected. • What's it going to be like at Parley Cross, more congestion on all main roads backing up causing more delays at many more times of the day. • All with the added problem of a new shopping parade and the parking, entry and exit dilemmas associated with these amenities, in an area already over its capacity. • How will it affect local businesses already in situ at Parley Cross • As for link roads passing through urban areas, surely this has not been thought through from a safety aspect for residents particularly for young children or the elderly. • Where are the children from families taking residence in these new homes going to school are there enough places in our existing local education facilities? • What plans have been thought for welfare, medical and dentistry requirements & local transport? <p>On 14th February we sent a e-mail to 35 Councillors, we received replies from Cllr J Wilson, Cllr S Lugg, Cllr B Manuel and Spencer Flower, only 4, that's only 11%. Its obvious where the other 31 votes are! You're definitely not listening to us residents, is this because it does not affect each of you personally where you live?</p> <p>Please consider our views we really do care about where we live in West Parley.</p>						
656525	Mr James Rainsbury		CSPS2678	Policy FWP6							<p>I wish to object to the building of 220 houses on the FWP 7 and 300 on FWP6 sites for the following reasons The New Road and Dudsbury heights fields are "KEY GAPS" with Bournemouth. These gaps were to prevent urban sprawl, and the main reason for having a green belt in the first place. 520 more houses in Parley is a 32% increase in the housing stock. This is excessive, wrong and damaging, schools, doctor's surgeries etc will not be able to cope with the influx of people. Dudsbury Rings is an important heritage sight and this field is too closely connected to the site for the security of this important site to be protected. The new roads will not be started until half the houses are built so Parley Cross will have to cope with hundreds more</p>				506		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description		
											cars a day. It is already over capacity and is dangerous at peak times. Traffic jams will merely be moved down the main road. Government legislation requires you to consult fully with local communities before setting out proposals. So far EDDC have ignored this legislation. Another Supermarket is not needed in the area and will only bring chaos to the already crowded roads of the area. We already have 2 Tesco stores in Parley and larger stores close by. I urge you to reconsider these proposals and find more appropriate locations for this level of residential housing.								
656526	Mr & Mrs A Miller		CSPS2691	Policy FWP6							I am writing about the plans to build 220 houses on the FWP7 and 300 FWP6 sites. I know more affordable housing is needed and some houses probably do need to be built, but to build such a huge number of houses in West Parley will join Bournemouth to Ferndown in a huge conurbation. West Parley would lose its identity and become part of the urban sprawl. The 2 new roads proposed will create islands of noise for all those living between them and it is likely that children will be living in houses near to what will become a rat-run. The roads will not ease the traffic situation in West Parley as there will be many extra cars on them due to the expanded population. I don't see any new doctors' surgeries or schools on the plans and I wonder how the existing ones will cope with the extra people? I already have to wait up to two weeks to see my doctor sometimes. However, I see there are plans for a supermarket. Why? We already have Tesco Express for emergencies, and there is an excellent bus service to the Supermarkets in Ferndown, which my 90 year-old neighbour uses without a problem. Surely a new Supermarket will bring even more traffic to the area and further erode the rural feel we have in West Parley at present. Most of my elderly neighbours do not have the internet and have been unable to find the information they need to look closely at the proposals. I am asking that you re-think these proposals and put forward some new ones that will take into consideration our rural environment and heritage, the needs and wishes of the present population and service providers of West Parley, and the needs of those who would be coming to live in new houses here, as I feel that none of these is being satisfied at present.						506		
656533	Mr Mark Rainsbury		CSPS2666	Policy FWP6							I wish to object to the building of 220 houses on the FWP 7 and 300 on FWP6 sites for the following reasons. The New Road and Dudsbury heights fields are "KEY GAPS" with Bournemouth. These gaps were to prevent urban sprawl, and the main reason for having a green belt in the first place. 520 more houses in Parley is a 32/ INCREASE IN THE HOUSING STOCK. This is excessive, wrong and damaging, schools, doctor's surgeries etc will not be able to cope with the influx of people. The proposed link road will go right through the middle of 300							506	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
											houses in FWP6 which will be very dangerous for young children. The new roads will not be started until half the houses are built so Parley Cross will have to cope with hundreds more cars a day. It is already over capacity and is dangerous at peak times. Traffic jams will merely be moved down the main road. Government legislation requires you to consult fully with local communities before setting out proposals. EDDC have ignored this legislation. Another Supermarket is not needed in the area and will only bring chaos to the already crowded roads of the area. We already have 2 Tesco store in Parley and a larger store in Ferndown only 2 miles away. I urge you to reconsider these proposals and find more appropriate locations for this level of residential accommodation.							
656538	Mr & Mrs R Bradshaw		CSPS2673	Policy FWP6							As residents of West Parley, we are writing to express our concerns regarding the plan to build 300 houses on the FWP 6 site and 220 houses on the FWP 7 site. We wish to object most strongly to this proposed development and state our objections as follows: 1. A seriously flawed consultation process: We have attended several public meetings organised by West Parley Parish Council and a meeting Chaired by our local Member of Parliament. We have also researched the government criteria upon which this consultation process is supposedly based and find your methods to be totally unsatisfactory. The residents of West Parley took part in a detailed consultation organised by the Parish Council who then produced a Parish Plan based firmly upon this consultation. The Plan was well publicised (We helped in the delivery of copies to every household in the Parish). I understand that copies were also submitted to East Dorset District Council. It is clear in the Parish Plan that the maximum number of new houses which residents are prepared to tolerate is no more than 100, yet this part of what should be a democratic and transparent process has been ignored by your planners. Local Government, like any other elected body, is directly responsible to those citizens who put it there and should not hide behind "policy planning" to manipulate public opinion to suit their own agenda. Would you please explain why this part of the West Parley Parish Plan has been ignored by your planners? Communication between the concerned residents of this Parish and the District Council has been sparse to say the least. I must add that our family have experienced great difficulty in accessing the information necessary to gain a true picture of what East Dorset District Council are proposing and the reasoning behind this. We are all computer literate in our household but we fear that there are many residents of West Parley who do not have the same skills or who, indeed, do not even have access to the internet. How on earth are they supposed to be able to form an opinion on this consultation					506		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>process? Surely, it was never the intention to keep a percentage of residents uninformed by excessive use of electronic information to the detriment of other methods?</p> <p>2. Green Belt Policy: The Town and Country Planning Act of 1947 defined Green Belt Policy and this is reiterated the Planning Policy Guidance 2: Green Belts: to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas, to prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another, to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment, to secure nature conservation interests, to retain land in agricultural use, to provide opportunities for access to the open countryside and to assist in urban regeneration by encouraging the redevelopment of brownfield sites. Building over 500 houses in West Parley, primarily on green belt land, is quite clearly contrary to this legislation. It will connect Ferndown with Bournemouth in an unbroken urban sprawl in which the distinctive character of the village of West Parley will disappear. We have no wish to become part of the Greater Bournemouth conurbation. Neither do we wish to see the destruction of valuable agricultural land upon which this proposed development would be built. We do not wish to see the destruction of the countryside adjacent to our village and the tragic effect this will have upon local fauna and flora which is a pleasure to view. We would add therefore, that these proposals would seriously undermine the quality of life which residents of West Parley currently enjoy, living in close proximity to green belt land. It is a flawed concept that this country's Green Belt Policy can be reinterpreted. There do not appear to be any exceptional circumstances in which a reinterpretation could be applied to West Parley and we would ask you to reconsider the legality of such a course of action.</p> <p>3. We understand that an additional 520 houses in West Parley represents an increase in the housing stock of 32%. We can see no evidence of accompanying plans to increase the local infrastructure to cover this excessive increase in population. We would ask, where are the plans for new schools, policing, health facilities, etc., which should accompany these proposals? We can see proposals for two new roads, one of which will be constructed dangerously close to Dudsbury Rings (FWP7) a heritage site of major archaeological value. We are sure that East Dorset District Council would not wish to be accused of an uncaring approach to our national heritage akin to archaeological vandalism should this site be disturbed in any way by property developers. We also understand that this road would necessitate the felling of ancient trees significant enough to have been given preservation orders and the displacement of a bat colony.</p> <p>4. The traffic system in the West Parley area is already overstretched and cannot cope with the present amount of traffic which passes through at certain times of the day. Over 500 additional households would increase local car ownership, possibly by 1000. A proposed narrowing of the road system at Parley Cross and a traffic shunting exercise around the two proposed new roads will only move the</p>						

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>problem around the housing development creating potential for an increase in road traffic accidents, not resolve it.</p> <p>5. We fail to understand the logic of yet another supermarket (to be located at Parley Cross – FWP6) when there are already 5 other such stores serving the area. The roads in the West Parley area are already overcrowded; an additional superstore would add to this congestion. We suspect that the only people to profit from this would be the new superstore proprietors. There is no demand for this development. Similarly, the residents of West Parley have not asked for and do not need an Orchard (FWP 6) as they enjoy the full benefits of the adjacent Green Belt. We do not recall any consultation on this or indeed on the need for allotments. We, the residents Close, West Parley, are appalled at the planning proposals for our village, we object to the high-handed manner in which East Dorset District Council have ignored the genuine concerns of residents and their representatives on the Parish Council, and we are bitterly disappointed in the absence of a transparent, democratic and genuine dialogue on the above proposals. We have no intention of allowing our village to become subsumed and give our full support to our representatives on the Parish Council who are working so hard to make residents' voices heard. Please begin to listen to them and act accordingly.</p>						
656541	Mr R J Bradshaw		CSPS2676	Policy FWP6							<p>As residents of West Parley, we are writing to express our concerns regarding the plan to build 300 houses on the FWP 6 site and 220 houses on the FWP 7 site.</p> <p>We wish to object most strongly to this proposed development and state our objections as follows:</p> <p>1. A seriously flawed consultation process: We have attended several public meetings organised by West Parley Parish Council and a meeting Chaired by our local Member of Parliament. We have also researched the government criteria upon which this consultation process is supposedly based and find your methods to be totally unsatisfactory. The residents of West Parley took part in a detailed consultation organised by the Parish Council who then produced a Parish Plan based firmly upon this consultation. The Plan was well publicised (We helped in the delivery of copies to every household in the Parish). I understand that copies were also submitted to East Dorset District Council. It is clear in the Parish Plan that the maximum number of new houses which residents are prepared to tolerate is no more than 100, yet this part of what should be a democratic and transparent process has been ignored by your planners. Local Government, like any other elected body, is directly responsible to those citizens who put it there and should not hide behind "policy planning" to manipulate public opinion to suit their own agenda.</p> <p>Would you please explain why this part of the West Parley Parish Plan has been ignored by your planners?</p> <p>Communication between the concerned residents of this Parish and the District Council has been sparse to say the least. I must add that our family have experienced great</p>				506		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
											<p>difficulty in accessing the information necessary to gain a true picture of what East Dorset District Council are proposing and the reasoning behind this. We are all computer literate in our household but we fear that there are many residents of West Parley who do not have the same skills or who, indeed, do not even have access to the internet. How on earth are they supposed to be able to form an opinion on this consultation process? Surely, it was never the intention to keep a percentage of residents uninformed by excessive use of electronic information to the detriment of other methods?</p> <p>2. Green Belt Policy: The Town and Country Planning Act of 1947 defined Green Belt Policy and this is reiterated the Planning Policy Guidance 2: Green Belts: to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas, to prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another, to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment, to secure nature conservation interests, to retain land in agricultural use, to provide opportunities for access to the open countryside and to assist in urban regeneration by encouraging the redevelopment of brownfield sites. Building over 500 houses in West Parley, primarily on green belt land, is quite clearly contrary to this legislation. It will connect Ferndown with Bournemouth in an unbroken urban sprawl in which the distinctive character of the village of West Parley will disappear. We have no wish to become part of the Greater Bournemouth conurbation. Neither do we wish to see the destruction of valuable agricultural land upon which this proposed development would be built. We do not wish to see the destruction of the countryside adjacent to our village and the tragic effect this will have upon local fauna and flora which is a pleasure to view. We would add therefore, that these proposals would seriously undermine the quality of life which residents of West Parley currently enjoy, living in close proximity to green belt land. It is a flawed concept that this country's Green Belt Policy can be reinterpreted. There do not appear to be any exceptional circumstances in which a reinterpretation could be applied to West Parley and we would ask you to reconsider the legality of such a course of action.</p> <p>3. We understand that an additional 520 houses in West Parley represents an increase in the housing stock of 32%. We can see no evidence of accompanying plans to increase the local infrastructure to cover this excessive increase in population. We would ask, where are the plans for new schools, policing, health facilities, etc., which should accompany these proposals? We can see proposals for two new roads, one of which will be constructed dangerously close to Dudsbury Rings (FWP7) a heritage site of major archaeological value. We are sure that East Dorset District Council would not wish to be accused of an uncaring approach to our national heritage akin to archaeological vandalism should this site be disturbed in any way by property developers. We also understand that this road would necessitate the felling of ancient trees significant enough to have been given preservation orders and the displacement of a bat colony.</p>							

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
											<p>4. The traffic system in the West Parley area is already overstretched and cannot cope with the present amount of traffic which passes through at certain times of the day. Over 500 additional households would increase local car ownership, possibly by 1000. A proposed narrowing of the road system at Parley Cross and a traffic shunting exercise around the two proposed new roads will only move the problem around the housing development creating potential for an increase in road traffic accidents, not resolve it.</p> <p>5. We fail to understand the logic of yet another supermarket (to be located at Parley Cross – FWP6) when there are already 5 other such stores serving the area. The roads in the West Parley area are already overcrowded; an additional superstore would add to this congestion. We suspect that the only people to profit from this would be the new superstore proprietors. There is no demand for this development. Similarly, the residents of West Parley have not asked for and do not need an Orchard (FWP 6) as they enjoy the full benefits of the adjacent Green Belt. We do not recall any consultation on this or indeed on the need for allotments. We, the residents Close, West Parley, are appalled at the planning proposals for our village, we object to the high-handed manner in which East Dorset District Council have ignored the genuine concerns of residents and their representatives on the Parish Council, and we are bitterly disappointed in the absence of a transparent, democratic and genuine dialogue on the above proposals. We have no intention of allowing our village to become subsumed and give our full support to our representatives on the Parish Council who are working so hard to make residents' voices heard. Please begin to listen to them and act accordingly.</p>							
656544	Ms C Bradshaw		CSPS2679	Policy FWP6							<p>As residents of West Parley, we are writing to express our concerns regarding the plan to build 300 houses on the FWP 6 site and 220 houses on the FWP 7 site. We wish to object most strongly to this proposed development and state our objections as follows:</p> <p>1. A seriously flawed consultation process: We have attended several public meetings organised by West Parley Parish Council and a meeting Chaired by our local Member of Parliament. We have also researched the government criteria upon which this consultation process is supposedly based and find your methods to be totally unsatisfactory. The residents of West Parley took part in a detailed consultation organised by the Parish Council who then produced a Parish Plan based firmly upon this consultation. The Plan was well publicised (We helped in the delivery of copies to every household in the Parish). I understand that copies were also submitted to East Dorset District Council. It is clear in the Parish Plan that the maximum number of new houses which residents are prepared to tolerate is no more than 100, yet this part of what should be a democratic and transparent process has been ignored by your planners. Local Government, like any other elected body, is directly responsible to those citizens who put it there and should not</p>					506		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>hide behind “policy planning” to manipulate public opinion to suit their own agenda.</p> <p>Would you please explain why this part of the West Parley Parish Plan has been ignored by your planners?</p> <p>Communication between the concerned residents of this Parish and the District Council has been sparse to say the least. I must add that our family have experienced great difficulty in accessing the information necessary to gain a true picture of what East Dorset District Council are proposing and the reasoning behind this. We are all computer literate in our household but we fear that there are many residents of West Parley who do not have the same skills or who, indeed, do not even have access to the internet. How on earth are they supposed to be able to form an opinion on this consultation process? Surely, it was never the intention to keep a percentage of residents uninformed by excessive use of electronic information to the detriment of other methods?</p> <p>2. Green Belt Policy: The Town and Country Planning Act of 1947 defined Green Belt Policy and this is reiterated the Planning Policy Guidance 2: Green Belts: to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas, to prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another, to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment, to secure nature conservation interests, to retain land in agricultural use, to provide opportunities for access to the open countryside and to assist in urban regeneration by encouraging the redevelopment of brownfield sites. Building over 500 houses in West Parley, primarily on green belt land, is quite clearly contrary to this legislation. It will connect Ferndown with Bournemouth in an unbroken urban sprawl in which the distinctive character of the village of West Parley will disappear. We have no wish to become part of the Greater Bournemouth conurbation. Neither do we wish to see the destruction of valuable agricultural land upon which this proposed development would be built. We do not wish to see the destruction of the countryside adjacent to our village and the tragic effect this will have upon local fauna and flora which is a pleasure to view. We would add therefore, that these proposals would seriously undermine the quality of life which residents of West Parley currently enjoy, living in close proximity to green belt land. It is a flawed concept that this country’s Green Belt Policy can be reinterpreted. There do not appear to be any exceptional circumstances in which a reinterpretation could be applied to West Parley and we would ask you to reconsider the legality of such a course of action.</p> <p>3. We understand that an additional 520 houses in West Parley represents an increase in the housing stock of 32%. We can see no evidence of accompanying plans to increase the local infrastructure to cover this excessive increase in population. We would ask, where are the plans for new schools, policing, health facilities, etc., which should accompany these proposals? We can see proposals for two new roads, one of which will be constructed dangerously close to Dudsbury Rings (FWP7) a heritage site of major archaeological value. We are sure that East Dorset District</p>						

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>Council would not wish to be accused of an uncaring approach to our national heritage akin to archaeological vandalism should this site be disturbed in any way by property developers. We also understand that this road would necessitate the felling of ancient trees significant enough to have been given preservation orders and the displacement of a bat colony.</p> <p>4. The traffic system in the West Parley area is already overstretched and cannot cope with the present amount of traffic which passes through at certain times of the day. Over 500 additional households would increase local car ownership, possibly by 1000. A proposed narrowing of the road system at Parley Cross and a traffic shunting exercise around the two proposed new roads will only move the problem around the housing development creating potential for an increase in road traffic accidents, not resolve it.</p> <p>5. We fail to understand the logic of yet another supermarket (to be located at Parley Cross – FWP6) when there are already 5 other such stores serving the area. The roads in the West Parley area are already overcrowded; an additional superstore would add to this congestion. We suspect that the only people to profit from this would be the new superstore proprietors. There is no demand for this development. Similarly, the residents of West Parley have not asked for and do not need an Orchard (FWP 6) as they enjoy the full benefits of the adjacent Green Belt. We do not recall any consultation on this or indeed on the need for allotments. We, the residents Close, West Parley, are appalled at the planning proposals for our village, we object to the high-handed manner in which East Dorset District Council have ignored the genuine concerns of residents and their representatives on the Parish Council, and we are bitterly disappointed in the absence of a transparent, democratic and genuine dialogue on the above proposals. We have no intention of allowing our village to become subsumed and give our full support to our representatives on the Parish Council who are working so hard to make residents' voices heard. Please begin to listen to them and act accordingly.</p>						
656547	Mr T.G Wood		CSPS2640	Policy FWP6							<p>I am writing to express my objections to the plans for building of 520 new houses on the green belt field alongside New Road West Parley and 200 new houses at Dudsbury Heights. My first objection is on the grounds that green belts were specifically established to maintain reasonable areas of open space between residential towns and conurbations and that by building on the remaining fields at West Parley, Ferndown will be effectively conjoined with the Bournemouth conurbation.</p> <p>Secondly, the houses proposed will be virtually beneath the flight path for Bournemouth International Airport and, as it is one of the aims of the local authorities in the area is to increase commercial air traffic at the airport; this will cause noise pollution problems for future residents. (I live in this zone and can assure you that extra flights will not be welcomed even by existing residents living under the flight</p>				506		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>path).</p> <p>Thirdly, the proposed road layout whereby traffic between the River Stour side of New Road and the airport side of Christchurch Road is to be routed through the new housing estate via 5 mini round-a-bouts and new major junctions on New Road and Christchurch Road will cause enormous traffic chaos. Up to 300 cars per hour pass between these two roads in the rush hour. With the additional cut through new road from the river Stour side of New Road up to the Longham side of Christchurch Road, this will mean all traffic from New Road heading for the airport will encounter three major road junctions and five mini round-a-bouts within the distance of ½ mile.</p> <p>The new residences will be subjected to this amount of traffic every day and it will not be a pleasant place to live.</p> <p>Fourthly, the proposal for 720 new houses in the area will mean that approximately 1000 to 1500 extra cars will be seeking to join the school run and rush hour traffic and the proposed new road layout will be very dangerous for all pedestrians.</p> <p>Finally, is the inclusion of plans for a new medium sized supermarket at the corner of the cross roads which we are all amazed to see. This can only introduce the possibility of further conflicting traffic movements and, we know it will struggle for business in competition with the meagre trade seen at the existing Tesco Express.</p> <p>I trust that further more realistic thought will be given to choosing suitable sites for future housing development in East Dorset.</p>						
656766	Mr & Mrs M.J Muncer		CSPS2632	Policy FWP6							<p>I wish to place my concerns about the planning proposals for West Parley on record. In writing I am mindful of pages 220 of the Core Strategy Document and 57 of the National Policy Framework Document, plus the now superseded Government Document PPS12.</p> <p>I am a resident of Church Lane, West Parley and was attracted to the area due to its separate identity from Bournemouth and to a lesser extent the remainder of Ferndown. This separation is achieved by the open spaces that exist between West Parley and the rest of the conurbation. If building is allowed on these vital open spaces West Parley will loose its character and the conurbation will become yet more dense and overbuilt. There are presently a number of these Green Lungs in the West Parley area and they all appear to be under threat. A green belt has been inforce in this area for many years but it now seems that at the very time its protection is needed it is being treated as a mere inconvenience.</p> <p>The planning proposals for West Parley would increase the population of the area by nearly a third which is a disproportionate part of the burden expected of the conurbation fringe. Increases in housing equals increases in traffic and the capacity of New Road is already near its maximum. The development on Dudsbury Heights (FWP7) has the advantage of being hidden from general view</p>				506		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>however 220 houses seems an enormous development whilst 300 houses on the New Road site (FWP6) will just turn the place into a town.</p> <p>I am mindful that there has been considerable “consultation” on this matter but it is becoming apparent that this is no more than window dressing. Proposal FWP 6 and FWP 7 are far more extensive than previously indicated and appear to have been foisted upon the area by local government with scant regard for local feeling. The Parish Council has genuinely consulted residents and the Parish Plan is a worthy document which I urgently ask the East Dorset District Council to fully respect when making decisions which will affect this community.</p>						
656790	Mrs T Wadeson		CSPS2648	Policy FWP6							<p>Firstly I would like to point out that the resident of West Parley have not been consulted at all on these new plans or their preparation with Top Down Planning, which is underhanded and very cavalier of the local council,</p> <p>I am writing to object to the over development of West Parley Green Belt.</p> <p>The site is old green belt (for good reason) these “Key Gaps” are to stop urban sprawl. This green belt site is the lungs of Parley and as such should stay the way it is. The development is too dense and will have an adverse impact to the character of the neighbourhood. A 32% increase in West Parley’s Housing. The development is ugly and overbearing and out of all proportion to the vicinity. As it is a green belt area the standard of design should be much higher and in keeping with the area. The impact of this development will ruin the landscape.</p> <p>Another point which I know is controversial is the relevance of the loss of view, whilst I and the neighbours in Church Lane understand “there is no right to view”. We are all in agreement that this is not irrelevant to us or the planning. The enjoyment of the view is an important part of the residential amenity of the neighbourhood With such matters of noise, disturbance, overshadowing and loss of privacy, in Church Lane we back onto the green belt area and our back gardens are not fenced off they are left to hedgerows. We are all in total agreement that the development will have an adverse effect on the residential amenity of the neighbourhood.</p> <p>The environmental impact will be huge and devastating, we have deer and their young in the green belt area and many others:- vole, bats, rabbits, fox, otter, badger, green woodpecker and swallows. We have Oak and Chestnut trees with preservation orders on them, what happens to these also? The development will have a devastating impact on our very diverse wildlife.</p> <p>With the proposed building of 300 homes, that would mean 600 children just in that one area, Where do you propose they go to school? West Parley first school has only 2 reception classes it is a very small school. They are not equipped to take this amount of children we would need a new school. I have a 4 year old son and I can just about get him in to see the doctor within the week, if I call the Doctors on Monday, I</p>				506		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
											<p>may be lucky to get in by Friday of the same week, which is really not good enough but what surgery will over a thousand people get in to. A 32% increase, there is no infrastructure in place for that amount of people for Schools, Doctors, Dentists or road capacity.</p> <p>The roads in and around Parley are extremely bust and at rush hour are at overcapacity the traffic can queue for 3 miles or more in each direction. (and you want to put 300 homes on the green belt site, calculating at least 600 vehicles at 2 per household) How do you propose these vehicles get onto an already overburdened cross road? The new road proposals are ludicrous in the extreme, the relief road which has been proposed to stop people turning left into Christchurch Road is impossible you cannot direct 40 foot juggernauts through the back of residential housing only to turn around on a small roundabout to double back on themselves to get back to Bournemouth airport and the Business Park. There are all sorts of freight going in and out of the airport in huge container lorries. We have at least 10 gravel trucks that leave the gravel pit each day and return. The filter system at the moment works very well from Christchurch Road but you intend there will be only two exits at the lights now. This will cause terrible congestion at peak travel times and the emissions from the juggernauts and container lorries will be very high because they will be idling for some time waiting for the lights. These lorries will be expected then to travel through the back of a residential area again. The relief road will become just a rat run.</p> <p>My last point would be that since I have lived here there have been quite a few planes crashes, the most prominent being the Red Arrows last year. There are very many light aircraft using Bournemouth Airport and this green belt has had quite a few emergency landings in it, due to either malfunction or lack of fuel; I noticed a plane only in the field the other day. With planes emergency landing and an Airport that is only getting busier, surely it would put people at risk building here. Why haven't you looked at local Brown Field Sites is that the governments directive?</p>							
656792	Mr R.G Williams		CSPS2649	Policy FWP6							<p>I am writing to let you know that I am very angry at the fact that you and your Committee are proposing to build 520 houses on 2 sites FWP6/FWP7 in our small village of West Parley. This will bring 1000 cars to the village morning and evening. The new link road that is proposed just over the river will be a waste of time as you will be able to drive through the estate on the other link Road as this will be turned into a rat run mainly for cars. You have not mentioned that we will need more Doctors, Dentists and schools, all our schools are full at the moment and will probly be this way a quite a few years to come. We do not need more shops here as Ferndown is just up the road and Bournemouth is a short car ride away. We were told that houses could not be built on the Airport flight path for safty reasons, what would have happened if the Red Arrow plane crash was traveling in the oppersite direction and was a Commercial Plane. I do feel that we need more</p>				506			

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
											houses but 520 is far to many, Why did you not ask to residents of West Parley for their views and proposals							
656811	Mrs Lesley White		CSPS2651	Policy FWP6							<p>I am writing in response to the proposed Green Belt Plans, and specifically policy FWP6, which would affect the New Road area of Parley Cross.</p> <p>I do not agree that these proposals are suitable for this area. For a start the 520 houses which are suggested would mean a huge increase of 32% for a small semi – rural village. Also the area is not ideal for young families as there are not enough school places or suitable transport links available. The small green belt that is the last space separating West Parley from Bournemouth should remain, in order to avoid the whole area from becoming an urban sprawl.</p> <p>These fields are home to a large amount of wildlife, and used by sparrowhawks searching for food. No thought has been given to the impact that housing would have on their needs. Also large areas of these fields are under water for weeks at a time after heavy rain, so houses would be flooded on a regular basis.</p> <p>The proposed link road from Christchurch Road to New Road would turn what has always been a quiet country lane into a very busy and dangerous road, with large gravel lorries passing very close to the houses several times a day, posing a danger to elderly and very young residents, and generally making their lives miserable.</p> <p>In conclusion I would like to point out that we need to have some areas that people can aspire to. There is no point in working hard all your life and paying taxes if there are no “nice” areas to aspire to. If everywhere becomes an urban sprawl we have no incentive to work or pay taxes. We NEED our green spaces. Please think again.</p>					506		
657421	Mr Chris Wells		CSPS2531	Policy FWP6							<p>I am absolutely horrified and appalled at the proposed development in West Parley area.</p> <p>Nearly all the few remaining pockets of countryside in this already overcrowded area will get swallowed up. Also this will contribute to even more traffic at one of the busiest crossroads in Dorset.</p> <p>To build more link roads is not the answer because it will just create even more traffic in the long run.</p> <p>The higher density of population that will come about with more building will put even more strain on our amenities such as Doctors Dentists and schools etc.</p> <p>I think the only way ahead is to leave this area exactly like it is now and have no more development whatsoever.</p> <p>We also don't need any more food stores as there are already plenty in Bournemouth, Ferndown & Wimborne etc.</p>					506		
660079	Mrs S Moore		CSPS2604	Policy FWP6							<p>I live in Church Lane when I walk up the road to try and cross to the Curlew, Memorial Hall and Parley Sports Club, you can wait ages, you get a kind lorry driver stop to let you cross. I do hope there will be a crossing when they build all these houses and more cars.</p> <p>I am in my eightys. I don't want to walk up to Parley Cross lights to cross.</p>					506		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											I don't see why they have to build on a busy road its bad enough now. I hate to think whats its going to be like.						
496473	Mr Brian Morgan		CSPS2664	Policy FWP6							<p>Further to my previous response to the consultation document, I would like to raise the following additional points:-</p> <p>1. In respect of Policies FWP6 and 7, 300 and 220 new homes are clearly far too many for what is now a greenbelt site, adjoining the built-up area of what is now a small parish. It represents a 32% increase in West Parley's housing stock; quite apart from the fact that building on these Key Gap areas at all is environmentally unacceptable and damaging, not to mention excessive, there are also financial factors to consider here. It is, in short, this very kind of overdevelopment, which has resulted in up to 80% discounts being available against Spanish property asking prices, with estates comprising dozens of houses remaining unoccupied, and even vandalized. Banks, which have lent heavily on such projects, are now virtually bankrupt, and here you are proposing exactly the same type of damaging (economically) overdevelopment, in what are clearly very straitened and difficult financial times, with a similar foreseeable outlook.</p> <p>2. Why, having regard to the foregoing, propose yet another supermarket in FWP6 (and shopping centre), when the locality already has 4 of them, as well as many convenience stores? There is simply no need for it, and it would inevitably close down in my view, that is assuming anyone ever agreed to open it!</p> <p>3. A link road proposed to go through the middle of a 300 house estate, as per FWP6, would clearly be highly dangerous for occupying families – if there are any – while the decision to include a proposal for completion of this Link Road (and the one for FWP7) at some indefinite time, well after half the houses have been built, is little short of crazy; by this, I mean that the already severe vehicle congestion at Parley Cross, experienced, especially driving rush-hours, will simply be made unnecessarily very much worse indeed.</p> <p>All round, in my opinion, these proposals, along with many others in this consultation document, are appallingly damaging, and I trust that elected members will have the courage to treat them with the disdain they deserve unreservedly.</p>				506		
496987	Mrs M Marshall		CSPS2684	Policy FWP6							<p>I write to voice my concerns about the proposed building of 220 houses on the FWP7 and 300 on the FWP6 sites. I took a great interest in the published Parish Plan and thought that this was in keeping with the government legislation of a full consultation with the local community. This seems to have been subsequently ignored.</p> <p>The proposals change West Parley from being a community in its own right to an extension of Bournemouth. Will we become part of the Bournemouth Unitary Council and not part of EDDC?</p> <p>I do not wish to see the loss of the countryside around the area – it provides an essential part of our existence and is well used by residents for walking, nature trails etc. The increase in the number of houses is frightening. The</p>				506		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
											<p>seems little mention of more school places, doctors, dentists car parking places in Ferndown but another Supermarket is proposed – since when was shopping more important than health, schools and transport?</p> <p>I always know when there is an accident on the Bournemouth Spur road – the traffic is diverted through West Parley crossroads. The road junction is at maximum capacity anyway but to add 1,000 cars to the equation is to create a possible grid lock on many occasions. Please look at how often there is an accident on the Spur Road.</p> <p>There are many reasons why this proposal should not go ahead – I have to trust that you have the necessary information that says all these houses are needed, I have never been made aware of the great need.</p> <p>I hope that there will be much more public consultation before any plans are finalised.</p>							
500810	Mrs Elizabeth Le Rossignol		CSPS2688	Policy FWP6							<p>I am writing about the plans to build 220 houses on the FWP7 and 300 FWP6 sites.</p> <p>I know more affordable housing is needed and some houses probably do need to be built, but to build such a huge number of houses in West Parley will join Bournemouth to Ferndown in a huge conurbation. West Parley would lose its identity and become part of the urban sprawl.</p> <p>The 2 new roads proposed will create islands of noise for all those living between them and it is likely that children will be living in houses near to what will become a rat-run. The roads will not ease the traffic situation in West Parley as there will be many extra cars on them due to the expanded population. I don't see any new doctors' surgeries or schools on the plans and I wonder how the existing ones will cope with the extra people? I already have to wait up to two weeks to see my doctor sometimes.</p> <p>However, I see there are plans for a supermarket. Why? We already have Tesco Express for emergencies, and there is an excellent bus service to the Supermarkets in Ferndown, which my 90 year-old neighbour uses without a problem. Surely a new Supermarket will bring even more traffic to the area and further erode the rural feel we have in West Parley at present. Most of my elderly neighbours do not have the internet and have been unable to find the information they need to look closely at the proposals.</p> <p>I am asking that you re-think these proposals and put forward some new ones that will take into consideration our rural environment and heritage, the needs and wishes of the present population and service providers of West Parley, and the needs of those who would be coming to live in new houses here, as I feel that none of these is being satisfied at present.</p>					506		
502678	Mr R F Perry		CSPS2693	Policy FWP6							<p>We came to live in this area because it is semi rural. With open fields etc.</p> <p>Now the policy seems to be to destroy all of what has been Green Belt, take away the Key Gaps that exist between Bournemouth and Ferndown. The sheer number of proposed dwellings are far too many with insufficient infrastructure, the</p>					506		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
											roads at moment cannot cope. 32% increase in housing for West Parley to excessive. Why did the District Council virtually ignore the West Parley Parish Plan. What is the point of all this? Are we the people of Parley inconsequential. Why do we need another supermarket when one already exist? The shops we had on the Parade have now become virtually a trading Estate, so much for planning.							
502950	Mr I G Banks		CSPS2768	Policy FWP6	No	No	No	No	No	No	<p>The Consensus of W. Parley residents is to retain the limited amount of green belt areas that remain. David Cameron P.M. said in Parliament on 27th April '12 "Green belt together with SSI's, parks, playing fields will remain protected under new planning laws and wishes of local communities will be upheld". This view has been supported by relevant committees as listed in my letter (by Email) to John Wilson 25 Feb '12, copy attached for reference.</p> <p>COPY 187 New Road West Parley Ferndown Dorset BH22 8ED 25 February 2012 To: Mr John Wilson Dorset County Council Re: Development of Green Belt at West Parley</p> <p>I was dismayed to learn that the "old chestnut" to include the green belt within new housing proposals incorporated within the core strategy plans is presently up for debate at the EDDC meeting scheduled for 5th March 2012 at Village Hotel Bournemouth.</p> <p>May I remind you of the various personages and relevant committees who have previously spoken out in support of preservation of Green Belt areas both nationally and locally.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "I believe that decisions on local issues like use of Green Belt areas for housing development should be decided by local people" – (David Cameron, and Chris Chope MP for General Election ...and) • "We believe that election promises should be kept. It's a matter of trust" – (David Cameron as Prime Minister for EU elections.) • "...area enjoys some of the most sylvan settings ...will continue towards maintaining these and resist the tide of urbanisation that is threatening this by ever increasing housing development" – (Wilson, D. Burt for DCC elections.) • "Support the protection of our Green Belt against it becoming a concrete jungle" – (R.Daw, B.Manuel for EDDC elections) • "The Council voted unanimously to oppose plans for building on Green Belt land" – (EDDC meeting held 3 Sept 2008.) • "The Council objected in the strongest possible manner ... and consider the Green Belt housing plans no longer deliverable."- (DCC press release confirming decision in Oct 2008.) • "Conservative councillors are pledged to resist extensive development in our Green Belt." – (for May 2010 General 	Cancel the development proposals to maintain Key Gaps with Bournemouth, as planning contracts originally intended for the prevention of urban sprawl.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		506			

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
											<p>elections.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "We pledge to safeguard our Green Belt from inappropriate development in the local plan" – (J. Wilson, B. Manuel for EDDC elections May 2011.) <p>I understand that over 80% of West Parley residents are against the proposals and therefore ask you and all members that have expressed opposition in the past to vote against the proposal in respect of Green Belt development and thus demonstrate that democracy at local level does prevail. It is a shame that so much time and resources have had to be expended over this matter in the past, but we can avoid going through the same rigmarole all over again facing a long battle to get an unpopular decision reversed.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Ian Banks</p>							
657383	Mrs A Perry		CSPS2653	Policy FWP6							<p>I object to buildings and sties proposed for West Parley. The field is the only piece of Green land left, we are a village and wish it to stay so.</p> <p>Has the Aircraft been taken into consideration flying right over said field not good for peoples Health.</p> <p>We already have a supermarket here why more, most people do not want this to happen why can everyone who doesn't live here say what should happen. As is now we have plenty of Community Activities and open Park for Amenities. We feel our countryside will be lost forever for protected Species, Plus this is Green Belt land. Traffic is very busy and without appropriate Infrustructure there will be unacceptable pressures on existing provisions. We should not be sacrificed by planners and West Parley people should have more say as to what happens to their village.</p>					506		
657385	Mr W.P Rees		CSPS2656	Policy FWP6							<p>I would like to register my deep concern and opposition to the current proposals to build 500 houses on Green Belt land at West Parley. These proposals show a complete disregard for the village of West Parley and a disdain for the principles of environmental conservation.</p> <p>The two planning policies FWP7 and FWP6 differ considerably from the proposals of 2010. Consequently neither of these policies have been properly consulted upon. In fact the council have apparently avoided any input from West Parley Parish Council and appear to be attempting to steam-roller these proposals through while ignoring the well known local and national opposition to any encroachment on the Green Belt.</p> <p>Another 500 houses at West Parley would increase the size of the village by over 30%. By anyone's standard, this explosion in size over such a short time scale is wholly unsustainable, especially considering the current congestion at West Parley cross roads.</p> <p>The Green Belt is perhaps the most important environmental constraint within current planning law. It has protected countless Dorset villages from avaricious developers for many years. The current West Parley Green Belt that the council plan to destroy is even more important as these sections of Green Belt from Key Gaps. Without these Key Gaps West</p>					506		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
											<p>Parley would inevitably be subsumed into Bournemouth. The people of West Parley have recorded their dissent. The Parish Plan recorded that 80% of residents opposed building on the Green Belt. In fact this is not just a West Parley issue. A poll by the CPRE also found the same percentage (80%) of the national population were opposed to any encroachment onto the Green Belt.</p> <p>The Green Belt is too precious to be lost. The Green belt is a legacy for our children. It should be conserved at almost any cost. Any encroachment on the Green Belt is wholly reprehensible. West Parley is quintessentially English village protected by the surrounding Green Belt. Both are too precious to be destroyed by what amounts to planning vandalism.</p> <p>Please review and amend these proposals.</p>							
660162	Mrs H M Wood		CSPS2645	Policy FWP6							<p>I am writing to express my objections to the plans for building of 520 new houses on the green belt field alongside New Road West Parley and 200 new houses at Dudsbury Heights. My first objection is on the grounds that green belts were specifically established to maintain reasonable areas of open space between residential towns and conurbations and that by building on the remaining fields at West Parley, Ferndown will be effectively conjoined with the Bournemouth conurbation.</p> <p>Secondly, the houses proposed will be virtually beneath the flight path for Bournemouth International Airport and, as it is one of the aims of the local authorities in the area is to increase commercial air traffic at the airport; this will cause noise pollution problems for future residents. (I live in this zone and can assure you that extra flights will not be welcomed even by existing residents living under the flight path).</p> <p>Thirdly, the proposed road layout whereby traffic between the River Stour side of New Road and the airport side of Christchurch Road is to be routed through the new housing estate via 5 mini round-a-bouts and new major junctions on New Road and Christchurch Road will cause enormous traffic chaos. Up to 300 cars per hour pass between these two roads in the rush hour. With the additional cut through new road from the river Stour side of New Road up to the Longham side of Christchurch Road, this will mean all traffic from New Road heading for the airport will encounter three major road junctions and five mini round-a-bouts within the distance of ½ mile.</p> <p>The new residences will be subjected to this amount of traffic every day and it will not be a pleasant place to live.</p> <p>Fourthly, the proposal for 720 new houses in the area will mean that approximately 1000 to 1500 extra cars will be seeking to join the school run and rush hour traffic and the proposed new road layout will be very dangerous for all pedestrians.</p> <p>Finally, is the inclusion of plans for a new medium sized supermarket at the corner of the cross roads which we are all amazed to see. This can only introduce the possibility of</p>				506			

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											further conflicting traffic movements and, we know it will struggle for business in competition with the meagre trade seen at the existing Tesco Express. I trust that further more realistic thought will be given to choosing suitable sites for future housing development in East Dorset.						
656498	Mr Matthew Morris	GVA Planning Development	CSPS2910	Policy FWP6	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	<p>We note that alongside planned improvements to Parley Cross a new neighbourhood is planned to the east of New Road. The allocation, under Policy FWP6, proposes 320 new residential units and a 3,000sq m convenience foodstore. Map 10.9 on page 121 of the Pre-Submission document shows the foodstore placed in the south-eastern corner of Parley Cross, next to the Local Centre. We also note that there is a further new neighbourhood planned for an area to the west of New Road and which contains provision for 200 new residential units.</p> <p>We have reviewed the 'East Dorset New Neighbourhood Masterplan Reports' and it is clear that the evidence base for the planned foodstore at Parley Cross comes from a report prepared by NLP in 2008 entitled 'Potential for New Retail Floorspace Associated with Proposed Urban Extensions – Corfe Mullen and West Parley'.</p> <p>We have reviewed the NLP report and it is clear that there are some fundamental inconsistencies with the Pre-Submission Core Strategy. For example, in order to reach the conclusions it does, the NLP report is relying on 800 new homes within the urban extensions in West Parley. However, as we have already noted, the Pre-Submission document allocates only 520 new homes.</p> <p>In addition, it is clear that the Pre-Submission document is relying on an evidence base which is out-dated. For example, the study relies on high growth population forecasts which are not being used for the latest versions of the Core Strategy, whilst the retail expenditure growth forecasts (and the sales density information) used by NLP are all out of date.</p> <p>Finally, the reasoning why West Parley is able to accommodate 40% of the identified capacity for a different area (Ferndown) is not clear. It is also not clear whether the 1,500-2,000sq m of floorspace identified by NLP for convenience goods only or convenience and comparison goods.</p> <p>Overall, the scale of new floorspace within West Parley has: not been justified; is based upon an out of date evidence base; and, in any event, appears to be clearly out of scale with the role and function of the settlement.</p>		Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	Given the detailed nature of the Co-op's representations and the need to interrogate the Council's evidence base.	506		
656562	Mr Andrew Robinson	Symonds & Sampson	CSPS2901	Policy FWP6		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	<p>The Rossiter family consider that having regard to the NPPF the Core Strategy Pre-submission Consultation it is a helpful and collaborative document which passes the tests of soundness.</p> <p>As agent on behalf of the Rossiter family who own part of the land covered by Policy FWP6 have been asked to comment as follows:</p> <p>a) Both the Rossiter and Sibun family (who own the remainder of the land covered by Policy FWP6) entered into</p>				506		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>an option agreement with Wyatt Homes a year or two ago and both land owners are at one with this high quality company to bring this site forward for development. The site in the round is readily available and deliverable.</p> <p>b) It is apparent to the Rossiters that there is a need for both reasonably priced market homes and affordable stock in the West Parley area. It will have to be met by sensible releases of some green field land, including this most obvious nondescript area which serves no overriding Green belt purpose.</p> <p>c) In the Rossiter family's view, it is only reasonable that West Parley, like other settlements in the district meets part of the need for this housing and the proposal now emerging for this area of West Parley are very much less extensive than earlier propositions.</p> <p>d) th rossiters believe that the development proposed by Policy FWP6, with its inherent new link road, extent of land and other contributions, is an absolute necessity to improve both the environment and viability within the commercial heart of the settlement. it will also enable further job creation at the airport.</p> <p>FWP6 is needed to implement the hugely commendable FWP5 and FWP5 cannot happen without private land and finance.</p> <p>e) The Rossiter family believe that as well as homes for local people, the scheme will bring benefits in terms of large new areas of open space, direct employment and improved links to existing jobs. It will also improve retail facilities for local people, reduce the need to travel and result in the provision of built and outdoor community facilities and children's play areas. Much of the New Homes Bonus can also be spent locally on priorities to be determined by the West Parley residents.</p> <p>f) Whilst the family also believe the site is in a highly accessible and sustainable location, primary facilities are close by and public transport is some of the best inthe district. The mixed plan will result in the emergence of a balanced community and this is precisely what the NPPF will define as favoured "sustainable development". The policy is, therefore a sound one in terms of any logical planning assessment and the test of soundness within the the NPPF.</p> <p>In conclusion, to be "sound" a Core Strategy should be positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with National Policy. By including Policy FWP6 in the tendered strategy for this part of the plan area, housing delivery, job generation, transport enhancement and environmental perception will come forward and a major part of the soundly based Core Strategy will be delivered.</p>						
660983	Smiths Gore		CSPS2971	Policy FWP6	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	As Agents for the owners of the land currently under option to Wyatt Homes we confirm that our clients are acting as one with the Rossiter family and that the land required for the proposals is deliverable and available for development. We believe that Wyatt Homes as a well respected and local company can deliver the development proposed.		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		506		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>We recognise the need for both reasonably priced market homes and affordable stock is huge. It has to be met by sensible releases of some greenfield land including this most non-descript area which serves no overriding Green Belt purpose.</p> <p>The Development here, with its inherent new link road, extent of land and other contributions, is an absolute necessity to improve both the environment and traffic conditions at Parley Crossroads and the vitality and viability within the commercial heart of the Settlement as well as to enable further job creation at the airport. FWP6 is needed to implement the hugely commendable FWP5. FWP5 cannot happen without private land and finance.</p> <p>As well as Homes for Local people the scheme will bring great benefits in terms of large new areas of open space, direct employment and improved links to existing jobs, improved retail facilities for local people and to reduce the need to travel, built and outdoor community facilities and children's play provision. Much of the new Homes Bonus can also be spent locally on priorities to be determined by West Parley residents.</p> <p>The site is in a highly sustainable location Primary facilities are close by Employment opportunities at the Airport Public transport is some of the best in the district With the mix planned and the balanced community that will emerge this is precisely what the NPPF would define as favoured "Sustainable development" The policy is a sound one in terms of logical planning assessment and the tests of soundness within the NPPF</p>						
360302	Mrs Hilary Chittenden	Environment TAG (East Dorset)	CSPS3315	Policy FWP6		No			No		<p>The SANG should be informed by biological survey and Policy ME3. The area includes some trees with TPOs and native hedgerows. Subject to safe DDA compliant pedestrian and cycle access across the main roads, it could make a valuable contribution to the community of West Parley. Safe access for horse riders should also be considered.</p>		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		506		
490823	Mr Ian Jones	Ferndown Town Council	CSPS2999	Policy FWP6	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes		<p>The Town Council would object on grounds of additional traffic movements and journey time, prim?? To/from Ferndown on the A347 (see also FWP5) Any additional capacity created around Parley Cross by the two new link roads will be more that offset by the additional traffic from this and the proposed development west of New Road. (FWP7)</p>		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		506		
496919	Mrs Nicola Shaw	Hurn Parish Council	CSPS3655	Policy FWP6							<p>Policy FWP6 – East of New Road New Neighbourhood, West Parley The Parish Council would question whether it is “justified” to allocate this area for 320 homes. At “The Core Strategy Options for Consideration” stage only 100 homes were proposed in this location, which is much more in keeping with the rural aspect and would not encroach towards the properties in Church Lane. In addition 220 less new homes in this location would mean less pressure on the highway infrastructure both locally and in the wider area.</p>				506		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
359571	Mr Renny Henderson	Royal Society for the Protection of Birds	CSPS3733	Policy FWP6							Policy Allocation Dwellings/land area Comment WMC3 Cuthbury allotments and St Margaret's Close New Neighbourhood, Wimborne 260 SANG to be provided in accordance with policy ME3 WMC4 Stone Lane 90 SANG to be provided in accordance with policy ME3 6 WMC5 Cranborne Road New Neighbourhood, Wimborne 600 SANG to be provided in accordance with policy ME3 WMC6 South of Leigh Road New Neighbourhood and Sports Village, Wimborne 75 ha SANG to be provided in accordance with policy ME3 CM1 Lockyer's School and Land North of Corfe Mullen New Neighbourhood 250 SANG to be provided in accordance with policy ME3 FWP3 Holmwood House New Neighbourhood, Ferndown 110 SANG to be provided in accordance with policy ME3 FWP4 Coppins new Neighbourhood, Ferndown 30 SANG to be provided in accordance with policy ME3 FWP6 Land East of New Road New Neighbourhood, West Parley 320 SANG to be provided in accordance with policy ME3 FWP7 West of New Road New Neighbourhood, West Parley 200 SANG to be provided in accordance with policy ME3 VTSW4 North West Verwood New Neighbourhood 230 SANG to be provided in accordance with policy ME3 FWP8 Blunt's Farm Employment Allocation, Ferndown 30ha A mitigation strategy to be agreed to avoid harm to European sites and SSSI VTSW5 North Eastern Verwood New Neighbourhood		Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	we would like to confirm that we wish to reserve the right to appear at the Examination into the Core Strategy, on the grounds the Core Strategy raises significant issues relating to the protection of internationally important wildlife sites (as highlighted in the HRA) and that there remains uncertainty over the delivery of appropriate and effective mitigation measures.	506		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>50</p> <p>SANG to be provided in accordance with policy ME3 VTSW6</p> <p>Woolsbridge Employment Allocation, Three Legged Cross 9.7ha</p> <p>A mitigation strategy to be agreed to SSSI</p> <p>The RSPB does not, in principle, object to the residential allocations above. However, the table does illustrate the heavy reliance on SANGs as a mitigation measure. The Councils will be aware of the relatively untested nature of SANGs as effective mitigation, albeit in the context of available measures, it is clear that SANGs offer perhaps the best opportunity of addressing potential adverse impacts on the European sites. SANGs are a principal component of the approach taken by the Dorset Heathlands Interim Planning Framework (IPF), and are used as a mitigation vehicle elsewhere in England, notably in the Thames Basin Heaths. Research continues on the effectiveness of SANGs, and it is imperative that this research informs SANGs development anticipated under the Core Strategy. Long-term management and monitoring is also critical (as is identified in policy CN1). Testing of the suitability of SANGs as a mitigation measure for the above policies is essential and has not yet been undertaken. We are concerned that some of the SANGs proposed may be ineffective, particularly SANGs associated with smaller allocations.</p> <p>With respect to employment allocations FWP8 (Blunt's Farm) and VTSW6 (Woolsbridge), we are not familiar with these locations. We do not object to these policies subject to receiving clarification from Natural England of the issues pertinent to these sites, and the likely efficacy of mitigation strategies anticipated by these policies.</p>						
524088	Mr Ken Parke	Ken Parke Planning Consultants	CSPS3635	Policy FWP6	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Please see attached representations document and appendices	Please see attached representations document and appendices	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	The representation has a significant bearing on the distribution of housing within the district and will require detailed oral examination.	506	2260318_0_1.pdf	
360271	Cllr Paul Timberlake		CSPS517	10.38	No	No	No	No	No	No	The opening sentence of paragraph 10.38 are false. The need for large-scale housing at West Parley has not been proved. It is not requested by residents but rather imposed by the authorities. This is the opposite of the government's policy of Localism where the wishes of the public are paramount.	Scrap this para and policies FWP6 and FWP7.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		508		
360271	Cllr Paul Timberlake		CSPS520	10.39	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes	The setting of Dudsbury Hill is important, not just the protected ancient monument of the Hillfort. The whole area should therefore be out of bounds to development.	Amend wording of paragraph 10.39 to take account of the historic setting of Dudsbury Hill.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		509		
359478	Mr Rohan Torkildsen	English Heritage	CSPS2746	10.39		No					NPPF Section 12 – Conserving and Enhancing the HE. Paragraph 129. Q1. Has the Plan assessed the particular significance of any	It is our expert opinion that this proposal lies too close the			509		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
											<p>heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal (including by development affecting the setting of a heritage asset) taking account of the available evidence and any necessary expertise. NPPF Section 12 – Conserving and Enhancing the HE. Paragraph 129. Q2. Has the significance of the heritage asset been taken into account when considering the impact of a proposal on it, to avoid or minimise conflict between the heritage asset’s conservation and any aspect of the proposal? NPPF Section 12 – Conserving and Enhancing the HE. Paragraph 132. Q3. Has the impact of any proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset and their setting been given to the asset’s conservation? NPPF – Plan making. Paragraph 152. Q4. Are there any significant adverse impacts on the protection of the HE and have alternative options which reduce or eliminate such impacts should be pursued? Please also refer to English Heritage letter to ED&C dated 1 June 2012 which provides a more detailed response to this proposal.(Set out below) A. There is a lack of available evidence by the necessary expertise to demonstrate an appreciation of the particular significance of Dudsbury Hillfort and its setting. A. There appears to be a lack of understanding of the significance of the hillfort’s setting in light of the proposed 75 metre buffer. The basis/justification for the figure is unclear. A. We consider this is not the case. A. There are significant adverse affects and the proposed mitigation (75 m buffer) is insufficient to overcome substantial harm. Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy Land to the West of New Road at Ridgeway, West Parley I refer to the current consultation. In advance of a comprehensive reply to the draft Core Strategy please find a specific response to the proposal at West Parley. I hope it can help inform your discussions at the public meeting on 11 June. The proposed new neighbourhood lies immediately east of Dudsbury Camp, a prehistoric hillfort and designated Scheduled Monument (reference 1003583). The hillfort’s setting is affected by housing development to the north and golf course to the west, whilst this proposal will result in development to the east. The hillfort clearly contributes to the areas identity, its local distinctiveness and is an important part of the areas cultural heritage – its history. As a nationally significant heritage asset the hillfort and its setting are protected by the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979 and the National Planning Policy Framework, March 2012 (NPPF). The PPS5 Historic Environment Planning Practice Guide, March 2010 (still extant) and The Setting of Heritage Assets, English Heritage October 2011 are also particularly relevant in relation to this</p>	<p>Scheduled Monument of Dudsbury Camp and that if implemented it will have a negative impact on its setting. The north-western part of the development is of particular concern although the western edge is also likely to have an impact and consideration should be given to pulling this back. This accords with paragraph 129 of the NPPF. As it stands we do not feel that paragraph 10.39* of the Core Strategy has been met. The LPA should also be reminded that significant archaeological remains may survive beyond the boundary of the Scheduled Monument and that these will need to be properly assessed. Paragraph 139 of the NPPF states 'Non-designated heritage assets of archaeological interest that are demonstrably of equivalent significance to scheduled monuments, should be considered subject to the policies for designated heritage assets'. We strongly recommend the extent and form of this proposal is reconsidered. As it stands English Heritage consider the proposal is contrary to the NPPF and the Plan as a consequence is UNSOUND. Note, the more</p>						

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
											<p>case.</p> <p>Unfortunately the Core Strategy and evidence base only make fleeting reference to the hillfort by stating that, for example, development is to be kept at least 75 metres away and open space used to maintain its integrity. There is no specific evidence to demonstrate an understanding of the significance of the Iron Age hillfort has informed the principal of development in this location nor is it explained how such an assessment has informed the proposed mitigation and design response to it e.g. the 75m buffer.</p> <p>In addition to the impact of the development on the setting and integrity of the hillfort, consideration must be given to the future implications of an increased public use of the scheduled monument that is likely to occur as a result of the development. How can this be managed positively? How can the development contribute to the upkeep, appreciation and enjoyment of this historic landmark? What condition is it in? The particular characteristics that contribute to the monument's significance must be defined. This understanding must in turn be used to assess whether the significance will be conserved. I refer to NPPF paragraph 169, 129 and 132 for example. This requirement was clearly set out in formal English Heritage correspondence to you in May 2008 and in particular January 2011.</p> <p>"To ensure the national significance of Dudsbury camp is conserved (protected and enhanced), its values must first be fully appreciated. The immediate and wider significance of the historic landscape must also be understood. Specific detailed evidence must therefore be gathered to inform consideration of the areas suitability, the proximity and the form of any future potential development".</p> <p>Furthermore when this scheme was first mooted as part of the Regional Spatial Strategy in 2006 English Heritage expressed major reservations and offered to explain the constraints presented by the monument and the work necessary to assess the scope for development, if any, at this location. This offer was never taken up and, in the absence of further information, our position remains unchanged.</p> <p>To deliver sustainable development in accordance with the NPPF there is an expectation that such irreplaceable heritage assets are conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance so that they can be enjoyed by future generations. At present it is unclear this will be the case and a consequence this proposal is not in accordance with national policy and the Plan as a whole is therefore unsound. I therefore strongly recommended specialist advice is commissioned as soon as possible to address the above matters and that the aforementioned national policy and guidance is applied.</p> <p>In light of these comments you may also consider whether the same concerns apply to other sites promoted in the Core Strategy as these too will be expected to have been assessed and informed by explicit historic environment evidence. You may wish to consider a single district wide piece of work. The</p>	<p>important the asset, the greater the weight should be attached to its conservation. Scheduled monuments are considered to be of the highest significance along with World Heritage Sites and similar.</p>						

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											Historic Environment assessment prepared for Wiltshire Council by LUC consultants is a recent local example which may provide a useful reference.						
496473	Mr Brian Morgan		CSPS27	Policy FWP7	No	No		Yes		Yes	The reasons are for the most part set out in my attached copy letter to Christopher Chope MP dated 17th February 2012 (actual letter dated 8th February), in addition to which I consider there to be little or no need (as opposed to demand) for new housing here, and certainly not enough to override green belt protection.	Complete deletion of FWP5, FWP6 and FWP7. Exactly the same comments as those in 3, 4, 5 and 6 above apply to many other policies in the document with similar deletion considered necessary - these include:- FWP3 and 4, WMC3 and 5, and VTSW4 and 5. The only proviso to this is that it in so far as any of these sites are not now green belt, then that factor would obviously not apply to those sites.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	1. I consider a well-argued oral and public presentation of the case outlined above would be much more effective than mere written argument. 2. The opportunities for open public debate on this matter have so far been far too limited, having regard especially to the long term importance of the Green Belt heritage, as opposed to the short term 'needs' to promote economic growth, both locally and nationally.	510	2158984_0_1.pdf 2158985_0_1.pdf 2158987_0_1.pdf	
496575	Mrs Gillian Sewell		CSPS64	Policy FWP7	No	No		No		No	New link road in flood area. It will spoil riverside beauty. It is too close to Dudsbury Hillfort - this area should be conserved for future generations to appreciate. Green Belt should not be threatened.	Too many homes in relation to existing housing stock. There should be consultation with English Nature (Natural England). There are many wild birds and animals, including kingfishers and deer in this lovely area of importance. Historically there have been archaeological finds in this area.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		510		
496597	Mr Colin Sewell		CSPS54	Policy FWP7	No	No	No	No	No	No	Too many houses. The fields and green belt should not be built on EVER. We do not need "enhancing". We have enough shops and facilities (sports fields, clubs, community centres)	Density of housing much too high. Hill fort area should be avoided. New Road will get very clogged up. Traffic will become worse.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination	No, if our views are collected accurately and local democracy respected.	510		
508605	Miss Janet Ames		CSPS67	Policy FWP7	No	No		No	No	No	We voted against large scale development. We in West Parley or even Ferndown do not have large numbers of homeless. Where are these people coming from? Are we building for Bournemouth, Poole or London? There is a consistent 'Dump problems in Parley or Hurn'. Where is the transport? We have none in Dudsbury.	That you listen to the locals. I also hope that Iford and Christchurch will sue if water levels rise as flood water will be drained into the river.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	See above.	510		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
644715	Mrs Barbara Ralph		CSPS73	Policy FWP7	No	No	No	No	No	No	<p>Not legally compliant - because if anyone else except the government tried to sell land that had no planning permission then it would be regarded as a 'land scam'. It has not been proved that these houses are needed.</p> <p>Unsound, not positively prepared - We do not need 60+% of houses (30+% which are for social housing) to be bought by older people.</p> <p>Not justified - We need the Green Belt. If the banks would lend, younger people could afford houses which already exist.</p> <p>Not effective - The plan isn't deliverable. Who is going to buy all these new houses? It will be using arable land and the new roads that are planned through the developments are just plain ridiculous. They will erode another block of right turn traffic as well as at Parley Cross and another block of left turn traffic on the airport side of Parley Cross.</p> <p>Not consistent with National Policy - We cannot increase the Green Belt land (to stop urban sprawl) so what we should have should be preserved. Will there be anymore police to regulate. Where will new schools be built and doctors or dentists surgeries?</p>			Not forgetting that Councils receive an 'incentive' payment from the government for allowing housing to go ahead. Where is the Democracy? (in name only).	510		
645375	Mr J Sewell		CSPS55	Policy FWP7	No	No					<p>Road to be built where river floods. I'm twenty years old and have seen this many, many times. Too many houses in what should be protected green belt. Green belt should not be considered for building.</p>	<p>Cancel building. We have enough shops already. "Affordable" homes sound cheap and nasty, people will not want them in the future- refer to previous "ffordable" developmets. traffic will become worse.</p>	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		510		
503864	Heather Freeman		CSPS126	Policy FWP7		No			No		<p>Deep concerns for school facilities to cover the increase in 'child' population the 200 homes will bring to the area as local schools are already oversubscribed. Concern for current the residents as affordable housing is within the proposal.</p>	<p>Reduce the number of homes proposed and keep the structures in 'like' style to current properties in the area. Spacing of buildings, gardens, bungalows etc. Reduce the size of the development. Address schooling and medical support for the increase in population.</p>		510			
503869	Mrs Jean Khan		CSPS129	Policy FWP7	No	No	No	No	No	No	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Movement of Green Belt to suit development plans. Contrasting to legislation of Green Belt land. 2. 30% increase in housing in West Parley. 3. Not in West Parley Parish Plans. Undemocratic process! 4. Failure to provide adequate schooling and medical facilities. 	<p>This area is being totally over developed. Another 200 homes means approximately another 400 cars, in one of the most congested local areas. Compensation for properties affected. The value of many properties will go down</p>	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination	510			

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
												in price.						
508708	Mr & Mrs G Peskett		CSPS379	Policy FWP7							<p>We think that the Green Belt in these two areas should be kept to stop the urban sprawl from Bournemouth. The West Parley Parish Plan which was contributed by over 1000 residents and was encouraged by the District Council has been ignored.</p> <p>We do not want another supermarket in the village, with its inherent traffic problems that will arise, as the Parley Crossroad is already over capacity as the fellow from the Dorset Highways told us at the meeting a few weeks ago. To build 300 houses on the large field along New Road, with the proposed changes to the crossroads, meaning that heavy 32ton Artic Lorries will run through the new housing estate, beggars belief to the safety of young families and pets.</p> <p>Along with the proposed 220 houses on the Dudsbury heights field next to the old hill fort and the endangered animals' and bats in this area.</p> <p>The two roads through these proposed housing estates will have traffic lights at each junction with New Road and Christchurch Road, how ever they are fazed this will cause traffic tailbacks on two very busy roads, this has not been thought through in any way.</p> <p>Another thing is the school where are the schools and medical going to be put, as the existing system is at full capacity.</p> <p>With this proposed 520 houses in the village is equivalent to 32% increase to the houses along with 600 to 1000 more cars to use the now overcrowded roads.</p> <p>We think these proposals are completely unsound and not justified in any way.</p>				510			
524338	Mr Kenneth Brooks		CSPS242	Policy FWP7							<p>This proposal appears to be a revision of the FWP3 Option in the Core Strategy Document 2010, with the added provision of a link road joining Christchurch Road with New Road at a point very close to the River Stour and which is clearly on a Flood Plain. Up to the end of March 2012 there have been drought conditions for a long period, but the heavy and frequent rain since then has resulted in the River Stour bursting its banks at this point and the whole area has been under water.</p> <p>It is difficult to envisage the effect of the two link roads allocated in Policies FWP6 and FWP7 would have on the acknowledged serious traffic problems already experienced at this junction. Indeed, the projected scheme for improving Parley Crossroads would probably be inadequate to solve even the current traffic problems. An additional 520 homes within a short distance of the junction on both sides of New Road plus new shops and facilities would only exacerbate the severe congestion in the area, despite the attractions of 'developer gain' funding.</p>				510			
649759	Mrs Amanda Jones		CSPS256	Policy FWP7	No	No					<p>West Parley already experiences serious traffic congestion from all directions in and out of Parley lights and through Longham; the proposed layout changes at Parley lights will offer limited or no improvement. It is the volume of traffic that</p>		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		510			

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>is the issue and unless all the connecting roads and junctions are factored into the infrastructure plans; it will do nothing more than push the gridlock further up or down New Road or Christchurch Road.</p> <p>The number of proposed houses is excessive and there is little or no plans for community services such as schools, doctors etc to support the additional homes; the homes are too far from local schools which will result in even more traffic on the main roads. Glenmoor Road already has serious problems around pick up and drop off times at Parley First School; this will be exacerbated if the intention is to increase headcount at the school.</p> <p>Where are the statistics to justify the need for 30%+ increase in housing stock in West Parley? Do our schools have waiting lists? Are they oversubscribed? Do the doctors and dentists have capacity? Or is it the case that West Parley happens to have more green belt areas than its neighbours and by default that makes it the best option? Why is it acceptable for the Council to build on green belt land when a private homeowner will struggle to achieve planning consent for an extension to an existing property that just happens to be in the vicinity of green belt land?</p> <p>The proposed housing in FWP7 is alongside an area that already experiences flooding issues; the plan does not mention anything about this or how it proposes to alleviate the issues with run off water that more hardstanding areas such as houses and roads will create.</p>						
360060	Mr G.M Edwards		CSPS426	Policy FWP7	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	<p>The Core Strategy response form is far from user friendly and must, by intention or otherwise, be devoid of easy understanding for many residents who will not reply because of inability to carry out in depth research to comply with the set out requirements.</p> <p>A high proportion of residents (and voters) are seriously concerned as evidenced by the WPPC. There is a strong feeling of being steamrollered into a not viable, ill conceived and poorly analysed situation that is judged to have so many flaws.</p> <p>It appears that the District Council has acceded to pressure and will accept written letters in lieu of the printed form. Given sufficient publicity it is an improvement, but is indicative of the odious air surrounding the whole proposal and action by many Councillors.</p> <p>Since Policies FW7, 6 and 5 are deemed to be unsound, not legally compliant, not justified, not effective and not consistent with National Policy, and bearing in mind Government Document PPS12, is now irrelevant. Any constructive support is negated by the lack of publicly widely reported analytical research to support viability.</p> <p>That such porous proposals should be enacted for the betterment of the West Parley area has at least to be highly questionable.</p> <p>At a time of national hardship, and possible future uncertainty of national wealth, to proceed must impose measures by councils and supportive interests of prolonged misery for</p>				510		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>which they must become accountable.</p> <p>The situation is such that it has become virtually impossible to analytically discuss with the District Council potential problems such as:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Increasing probability of flooding. 2. Full public analysis of true housing requirements, devoid of promoting house building and construction work. 3. Excessive affordable housing will inevitably attract or be allocated to many families who are not self supporting. Consequently, rate payers will have to heavily subsidise the numerous forms of support requirements. 4. Infrastructure in the form of schools, church, medical, care and pastime facilities will be further burdens to be carried. 5. The 100 houses as originally proposed by WPPC would be viable and support local shops. A supermarket would kill local traders and add further road chaos. 6. Current West Parley traffic problems are of short duration and no more than many other spots in the area. Road changes may well lead to estate road hazards. 7. Sites of interest, green belt land and wooded areas should not be decimated and sacrificed at the seemingly whim of Councillors or others who seem to dismiss the word sacrosanct when associated with West Parley and other contentious areas in the Core Strategy Plan. 						
361037	Mr P Stratford		CSPS430	Policy FWP7							<p>Re proposed house building on Green Belt land at West Parley policy FWP7 and 6.</p> <p>I have lived in Parley for most of the last fifty years. In that time the Council has embarked on a perpetual cycle of "we need to develop land for housing in order to provide local businesses with workers." Once this has been obtained it is then followed by the council saying "we need to develop more land to expand local industry so that we can give jobs to the local work force." After this happens it's not long before the cry from the council is "more land for housing is needed to accommodate employees."</p> <p>I'm sure by now you are getting the picture that the council constantly demands more land for either housing or business. I am not aware of any land being returned from residential / industrial use to Green Belt or even open land. If you know differently please let me know, but I'm not expecting an answer. At some time this has to stop and that time is now! Development on these Green Belt fields would destroy the "Key Gap" between Parley and Bournemouth, which gives it its own identity, and make Parley just another suburb of Bournemouth.</p> <p>The council officially recognises that the cross roads at West Parley have the most traffic in the east of the county. Therefore, given that on average there are two cars per household and that the proposals are for an additional 520 houses means that there will be an additional 1040 cars in the area. This is without the natural growth of vehicle numbers from existing properties. The huge increase in traffic levels that would result from the new houses is unsustainable. I cannot see where the demand for a new shopping area is</p>				510		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											going to come from, especially as there are regular reports in the business sector media that the high street retail market is in terminal decline. What is the point of building shops that there is not a requirement for and are extremely likely to remain unoccupied? The survey carried out of the local residents in order to create the Parley Parish Plan overwhelmingly showed that the residents and voters of Parley did not want any major development in the area. What is the point of doing Parish Plan when you the council do not listen to us. We feel as if these new houses are being imposed on us without involved or consulted. The proposed development is excessive and not in keeping with the area. For all the above reasons I strongly urge you to reject totally the proposed plans.						
496575	Mrs Gillian Sewell		CSPS425	Policy FWP7							I am writing in order to state my opposition of the proposed erection of 220 houses and the new road planned for Dudsbury Heights, i.e. Policy FWP7. I am also against the erection of 300 houses for the New Road field, i.e. Policy FWP6. I supported the West Parley's Parish Plan, which appears to have been ignored, so one questions local democracy, which has to be considered vital to the health of democracy in our country. The green belt should be respected as exactly that as green spaces, especially around urban areas, are needed for future generations. I support the National Trust's aim for "building for people, not profit" that respects the green belt which was created to prevent urban sprawl. The proposed density is also too high, because although this maximises profit, quality housing will also stand the test of time. However, I have also concerns regarding link roads being built in a flood plain and spoiling the Dudsbury Hill area for future generations for short term profit. I have never heard anyone in West Parley moan about our shopping area and facilities, which are suitable and adequate; indeed the SSSI, fields, footpaths and sports clubs are much appreciated. We do not need anymore shops, especially as future retail trends indicate increased shopping on the web, out of town supermarkets and retail centres. In fact, we are lucky to have the shops that we have, because these include: post office, pharmacy, hairdressers, barbers, boutique, Tesco supermarket, beauty salon, veterinary services, kitchen, tiles, bathroom outlets, sewing shop, chiropedy, nearby dentist and chiropractor and traditional fish and chips, etc.				510		
496575	Mrs Gillian Sewell		CSPS412	Policy FWP7							I am writing to oppose policies FWP7 and policy FWP6. I am against the building of 520 houses, which is totally disproportionate to the present housing stock, The green belt, the 'green lungs', should not be built on. The people of West Parley have already expressed their opposition to these plans in the Parish Survey, which I absolutely agree with. Dudsbury Hill fort area is a beautiful area and should be preserved for posterity.				510		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
											Our community and its spirit will be shattered by these developments. We will no longer be a 'village', but the urban sprawl will be continued to Bournemouth. We enjoy our area and good facilities as they are; we are already well served with shops, walks, our parish council and lovely environment. For the above and other reasons, I am against these proposed developments.							
498775	Mrs P L Buckler		CSPS338	Policy FWP7							Green Belt land. Please put on record that I am totally opposed to building on Green Belt land, it should be sacrosanct. If the erosion of the Green Belt begins the whole of the South of England will be buried under concrete before long. I bought my house 30/40 years ago because I felt I was living in the country - not any more.				510			
499040	Mr K Grimshaw		CSPS333	Policy FWP7							<p>As a resident of West Parley having lived in the above address since 1984 I wish to submit my objections to the proposed increase in the housing in West Parley under Policy FWP6 and FWP7 in particular to FWP6.</p> <p>My property is situated approx half a mile on the Knson side of Parley Traffic lights and even now under the present traffic conditions from about 7.15am until after 9am on a working day traffic is backed up from the lights almost to Kinson way way past my proeprty and the proposed number of houses and the lay out of the road system proposed will make this even worse.</p> <p>From the business park at Hurn Airport large lorries turn left at Parley lights and travel past my property in the direction of Kinson and from looking at the proposed layout of the estate it would seem that 5 traffic island are included which these vehicles will have to negotiate after leaving Hurn along the Christchurch Road turning left into the new estate before joining New Road midway between Parley traffic lights and my property. I would imagine that with the length of some of these vehicles they will find it difficult to rejoin New Road from the estate as it not all that wide.</p> <p>At the present time vehicles wanting to turn right towards Hurn have a set time with the traffic lights but unless more traffic lights are installed at the New Road entrance to the proposed estate there will be traffic hold-ups and dangerous attempts to cross in front of traffic travelling along New Road as vehicles attempt to enter or leave the proposed estate.</p> <p>The same danger will apply to traffic travelling to Hurn who leave New Road into the estate and with families moving into property owning vehicles it is going to be very dangerous for children living on the estate with the volume of traffic passing through at peak times.</p> <p>With regard to FWP7 it is not so much an issue with me but I would point out that the field included in the road from New Road is a flood plain and over the past couple of weeks has been mostly covered in flood water, in the time I have lived in my property I have seen the river waters right across New Road.</p> <p>West Parley feels to residents like a village and the proposed plans will ruin that feeling for us and for a number of residents will lower the values of their properties and also most feel that</p>				510			

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											the number of the proposed houses will mean properties with little or no gardens which is out of character with present buildings in the village.						
500115	Mrs Sylvia McIntyre		CSPS355	Policy FWP7							<p>I recently attended meetings and viewed plans on the proposals to build on the green belt land and whilst I know there is a need for housing I feel strongly that it shouldn't be at the expense of residents already living here and on our green belt.</p> <p>The vision for our village is to encourage a younger element to our community, however when questioned about schools which are already oversubscribed I felt fobbed off by the comment that those children living near West Moors would be sent to those schools (what happened to parents preferences). We already have children from West Parley being refused entry to all 3 local primary schools (Parley First, Hampreston and Ferndown First) and Ferndown Middle school is also turning away our local children.</p> <p>When questioned about which would come first - houses or infrastructure I was advised houses! So not only are our children being ferried miles but they, nor the rest of us, will get to work or school easily as with some 500 plus houses there is bound to be as many cars. My road is already gridlocked during certain times of the day and the proposed link roads will only move the problem further down the road, not to mention I will be expected to drive through the middle of the proposed 300 houses to go to Bournemouth this is potentially going to become a rat run which would be very dangerous for young families as Glenmoor Road has become!</p> <p>Whilst there is a lot of rhetoric about the community being consulted I feel we are being given a fete-e-comply the new plans viewed were nothing like the 2010 ones viewed previously, has the District Council ignored everything? I am advised that the green belt we have is calssed as "key gaps" which should prevent urban sprawl and the top reason for the green belt in the first place.</p> <p>I also believe the 500+ houses means a 32% increase in our housing stock and an excess of what is expected in other areas of our county.</p>				510		
501080	Ms Olivia Collins		CSPS445	Policy FWP7	No					Yes	<p>National Planning Policy Framework para 87. Inappropriate development is by nature, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. Para 88 "Very special circumstances" will not exist unless... harm... is outweighed by other considerations.</p>	<p>No building on green belt. Use the Dormy hotel site instead. It is possible, if necessary, to use small amounts of Green Belt to improve roads, without 520 new houses.</p>	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		510		
501593	Mrs E J Brockhurst		CSPS414	Policy FWP7							<p>Green Belt Plans - West Parley. I do not agree with the interference of the Green Belt area in West Parley. Policy FWP7. This goes against the Green Belt plan which was introduced specifically to prevent building on designated areas.</p>				510		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description			
											Policy FWP6. I do not agree with this policy for the reasons stated above. The link road proposed will interfere with the flow of traffic on Christchurch Road and exacerbate the already crowded roads at Longham. The West Parley's Parish Plan has been virtually ignored.									
501753	Mrs J Easterbee		CSPS375	Policy FWP7							Responding to the proposed plan to build 520 houses and 2 new main roads in West Parley I would like to point out that first and foremost we are and have been a village for hundreds, even thousands, of years so why should some outsiders decide to change this and no longer keep our green fields? As to the link roads, how can the proposal to build across a field that is flooded during wet weather be even considered? Also to bring more traffic out onto Christchurch Road is hardly going to ease an already very busy road. The airport and industrial estate will always be adding to their transporting of goods and passengers. Has drainage been thoroughly thought about on a flood plain field where 300 houses etc are to be built? We have no medical services or school to cope with a large influx of families. No! Councillors this is not the village for such intensive alterations, think again.					510				
501766	Mr D E Anderton		CSPS415	Policy FWP7							1. Whilst we welcome the additional mixed housing to add to the diversity of the population and make a contribution to the national housing targets, we believe that an increase of over 30% of properties will not be sustainable by the local infrastructure. Although we do not have the necessary data to make accurate calculation, this number of properties could increase the population of West Parley by up to 50%. Can the local services cope with this level of increase? 2. We strongly object to the destruction of our green belt. The Core Strategy states that 99.5% of green belt remains, but where is the justification to destroy the other 0.5%? What are the unarguable reasons for overriding the five stated purposes of the green belt as set down PPG2? What are the special circumstances that override those principles to allow development on the green belt which is a key gap between West Parley and Bournemouth? Why not build on 'in-fill' sites around the area?						510			
501801	Mrs Ward		CSPS443	Policy FWP7	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	The proposed road will cross a floodplain, which has been completely flooded in the recent drought. It will go through trees with a preservation order and rare bats home. There is also lots of other wildlife and nature that will be destroyed.	Its a flood plain - there is nothing to change. There are tree preservation orders - there is nothing to change. This is home to endangered bats - there is nothing to change!!!	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination			510				
502322	Mrs J C Critchell		CSPS324	Policy FWP7							Consultation response to the new Green Belt plans. I am writing to oppose the new parish plans proposed for West					510				

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>Parley. In the previous survey most residents were not against any new development, but objected to wholesale encroachment of our Green belt areas. They were especially against development on the Dudsbury Hills fields. We now learn (Ref. Policy FWP7) that we can expect about 200 houses on this site. The proposed link road from Christchurch Road, by the Dudsbury, to New Road will also cut into the Green Belt land. Did any planners see the flooded fields either side of New Road after the recent rains? This area floods every time we have heavy rain.</p> <p>I have always understood that the New Road Fields (shown in Policy PW96) to be another flood plain as well as an emergency area for the airport - one reason why planning permission for housing development on this site has been refused in the past. Building on this land should again be refused. 300 houses, along with a new road cutting through the estate, on Green Belt land, is unacceptable. West Parley infrastructure (roads, schools, and doctors) cannot absorb an extra 520 houses. 'Pies in the sky' never materialise and these issues need to be dealt with before any wholesale development takes place. Perhaps up to a hundred houses could be built in small clusters around the village, but no large scale estates. Once the land is built upon and concreted over, our open aspect will be lost and we will contribute to the general urban scrawl around our large towns.</p> <p>Instead of just looking at maps when considering areas for development, perhaps Officers and Councillors would visit the area to see what effect their ill-considered ideas will do. They should talk to residents and witness the traffic congestion. Maybe then, they will realise what the local people want, and reconsider their plans to accommodate these wishes.</p> <p>I look forward to receiving new plans for West Parley's development, taking into account the points raised above.</p>						
502683	Mr and Mrs G Milne		CSPS331	Policy FWP7							<p>We have lived in Ferndown for fifty years and seen many changes - some good, some bad. We consider the proposed policies FWP6/7 are bad.</p> <p>Why not stick to two basic rules?</p> <p>1 - Keep our green sites and use brown sites for building.</p> <p>2 - Show "entrepreneurs", who want to do otherwise, the door!</p>				510		
503717	Mr and Mrs L Grounsell		CSPS342	Policy FWP7							<p>We wish to object to Policy FWP7 and FWP6 both are excessive and unnecessary. We will soon be unable to get out onto our roads which are very busy. We have a green belt so leave it alone and preserve our history.</p>				510		
507463	Mr and Mrs G Hirst		CSPS318	Policy FWP7							<p>Regarding the proposed developments at West Parley. The Government document PPS12 appears to no longer be in force so we have been referred to the 220 page 'Core Strategy' and the 57 page 'National Planning Policy Framework' document. This whole process has been made so complex that it is clearly not written with residents in mind, very few will have the patience or knowledge to complete this as requested. So we have written this letter in plain English instead. Our concerns are quite simple common sense issues</p>				510		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description						
											and we felt there is absolutley no need for such complexity. Policies FWP6 and FWP7 are totally inappropriate and unacceptable to West Parley which already has some of the most congested routes in the Bournemouth area. The proposed link road that will pass through the middle of the houses in FWP3 has to be the most ridiculous ideas yet. This road will pass through affordable housing, children outside. I hope you get our drift on this, or should we wait for one more to be killed or injured first! The 'West Parley Parish Plan' that was contributed to by 1000 residents has been virtually ignored by the District Council. You are proposing an additional 520 houses at West Parley. What a complete nonsense. A few houses on brown field sites is fine. Certainly not building on these 'Key Gaps' against urban sprawl. You really need to remember who the customer is here (the 'West Parley Residents') and come to your senses over these decisions and listen to what we are saying.												
644715	Mrs Barbara Ralph		CSPS372	Policy FWP7							These houses will take away much used green space. The traffic will build up on New Road Parley due to the ridiculous proposal to put a road through from Christchurch Road to New Road. This will cause extra noise, exhaust fumes and a right turn blockage as traffic turns right from Christchurch Road and then blockage on New Road and traffic tries to exit from the new slip road through FWP7.				510								
650107	Mr David Baxter		CSPS310	Policy FWP7							This idea seems to be a little more sensible, with the road running around the perimeter of the new housing instead of directly through it. However, putting yet another junction on Christchurch Road West, and another junction on Christchurch Road East, in addition to the junction for the Parley Cross development, is foolish. New Road, like Christchurch Road is a busy road. It is heavily used and there is a constant flow of traffic along it. Blocking that flow will cause additional congestion and will create a start-stop-start journey for drivers, causing more pollution and using more fuel, regardless of the time of day. Banning traffic movement from Christchurch Road West on to New Road will immediately put a strain on the new link road. The link road should be built to a 40mph standard, not 30mph, and the movement at Parely Cross should be allowed, therefore providing maximising the availability of routes and reducing congestion in the area. What happens if someone who lives on Christchurch Road West, perhaps by Chine Walk at Parley Cross, wants to take some items to a friend who lives on Dudsbury Gardens, just off New Road? Currently, they would drive to Parley Cross, turn right onto New Road, turn right into one of the entrances to the New Road service road, then follow that along to Dudsbury Gardens. A simple drive taking just a few minutes. (Driving along Ridgeway, then turning left into Longfield Drive is not an option as Longfield Drive is gated to prevent people using it as a cut-through.) With the proposed road system, they would have to drive up Christchurch Road, turn left onto the new link road, drive				510								

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
											<p>along the entire length of the link road to New Road, turn left onto New Road, then left again onto the service road, and finally follow the service road on to the Dudsbury Gardens. Please explain to me how this waste of time is economical, reduces pollution, uses less fuel and is environmentally friendly?</p> <p>It seems that the council is dedicated to providing road systems that will not be suitable for the volume of traffic in the area. The council does this in the name of reducing traffic elsewhere. In the long run, as traffic continues to build, as the roads through new developments become congested with traffic that has no business in those new developments, the council will completely fail to see the repercussions of the short-sightedness of the decisions being made now. undoubtedly there will be an exclamation of "Goodness, isn't it terrible how congested these roads are? There's so much traffic on the roads these days." And to that, I say, "Council, you made this bed, you lie in it."</p> <p>I sincerely hope that the council reviews and removes the idiotic restrictions and designs that are in the document and comes up with a better designed, more sustainable, forward looking set of proposals that will do justice to the area and give credit to the designers and developers.</p>							
650257	Mr Ian King		CSPS439	Policy FWP7	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	<p>This proposal to build 520 new homes within the area FWP7 is not consistent with current Government policy and should be legally challenged. The scheme proposed is not sound as it is not justified, effective or consistent with National Policy for the following reasons:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The indiscriminate re-drawing of the Green Belt boundaries in West Parley is not consistent with current Government policy. • The proposed number of houses in FWP7 (220) is excessive even unnecessary as the site is far from ideal being a hilly mound, totally unsuitable for the civil engineering works which would need to be utilised both for the building of the houses and their services and the construction of a substantial road which will carry heavy goods vehicles as well as the increase in local traffic • The proposed housing in FWP7 is alongside an area that already experiences flooding issues; the plan does not mention anything about this or how it proposes to alleviate the issues with run-off water that more hard standing areas such as houses and roads will create. • The proposed changes to the layout at Parley lights will offer limited or no improvement; whereas the proposed link roads will cause additional tailbacks and traffic problems for all traffic trying to join the New Road just before the New Road Bridge. <p>Additional comments from letter received on 18.6.12</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The number of houses proposed for the schemes in FWP6 and FWP7 is too great for the area to absorb and there are little or no plans for community services such as schools, doctors etc to support the additional homes; the homes are too far from local schools which will result in even more traffic 	<p>This area of FWP7 is at present kept as an open space between the river and the present housing development along Christchurch Road and is used as livery for horses. There is a Public Footpath crossing the top of the area leading to the Dudsbury Fort and allowing an already Natural Green Space. Why do we need to lose it to be 'given' a SANG which will not be as suitable and cost more to achieve? It is overflowed by aircraft which makes it unsuitable for housing and being a mound will have drainage problems when 'tarmac' d over with a busy noisy road. the concept is ill conceived and should be radically reduced in size without</p>	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		510			

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>on the main roads. Glenmoor Road already has serious problems around pick up and drop-off times at Parley First School; this will be exacerbated if the intention is to increase headcount at the school.</p> <p>Questions the residents are asking are:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Where are the statistics to justify the need for 30%+ increase in housing stock in West Parley? 2. Do our schools have waiting lists? Are they oversubscribed? 3. Do the doctors and dentists have capacity? 4. Could it be the case that West Parley happens to have more green belt areas than its neighbours and by default that makes it the best option? 5. Why is it acceptable for the Council to build on green belt land when a private homeowner will struggle to achieve planning consent for an extension to an existing property that just happens to be in the vicinity of the green belt land? <p>As far as the road scheme is concerned, it is difficult to envisage the effect the two link roads proposed in Policies FWP6 and FWP7 would have on the acknowledged serious traffic problems already experienced at this junction. Indeed, the projected scheme for improving Parley Crossroads would probably be inadequate to solve even the current traffic problems. An additional 520 homes within a short distance of the junction on both sides of New Road plus new shops and facilities would only exacerbate the severe congestion in the area, despite the attractions of 'developer gain' funding. This is a case of the new housing funding and proposed roads and change of layout, thereby defeating the objective and indeed making it worse.</p>	the link road.					
650450	Mr and Mrs R Legg		CSPS325	Policy FWP7							<p>As a resident of West Parley we are absolutely disgusted and angry to know that we are expected to absorb 220 new houses and a new link road at Dudsbury Heights Field. Christchurch Road and New Road are already very busy, and to think even more housing plus cars will be added on this lovely green site is unbelievable. It is so important for local residents to have and enjoy and keep their local green field site and also for our future generations.</p> <p>There are lots of fields off Ham Lane which would make ideal building sites without affecting the local residents.</p>				510		
650651	Mr A Holden		CSPS339	Policy FWP7							<p>Leave as is. Green spaces are required for wild life and natural wild foliage.</p> <p>2010 Plans - Do not disregard what the people of West Parley think on this change. Green Belts are designated for a reason, and to treat of no importance does not serve you well.</p>				510		
650667	Mr A D Blakely		CSPS353	Policy FWP7							<p>Words are nearly failing me to believe that it is your intention to put 520 homes on these "Green Field Sites" and create 'two separate estates'.</p> <p>There is, for a start, not the infrastructure to support this amount of density, nor are the roads capable of taking the amount of extra traffic that will have to be supported.</p> <p>Oh yes, build your new roads and traffic lights, which will cause the existing slow traffic at peak times to be even</p>				510		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>slower, but this will also move the problem further afield to Ferndown, Haskins roundabout and the Kinson roundabout. Access to these 'new' roads, no doubt will be controlled by yet more traffic lights, again slowing down the excess traffic. Do not forget that more lights are being installed along New Road where the Dormy Hotel used to be! Hope I have made my point and without using your political 'slang', for slang it is.</p> <p>Use words and meanings that the average person understands, not for example in your Core Strategy Response Form, Q.7 'Please set out what change (s) you consider necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified at 5 above where this relates to soundness.</p> <p>It beggars belief.</p> <p>If you had a request for that question in a foreign language, you would translate it in the equivalent of 'plain' English. I also wonder how many of those councillors involved in the decision making have actually spent time at the Parley Cross roads at busy times and witnessed the existing chaos. I have only written about the traffic situation, I haven't mentioned all the other problems which would be created by such an influx of 'new residents', like schools, pets, sewerage, water, etc etc etc....</p> <p>The increasing population does need extra housing, but not on this scale.</p> <p>Help reduce the increase in the population by 'standing up and being counted' to the existing laws, which allows too many people, too easily, take advantage of them. You are supposed to represent us. About time you did. Enough said, I am strongly opposed to your plans.</p>						
650721	Mr M A Cook		CSPS370	Policy FWP7							<p>I write to object against the two aforementioned housing policies (FWP6 and FWP7), which are being considered for the West Parley area.</p> <p>I could write song and verse, but have chosen to simply identify some bullet points, as I understand an ordinary letter of objection is accepted by the District Council. My concerns / issues are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> *lack of existing infrastructure *poor link road design *disjointed plans - link roads after houses *over population *loss of green belt and 'Bournemouth Gap' *very little consultation *ignoring the West Parley Parish Plan and the views of the residents who strongly oppose. 				510		
703944	Cllr John Little	Christchurch & East Dorset Conservative Association	CSPS451	Policy FWP7	Yes	No		Yes	Yes		<p>The proposals fail to recognise the recommendations in the West Parley Parish Plan. Apart from the housing target of 200 there are no measurable targets on which to evaluate the proposals.</p> <p>100 houses could be built without the proposed highway improvement. The feasibility/practicability of providing the proposed link road on the southern side is not indicated and the required funding for this road has not been adequately</p>	<p>More detailed consideration as to the feasibility and practicability of providing the proposed link road between New Road and Christchurch Road.</p>	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		510		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
											considered. This proposal is rather idealistic bearing in mind the terrain and topography of the area. Recognising the need for housing, this development is supported. Again it seems likely that 50% of the homes could be occupied without any highway improvements being made. How practical is it to construct the link road as envisaged?							
360235	Mr Christopher Undery	Christopher D Undery	CSPS743	Policy FWP7		No			No		Housing proposals fail to take account of the benefits that could accrue to the established but disjointed settlement of Longham where little or no development is envisaged.	The Core Strategy should be amended to utilise and enhance the settlement of Longham in conjunction with the identified need for residential housing provision.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	To draw attention to the existing settlement of Longham.	510			
491034	Mr Kenneth Dalglish		CSPS726	Policy FWP7							Further to receiving recent communication regarding the housing proposals, I write to confirm my formal objection to the building of 300 houses on site FWP6 and 220 houses on site FWP7 for the following reasons: 1. The proposal represents a housing increase of approximately 32%. This is an unacceptable increase in a small village and puts the status of West Parley 'village' in jeopardy. 2. Increased volume of traffic will create further pressures on an already busy and sometimes dangerous junction. The creation of two additional roads will not alleviate this issue; it will only exacerbate the growing concerns of further major traffic incidents. I truly believe that any parties that authorise such an infrastructure change to Parley Cross, knowing the plans would increase traffic to an unacceptable level in an already dangerous junction, should be wholly accountable for increased injuries and fatalities. 3. The proposals will destruct the countryside which is home to many wild birds and animals, with many of those being protected; this in itself is so wrong. 4. The Green Belt is a policy where urbanisation will be resisted for the foreseeable future, maintaining an area where agriculture, forestry and outdoor leisure can be expected to prevail. The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open, and consequently the most important attribute of Green Belts is their openness. The proposals fail to recognise the importance of the detailed advice regarding PPG2's whereby there are five stated purposes of including land within the Green Belt, namely: • To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas • To prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another • To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment • To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns • To assist in urban regenerations, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.					510		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>5. West Parley is much older than our neighbours in Bournemouth and Ferndown, and has deeper roots than most of the settlements in South East Dorset. Dudsbury Rings, indeed, is an important heritage site and the protection of this and the surrounding area appears to be regarded as irrelevant in the proposals.</p> <p>I feel most strongly about the housing proposals and have highlighted the reasons why this should not be pursued. Each of the above reasons is valid, however, there is one area of additional concern which I would wish to raise. I question the reasoning and genuine integrity of the intentions of the EDDC planners as they have failed to conduct the consultation process in accordance with legislation. Government legislation requires consultation to be carried out fully with local communities before setting out local proposals.</p> <p>Therefore:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Why have EDDC proposed these plans in this format? Who is accountable for EDDC? And who checks the validity of what has been proposed? <p>Credibility is very important and the process, at this time, does not appear to be very credible.</p> <p>I look forward to hearing more positive news regarding the amendment or cancellation of the proposed plans.</p>						
496749	Mr J S Davidson		CSPS709	Policy FWP7							<p>I have been given to understand that you are prepared to accept written personal submissions in the above connection. Before dealing with specific aspects of the EDDC proposals for West Parley I wish to offer general comment pertaining to the political, economic and social circumstances, which appear to have given rise to the centrally imposed obligation to provide housing on the scale indicated.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> We are told that additional housing is vital. Why? – Because there are more people. Why? – Because of natural increase and immigrants. Population pressure has been exacerbated by successive Governments not having had a 'common sense' immigration policy. <p>Natural increase would see a steady, manageable demand for housing not the current mad dash to concrete over the countryside to meet Government targets, which targets have a national dynamic as well as a local one.</p> <p>We can, as a nation, have EITHER a Welfare State OR a permeable Immigration Policy but we cannot have both. We cannot ignore the root of the problem.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> I have the uncomfortable feeling that many of the proposals were formulated by the planners without adequate consultation with the communities affected. Perhaps the current exercise will go some way to dispelling that impression and confirm the effectiveness of local democracy, particularly in regard to the Parish Plan, which did receive reasonably comprehensive circulation. The Plan was firmly against more than 100 houses being built in West Parley. New housing on the scale suggested will irretrievably alter the landscape, destroy the residual semi-rural nature of the area and put intolerable pressure on services, roads and other amenities. There is more than just a whiff of reliance, 				510		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>ultimately, on central government and some thought has to be given to future funding (roads etc) with all the obligations such funding would bring. West Parley is already being pressured into accepting a disproportionate share of the housing burden.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Besides the information and views from the planners it is vital that all parties who have a vested interest in any of the proposals be named so that transparency and accountability are established. The position of the present owners of the development land; of the likely commercial enterprises involved/approached; contractors, developers etc has to be declared as soon as possible. The channels through which the proposals are being driven and personalities (MP's, public servants et al) involved in whatever capacity must be identified. Presumably our local MP and the MEP are being kept apprised of developments. (Cc sent). <p>FWP7 Yet more houses - 200 in this proposal. The perception is that there appears to be an absence of sympathy for and lack of understanding of the importance of the historical site.</p> <p>General A reasonable amount of housing imposing a minimal extra burden on services and the countryside is acceptable. What is now proposed is, in my opinion, scandalous for the reasons I have indicated and smacks of 'Big Brother'. Such proposed developments should take place to meet local needs, whereas in this instance pressure from central Government is clearly the dominating factor. The consequences of resisting such pressure are not apparent.</p> <p>The number of 520 extra houses goes beyond that which a relatively small community such as West Parley should be expected to bear. In registering my strong objection to FWP6 and FWP7 it is clear that EDDC needs to re-think the situation urgently and imaginatively.</p> 						
654320	Mrs Meghann Downing	Highways Agency	CSPS757	Policy FWP7	Yes	Yes					The proposed New Neighbourhood to the East and West of New Road are not immediately adjacent to the A31, nonetheless they represent a significant increase to existing housing, and therefore we would highlight the importance of including impacts upon the Strategic Road Network in the Transport Assessment and resulting mitigation to ensure that traffic impacts upon the SRN are appropriately managed.		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		510		
654437	Mr Ron White		CSPS702	Policy FWP7	No	No	No	No	No	No	<p>FWP7 The housing development and road proposal is an ill-conceived and ill thought out scheme that goes against all local democratic views and infrastructure concepts. The proposed development and influx of high density housing along with FWP6 and FWP5 schemes can be compared with two such local developments in completed in Bournemouth, namely Townsend Estate and West Howe Estates. These two Estates subsequently resulted in the highest crime rate of the surrounding areas.</p> <p>The current FWP7, FPW6 and FPW 5 schemes have a far greater content than the original schemes proposed by East Dorset Council, which when submitted to the electorate for consultation were democratically rejected by 98% of West</p>	Full consultation with the curent Parish Council on their proposals	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	To put forward the views of the local residents.	510		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
											<p>Parley residents.</p> <p>The local parish council at the time did not oppose these proposals. Subsequently, at the next parish council elections all councillors were voted out by the residents of West Parley and new councillors voted in.</p> <p>Since the election, the local council has consulted with the electorate and the consensus of opinion is that although the residents clearly object to the current proposals of building on green belt land, they are willing to accept that new housing will be required, but in far fewer numbers.</p> <p>The proposal by the recently elected local parish council was put forward for a future maximum development of 100 homes within the West Parley parish. These homes could be accommodated on brown fill land without incursion onto the green belt.</p> <p>This proposal was submitted to the electorate and was overwhelmingly accepted, yet the District council ignored the recommendation.</p> <p>The current East Dorset planning of this scheme failed to consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The democratic wishes of the electorate • The infrastructure required to sustain this type of development • The effect on the local environment • The effect of this great influx of population on the local doctors, dentists, schools. • The increase of traffic on an already over used road system • Lack of local employment in the area • The impact of increased crime statistics in the lowest crime rated parish district in the Dorset area. • Failed to consult fully with all of the local electorate on the latest proposals • Proposed road exit onto New Road to be built on flood plane • High density housing too close to National monument and Guide Camp with potential vandalism of both. 							
654581	Mr and Mrs H Hedges		CSPS722	Policy FWP7							<p>My wife and I wish to object most strongly to the plans for huge housing development in West Parley under Policy FWP6 and FWP7.</p> <p>The overwhelming majority of residents are against these plans which if implemented will seriously damage the quality of life of all who live here.</p> <p>It would seem that key areas of Green Belt are to be stolen, justified on the altar of house building with no regard to the wishes of the resident population.</p> <p>The Green Belt is there for a good reason: to leave a breathing space and prevent further urban sprawl. Parley is already a notorious black spot at Parley Cross with excessive traffic volumes, with hold ups and accidents commonplace.</p> <p>The air pollution we have to endure is appalling and will be exacerbated by hundreds more cars from the proposed housing.</p> <p>Councils have a duty to protect the Green Belt and maintain the quality of life of its Ratepayers. Ratepayers will not forget Councils which ignore their wishes.</p>					510		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
654595	Mr and Mrs T Sams		CSPS732	Policy FWP7							<p>We would like to express our concern at the proposed huge development in this historic and beautiful village.</p> <p>We are sure the residents of our community understand that housing is a requirement in line with the population expansion, but a development of this size in an area that has already seen the increase in scheduled flights from the now Bournemouth Airport, the lorries serving the Waste Disposal Unit and the impossible traffic situation along Christchurch Road and New Road, is a plan for disaster.</p> <p>This village has also had to suffer the increased Ambulance, Police and Fire activity that excess traffic has brought to this area. Surely there is better logic than to increase the residential capacity by the amount you are proposing?</p> <p>It has also been our understanding that Green Belt land is a government policy for controlling urban growth, the type that you are proposing.</p> <p>Surely, the main purpose of this policy was to protect land and maintain the designated area for forestry and agriculture as well as to provide for wildlife and protect the unique character of rural communities.</p> <p>How can we ever believe Government and Councils who ignore the very policies they introduce?</p> <p>Rather than subject the local Parley community to irresponsible developments, perhaps your focus should be more on the 3,000 empty properties at any one time in the Bournemouth and Christchurch area. Surely this is a significant wasted resource which would contribute towards the housing demands. The Empty Homes Strategy 2009-2012 identifies this wasted resource as you probably know.</p> <p>It must also be clear to you that the consultation process has been unsatisfactory. Government legislation requires you to consult fully with those who will be severely impacted by your proposal. You have failed to adhere to this legislation.</p> <p>The West Parley Parish Council have been proactive in consulting residents who responded overwhelmingly against more than 100 homes being built in West Parley. It is evident that EDDC planners chose to ignore this.</p> <p>The general concerns are that EDDC seem to indulge in secret consultations and decisions which are not only unacceptable but also fail to meet Government legislation. Creating an unbroken urban sprawl from Bournemouth to Ferndown by building on Green Belt land does not represent good practice and ignores Green Belt Policy and the community which you are supposed to represent.</p> <p>The proposal for 2 new roads will be dangerous for children living in the new houses and will not ease the already stretched traffic system in West Parley. Traffic jams will be merely moved further down the main roads. 520 extra houses will bring up to 1000 extra cars trying to navigate through West Parley.</p> <p>Such a development represents an increase in housing of about 32%. This is excessive and is far more than is proposed for the other East Dorset communities. Without the appropriate infrastructure of adequate school places, doctors, dentists, community centres etc there will be unacceptable</p>				510		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
											pressure on existing provisions. The planners do not seem to have considered traffic congestion issues, floodplain, heritage sites, and the traffic chaos that yet another supermarket will bring. We implore you not to make such community impacted decisions that may well haunt you for years. Such examples are the Castlepoint disaster for both traffic flow and major car parking issues with jacks holding up some of the foundation and the IMAX Centre which you are now considering demolishing to name but two major Council planning disasters. West Parley should not be sacrificed by planners' unrealistic dreams and an attempt at social engineering. I urge you to reconsider these proposals and to start talking to the people in West Parley Community who are entitled to have a say in the drawing up of proposals for any increase in housing in their village.							
654631	Mr Michael Ward		CSPS733	Policy FWP7		No	No	No	No	No	Contravenes Green Belt Policy - this would create an unbroken urban sprawl from Bournemouth to Ferndown. A new link road from New Road to Christchurch Road would create a bottleneck further up New Road as well as at Parley lights. The fields are constantly under water after heavy rainfall. There are many protected species of animals inhabiting around the area that the link road will cut through. There was no public consultation with the local community.	Leave West Parley as is. Create a new conurbation of the A338 between the Blackwater Junction and Ringwood.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		510			
654783	Mrs Lesley Wilson		CSPS866	Policy FWP7	Yes	No	No		No	No	Green belts were created for the excellent ideal of keeping gaps between urban communities and it follows that to move the boundaries to allow building on them when they lie between two adjacent conurbations flies in the face of that ideal and should be a very last resort. This green belt lies between West Parley and Bournemouth and should be retained complete. Together with FWP6 it introduces for the first time two new link roads across the green belts and four new traffic signal controlled junctions on the two main roads through Parley crossroads. This is claimed to reduce traffic through Parley crossroads by 30% from current levels but makes no reference to the impact of an extra 550 houses being built alongside those roads as part of this strategy and ignores the fact that the local airport passenger numbers in this recession are something like 2 million less than the airport was built to cater for. A previous consultation should have included all the above changes and provided evidence of their buildability and effectiveness. The policy is to include a requirement for the new link roads to be built when 50% of the new houses have been constructed. That is very weak. The new road construction should be required to commence at Day One if the houses are approved.	A further consultation.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		510			
654962	Mr Christopher Chope		CSPS1015	Policy FWP7	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Policies FWP5, 6 and 7 together result in the removal of an essential part of the South East Dorset Green Belt from Green Belt designation. There is no justification for this, consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework which requires that development on land designated as Green Belt should be restricted when plan making is undertaken and that	Deletion of these policies from the Plan.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	In order to reinforce the strong and deep rooted campaign by members of the West Parley community to preserve their Green	510			

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
											such a restriction should be part of the concept of sustainable development.			Belt and prevent West Parley becoming assimilated as part of a suburb between Bournemouth and Ferndown.				
655073	Mrs Barbara Bailey		CSPS1003	Policy FWP7	No	No	No	No	No	No	<p>The proposal to build 520 new homes within the areas FWP6 and FWP7 is not consistent with current Government policy and should be legally challenged. The schemes proposed are not sound as they are not justified, effective or consistent with National Policy for the following reasons:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Indiscriminate re-drawing of the Green Belt boundaries in West Parley is not consistent with current Government policy. • West Parley already experiences serious traffic congestion from all directions in and out of Parley lights and through Longham due to the inadequate size of the A348 to Bear Cross. This is a major trunk road and needs to be upgraded to relieve the congestion on the Christchurch Road and New Road. The proposed changes to the layout at Parley lights will offer limited or no improvement; whereas the proposed link roads will cause additional tailbacks and traffic problems for all traffic trying to join the New Road just before the New Road Bridge. It is the volume of traffic that is the issue and unless all the connecting roads and junctions are factored into the infrastructure plans; it will do nothing more than push the gridlock further up or down New Road or Christchurch Road. Not justified or effective. • The proposed number of houses in FWP7 (220) is excessive even unnecessary as the site is far from ideal being a hilly mound, totally unsuitable for civil engineering works which would need to be utilised both for the building of the of the houses and their services and the construction of a substantial road which will carry heavy goods vehicles as well as the increase in local traffic. • The proposed housing in FWP7 is alongside an area that already experiences flooding issues; the plan does not mention anything about this or how it proposes to alleviate the issues with run-off water that more hard standing areas such as houses and roads will create. • The number of houses proposed for the schemes in FWP6 and FWP7 is too great for the area to absorb and there are little or no plans for community services such as schools, doctors etc to support the additional homes; the homes are too far from local schools which will result in even more traffic on the main roads. Glenmoor Road already has serious problems around pick up and drop-off times at Parley First School; this will be exacerbated if the intention is to increase headcount at the school. <p>Questions the residents are asking are:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Where are the statistics to justify the need for 30%+ increase in housing stock in West Parley? 2. Do our schools have waiting lists? Are they oversubscribed? 3. Do the doctors and dentists have capacity? 				A more viable solution could be a roundabout on the Parley Crossroads, making use of the garage site which is available to be used, and part of the field opposite. This would enable the flow of traffic to be better managed and without the expense of 2 new roads being built through residential areas of taking over Green Belt land.	510		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
											<p>4. Could it be the case that West Parley happens to have more green belt areas than its neighbours and by default that makes it the best option?</p> <p>5. Why is it acceptable for the Council to build on green belt land when a private homeowner will struggle to achieve planning consent for an extension to an existing property that just happens to be in the vicinity of the green belt land?</p> <p>As far as the road scheme is concerned, it is difficult to envisage the effect the two link roads proposed in Policies FWP6 and FWP7 would have on the acknowledged serious traffic problems already experienced at this junction. Indeed, the projected scheme for improving Parley Crossroads would probably be inadequate to solve even the current traffic problems. An additional 520 homes within a short distance of the junction on both sides of New Road plus new shops and facilities would only exacerbate the severe congestion in the area, despite the attractions of 'developer gain' funding. This is a case of the new housing funding and proposed roads and change of layout, thereby defeating the objective and indeed making it worse.</p>							
655076	Mrs Phyllis Evans		CSPS1005	Policy FWP7	No	No	No	No	No	No	<p>The proposal to build 520 new homes within the areas FWP6 and FWP7 is not consistent with current Government policy and should be legally challenged. The schemes proposed are not sound as they are not justified, effective or consistent with National Policy for the following reasons:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Indiscriminate re-drawing of the Green Belt boundaries in West Parley is not consistent with current Government policy. • West Parley already experiences serious traffic congestion from all directions in and out of Parley lights and through Longham due to the inadequate size of the A348 to Bear Cross. This is a major trunk road and needs to be upgraded to relieve the congestion on the Christchurch Road and New Road. The proposed changes to the layout at Parley lights will offer limited or no improvement; whereas the proposed link roads will cause additional tailbacks and traffic problems for all traffic trying to join the New Road just before the New Road Bridge. It is the volume of traffic that is the issue and unless all the connecting roads and junctions are factored into the infrastructure plans; it will do nothing more than push the gridlock further up or down New Road or Christchurch Road. Not justified or effective. • The proposed number of houses in FWP7 (220) is excessive even unnecessary as the site is far from ideal being a hilly mound, totally unsuitable for civil engineering works which would need to be utilised both for the building of the of the houses and their services and the construction of a substantial road which will carry heavy goods vehicles as well as the increase in local traffic. • The proposed housing in FWP7 is alongside an area that already experiences flooding issues; the plan does not mention anything about this or how it proposes to alleviate the issues with run-off water that more hard standing areas such as houses and roads will create. • The number of houses proposed for the schemes in FWP6 	<p>A more viable solution could be a roundabout on the Parley Crossroads, making use of the garage site which is available to be used, and part of the field opposite. This would enable the flow of traffic to be better managed and without the expense of 2 new roads being built through residential areas of taking over Green Belt land.</p>				510		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>and FWP7 is too great for the area to absorb and there are little or no plans for community services such as schools, doctors etc to support the additional homes; the homes are too far from local schools which will result in even more traffic on the main roads. Glenmoor Road already has serious problems around pick up and drop-off times at Parley First School; this will be exacerbated if the intention is to increase headcount at the school.</p> <p>Questions the residents are asking are:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Where are the statistics to justify the need for 30%+ increase in housing stock in West Parley? 2. Do our schools have waiting lists? Are they oversubscribed? 3. Do the doctors and dentists have capacity? 4. Could it be the case that West Parley happens to have more green belt areas than its neighbours and by default that makes it the best option? 5. Why is it acceptable for the Council to build on green belt land when a private homeowner will struggle to achieve planning consent for an extension to an existing property that just happens to be in the vicinity of the green belt land? <p>As far as the road scheme is concerned, it is difficult to envisage the effect the two link roads proposed in Policies FWP6 and FWP7 would have on the acknowledged serious traffic problems already experienced at this junction. Indeed, the projected scheme for improving Parley Crossroads would probably be inadequate to solve even the current traffic problems. An additional 520 homes within a short distance of the junction on both sides of New Road plus new shops and facilities would only exacerbate the severe congestion in the area, despite the attractions of 'developer gain' funding. This is a case of the new housing funding and proposed roads and change of layout, thereby defeating the objective and indeed making it worse.</p>						
655496	Mr and Mrs S Williams		CSPS1028	Policy FWP7							<p>It is not my job to check the Planning Policy Statement to determine whether or not the document is legally compliant. It is your job to ensure that the document is legally compliant. If you are sure the document is legally compliant why ask me? Don't pass the buck?</p> <p>I really don't know how many more letters I must write, informing you that I do not want you to build on FWP6 and FWP7.</p> <p>I am told that more houses need to be built but surely you can find an alternative site. Recently the field next to the River Stour in the area where you propose to build the new link road up to Dudsbury Heights with 220 houses was flooded and I can only imagine how much extra rainfall will be running down off the road surface when it will be impossible to be absorbed in the ground.</p> <p>House insurance companies are now asking how much the area you live in is likely to be threatened by flooding. So the higher the likelihood of flooding, the higher the insurance premium will be. At the moment I am able to advise my insurance co. that we do not have a problem with flooding.</p>				510		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>Will I still be able to say that when the concrete's gone down? If you think there is no further risk of flooding with the development in this low-lying area, try convincing the insurance companies! After all, the fields get flooded now – BEFORE THEY'VE BEEN BUILT ON!</p> <p>Please tell me how confident you are that the proposed development will not increase the risk of flood, crime, pollution and the loss of quality of life in the area.</p> <p>You say you want to preserve as much green belt as possible and stop urban sprawl, but I cannot understand this, when you seem to want to do the opposite. There is hardly any gap between Bournemouth and West Parley as it is.</p> <p>I have live in West Parley since 1983 and I have lived without a supermarket nearby quite successfully – just like millions of other people in other towns and villages who don't want their area messed about with by dictators who don't even live there.</p> <p>Therefore, these dictators are the true 'not in MY back yard' NIMBYs who have the power to make others have it in their back yard instead. So much for local democracy. If there had been a supermarket there at Parley Cross, I would not have moved here. I am intrigued about the need for all these people to move here, when the employment is pretty much non-existent. The whole character of West Parley will change, as we will probably have an influx of take-aways (more litter and junk-mail) to follow the supermarket.</p> <p>Surely the house are the children of the residents to try to stop them moving away but I don't think this will change matters, you are just going to be bringing people in from out of the area. Therefore still not addressing the affordable housing for local residents.</p> <p>I love the photo of the proposed West Parley site outside the fish and chips parade under FWP5, you must live in a dream world if you really think that is going to be a true image. I noted also that in the 'before' photo, the trees are bare, but in the 'after' photo they are in full bloom. A nice crafty touch to make the scene look more attractive. Obviously deliberate, as this applies to both sets of photos and it is more computer work to alter the trees to green than to leave them bare. Also, if you compare the length and width of the bus lay-by to the passing traffic, you're going to need buses about four foot wide, and ten foot long.</p> <p>It's obvious that the councillors at East Dorset and the government have absolutely no idea about people's feelings and just ride roughshod over us. This will be the biggest mistake you have made for West Parley if you still build in the centre of West Parley – hindsight is a wonderful thing.</p>						
655527	Mr R K Lewis		CSPS1032	Policy FWP7							<p>I will not bore you with an endless explanation concerning your development plans for West Parley but merely offer bullet points for your consideration.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There is no shortage of housing in West Parley unless you intend to import sufficient people to create one. 2. It is not necessary to fill every open space with a building project. 				510		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>3. The traffic at West Parley is already at saturation point at certain times of the day and only a fool would consider adding to it.</p> <p>4. I am reliably informed by developers that there are sufficient brown sites to satisfy any shortfall in the housing stock without building on green belt.</p> <p>5. When we voted for councillors we did so with the belief that their intention was to represent us and protect our interests. You would do well to remember that.</p> <p>6. Finally we are determined to fight the building proposals at West Parley vigorously and I sincerely hope that our determination remains legal.</p>						
656186	Carol and Mark Grimes		CSPS1063	Policy FWP7							<p>We are writing to object to the 220 houses and the new road planned for the Dudsbury heights field near the old hill fort (Policy FWP7). 220 new houses would mean at least 300 more cars coming onto Christchurch Road from the field, which is already a busy road, and in rush hour, it would be chaotic. The area is home to many animals, birds and greenery and the wooded area surrounding the fort would be ruined by overuse.</p> <p>We are also writing to object to the 300 houses, supermarket, shopping centre and link road planned for New Road field (Policy FWP7). The newly proposed road appears to go from Christchurch Road to New Road right through the centre of the housing estate which sounds very dangerous. There would be many children in the new estate and to have a road running through the centre sounds like an accident or death waiting to happen. Parley Cross is one of the busiest junctions in the area and to have at least another 450 cars plus the 300 cars from the Dudsbury fields coming onto the junction would be a nightmare in rush hour. The queues at the junction are already too long, especially in rush hour and do not need any more cars added to them.</p> <p>Our village of West Parley would be devastated by the 32% Increase in housing stock, far more than any other area in the district. The schools and doctors surgery would be overrun by the increase in the population.</p> <p>The New Road and Dudsbury heights field are meant to be 'Key Gaps' with Bournemouth to prevent urban sprawl and are the main reason for having a green belt. There would be hardly any green areas left in West Parley and we would not be a village any more.</p> <p>We and the residents of West Parley DO NOT want this development.</p>				510		
656270	Mr and Mrs S G Ford		CSPS1105	Policy FWP7							<p>I refer to the above policy and will object to the proposal on the following grounds.</p> <p>1. This is building on existing Green Belt which is the lung between the Bournemouth connotation and the Parley, Ferndown, West Moors area. This green belt is the Key gap stopping the urban sprawl. If granted there will be no separation between these growing area's apart from the flood plains.</p> <p>2. This proposal will alter the Parish of West Parley for ever with a huge increase in the housing stock of 32%, far higher</p>				510		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>than any other area and against government policy.</p> <p>3. The increase in population could destroy the adjacent Neolithic Hill Fort.</p> <p>4. The increase in traffic would be untenable, the roads in the area are at present over capacity and the junction at Parley Cross is one of the busiest in Dorset. The increase from the Airport, the new estate in Coppins Nursery and the proposal at the Dormy Hotel site would bring the area to a standstill at most times of the day.</p> <p>5. The proposal is against government policy in so much that planning should come from the Bottom up and not from the Top down.</p> <p>6. The district Council has chosen to ignore the Parish Councils opinion on the Development and the new proposal differs from the 2010 plans.</p> <p>7. Additional shops and a Super Market are not required, the existing shops are under used and are not charity shops. In the last 40years it has been proved that small shops cannot survive against supermarkets and additional shops would remain under used or become charity shops.</p>						
656273	Mrs Angela Swift		CSPS1109	Policy FWP7							<p>I write to object strongly, to the proposed building of 220 houses on the FWP 7 and 300 on FWP6 sites for the following reasons:</p> <p>CONSULTATION PROCESS. The consultation process has not been carried out thoroughly. There has not been well publicised information, readily available to all. Rather there has been scant, electronic information, which has only reached a portion of residents. On a previous building proposal, which proposed many fewer new houses, residents made their views plain, the vast majority voting against. The EDDC were supplied with this information. Rather than then take these views on board, they have instead chosen to put forward a new plan which increases the proposed number of new houses from 100 to a simply staggering 520. This is certainly not consultation, it is dictatorial, and, in my view, not in any way democratic!</p> <p>SIZE OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT. The huge, I believe, 32% increase in West Parleys' houses, is disproportionately & unfairly high when compared to other building proposals in the surrounding areas. The proposal requires more roads, shops etc. West Parley cannot take more cars, more roads & even a supermarket. We cannot keep building ad-indefinitum. There has to be a point beyond which any area cannot & should not be further developed. Or are we to "concrete over" this "green & pleasant land" for future generations?</p> <p>GREEN BELT. I am both amazed & disgusted that FWP6 & 7 propose building on our "protected" green belt land. The whole point of designating this land as green belt was to prevent development on it. The government advocate building on brown field sites. Therefore, to build on green belt, 520 houses, shops etc., cannot be right, fair, is certainly not what was intended or what the residents of West Parley find</p>				510		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>acceptable. I would add that these residents elect the councillors, & the residents' views should be represented by them rather than being largely ignored. West Parley is not an outskirt of Bournemouth & * should never be so. Further the building on our countryside would not only be negatively felt by residents but also deplete wildlife, including some protected species. This is completely unacceptable. It is, I believe, generally accepted that we should now be conserving the whole of our natural biodiversity. Whether it is in relation to land, flora or fauna, if "protection" is in place, the this should remain protected, not be ignored, overridden or bulldozed through by anyone & certainly not just to suit planners.</p> <p>In summation, I believe that a) the views of West Parley residents have been completely disregarded, b) the proposed number of new houses to be unfairly high & in the wrong place, c) West Parley cannot cope with the extra traffic, shops & indeed extra residents d) it is not acceptable to build on land that has "supposedly" been protected, e) West Parley residents' quality of life would be detrimentally affected, & f) habitat & species would be depleted.</p> <p>Previously, certain councillors have stated that they were against building on green belt areas. When it came to the vote they abstained seemingly not having the courage of their convictions. This was extremely disappointing. I now urge you to heed the above objections & those of others in relation to these building proposals. And to take action to stop these terrible proposals from being implemented.</p>						
656630	Mr & Mrs PJ Gill		CSPS1286	Policy FWP7							<p>Having read through the various documents which comprise the "Core Strategy" and having attended presentations by East Dorset District Council we are writing to object to the Council's Core Strategy and to any plans to implement it without full and proper input from the residents of West Parley. Our objection is for the following reasons:</p> <p>1 Government policy is that you should consult with local residents before formulating your Core Strategy - clearly this has not happened.</p> <p>2 The West Parley Parish Plan produced as a result of receiving input of more than 60% of the residents of West Parley does not feature in the District Council Core Strategy.</p> <p>3 At the last local election, the people of West Parley voted in every single candidate for the "Keep West Parley Green" party. We are not making a political point here but want the District Council to acknowledge the wish of the residents of West Parley (that is the people directly affected by the Council's proposals) that they wish to keep West Parley "Green" - no building on green belt !!</p> <p>4 David Cameron's coalition Government has a clear message of "The Big Society" where individuals and communities should be at the centre of decision making on local matters - we haven't been!</p> <p>5 West Parley is a village, and has very few amenities and little or no employment. A 32% increase in housing stock is out of all proportion with the rest of the District, the County</p>				510		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>and the UK. Economic growth is currently flat and at best the forecast is 1%. How can the District Council possibly justify this massive increase?</p> <p>6 As there is no work in West Parley, why are the houses not being built where the work is? If the work is in Christchurch, build them there!</p> <p>7 The traffic on New Road is already at an unacceptable level - another 500+ houses will make New Road and Parley Cross a heavily congested black-spot. This is going to lead to more accidents, more frustrated drivers and an increase in traffic noise and pollution.</p> <p>8 The green belt is there for a purpose - to allow separate communities to retain their own identity, to prevent urban sprawl and to provide habitat for local wildlife. For years the District Council has fought to maintain it, and had declined planning applications from individuals who wanted to build on parts of it, but all of a sudden the Council has done a U-turn and seems happy to build on acres of green belt.</p> <p>9 West Parley is a "retirement area" for a large number of people and it enjoys being one of the safest places to live in the UK. Building 500+ house in such a concentrated manner will make West Parley a suburb of Bournemouth and we will have increases in crime and an increased threat to our safety and way of life.</p> <p>In summary, the residents of West Parley have voted "No" to building on green belt, have made their views very public, so we too urge you to think again and produce proposals which are more realistic in terms of growth in housing stock and which do not eat up large swathes of green belt.</p>						
359461	Mrs Nicola Brunt	Dorset Wildlife Trust	CSPS1346	Policy FWP7	No	No	No	No	No	No	<p>Ecological survey information for this site is not available therefore it is not possible to assess the potential environmental impacts of development on this site. NPPF (165) states that planning policies and decisions should be based on up-to-date information about the natural environment.</p> <p>Should this site be determined as of low ecological value, DWT has no objection to the allocation of this site providing that an effective Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace strategy can be achieved. However, we have some reservations about the suitability of the identified land for a SANG given the steepness of the slopes and the position in the floodplain, and its longer term management. The land may, for example, require grazing on steeper slopes which could conflict with recreational uses and dog walking.</p> <p>Should the land prove to have ecological value then we would suggest that the impacts on biodiversity would need to be carefully considered, for example to determine whether loss is unacceptable or if adequate compensation for loss of biodiversity on land developed for housing can be compensated by enhancements for biodiversity within the SANG.</p> <p>We also have concerns that the land between the development and Dudsbury Hillfort Ancient Monument is designated for parkland without an ecological survey to</p>	<p>DWT hold an objection until ecological survey information is provided for this site to assess whether the environmental strand of sustainability is satisfied and the allocation is deliverable. If the land is of biodiversity interest then we would wish to see full consideration of this against housing requirements and consideration of whether provision of a SANG is possible that can support sufficient public access whilst enhancing biodiversity to compensate for any loss elsewhere on the site.</p>	<p>Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination</p>	<p>Dorset Wildlife Trust is a voluntary nature conservation organisation which has specialist knowledge of the wildlife of Dorset and can offer local expertise. We manage the Sites of Nature Conservation Interest scheme for the county, are members of the East Dorset Environment Action Theme Group, the Dorset Biodiversity Officers Group and Dorset Biodiversity Partnership.</p>	510		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											determine the most appropriate open space use. Further, that the existing footpath from Christchurch Road is currently though open countryside and urbanisation/parkland could deter existing users, pushing them on the heath, thus the footpath should be retained in a significant natural green corridor. As development is proposed on slopes above the River Stour, we recommend a Sustainable Drainage Scheme for this development.	We seek change to wording under Layout and design bullet point 3: • Development is to be kept at least 75 metres from the Dudsbury Hillfort Ancient Monument. The land between is to be set out as parkland designated as open space and designed to enhance existing biodiversity. We seek an additional section on drainage under the policy to include a Sustainable Drainage Scheme.					
360983	Mrs Elizabeth Winkley	Bournemouth North Guide Association	CSPS1390	Policy FWP7	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	The property 'Dudsbury Monor' has not been shown or referred to in this map or document. The ancient monuments and archaeological areas act 1979, national planning policy framework, March 2012 (NPPF) The PPS5 Historic Environment Planning Practice Guide, March 2010 (still extant) and the setting of Heritage assets, English Heritage October 2011, have not been adhered to.	The above items must be addressed. The omission of a parcel of land must make a significant difference to all your calculations. You must comply with previous correspondence from English Heritage (NPPF paragraph 169, 129 and 132, set out in formal correspondence May 2008 and January 2011.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	In order to safeguard the valuable asset - Dudsbury Hillfort - and the future of the Dudsbury Girl Guide Camp.	510		
656249	Ms Gemma Care	Barton Willmore LLP	CSPS1082	Policy FWP7	Yes	Yes					Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on the Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy (JCS) Pre-Submission document. On behalf of our client, Stour Valley Properties (Dorset) Ltd., we are pleased to provide the following response, which should be read in conjunction with the accompanying Consultation Response Forms. Background Barton Willmore LLP has been instructed to make representations to this document, on behalf of Stour Valley Properties (Dorset) Ltd. ('SVP') SVP have land interests within East Dorset and welcome the opportunity to contribute to the emerging Core Strategy (JCS). SVP are currently promoting the release of their land to the south of Wimborne for housing. Fundamentally, SVP have serious concerns over the level of overall housing provision identified within the draft JCS and the degree to which that which is proposed is sufficient to meet identified needs within the East Dorset and Christchurch locality. We submit, having regard to the evidence base		Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	To ensure our case is presented in full and to be party to discussions.	510		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>material available that the level of housing proposed for East Dorset within the draft JCS is inappropriate and inconsistent with national planning policy, which states that each local planning authority should ensure that the Local Plan is based on adequate up-to-date and relevant evidence about the economic, social and environmental characteristics and prospects of the area. Local planning authorities are expected to ensure that their assessment of and strategies for housing, employment and other uses are integrated, and that they take full account of relevant market and economic signals.</p> <p>Consideration is given within the submitted representations to the strategic site allocations for Wimborne and Colehill identified within the JCS and the extent to which the proposed allocations fulfil the overall objectives and spatial vision for East Dorset and Christchurch. On the premise that insufficient housing requirements are identified in the Pre-Submission JCS we submit that additional strategic allocations or an increase in the specified number of required new dwellings are required in order to plan positively for the further housing growth we consider necessary in light of our appraisal of the Council's published JCS evidence base.</p> <p>In accordance with section 20 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended) local plans must be 'sound': i.e. they must be positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy. We suggest that the housing strategy adopted within the JCS as it stands is (a) not the most appropriate (on the basis that it is not considered fully justified) and (b) it is not 'positively prepared' – i.e. it is not based on a strategy which in our view genuinely seeks to meet objectively assessed needs.</p> <p>Within these representations we do not comment on every aspect of the JCS; our intention is to comment on those sections where we non-compliance with tests of soundness is apparent, or where we are particularly supportive. To be clear, our primary concern in this instance is the content and justification of Policy KS4 and the proposed housing allocations for Wimborne and Colehill – specifically Policy WMC6.</p> <p>An alternative proposal for housing to the south of Wimborne is considered with specific reference to the SVP land shown on the concept plan attached at Appendix 1 to these submissions.</p> <p>Comments are also provided on a number of other policies within the JCS, on individual response forms, as requested. The full list of policies to which these representations respond are:</p> <p>Policy KS1, KS4, KS5, KS10 Policy WMC3, WMC6 Policy FWP3, FWP4, FWP6, FWP7, FWP8 Policy ME3 Policy HE4</p> <p>Copies of all Core Strategy Response Forms relating to each policy addressed within these representations are contained at Appendix 4.</p> <p>Appendices 1 – 3 to this cover letter are those referred to in</p>						

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
											the various consultation forms. I trust that all of the enclosed is clear and in order and we look forward to engaging with you further in the consultation process. We broadly support these allocations.							
656748	Kerry Morris		CSPS1462	Policy FWP7		No					I was born here in West Parley and I can say that I would not like affordable housing here. I would like to live nearer a town centre that has something going on, like Bournemouth. Build the homes where the young (20 year olds and above like me want to live.) There is no work or anything to do round West Parley because it is a country place where people retire too or want to live for some decent village life. Perhaps one day I will aspire to this type of living but dumping over 500 houses here without any decent thought or planning and no real commitment to additional amenities, roads, schools or concern for the Greenbelt land the existing Villagers (my friends and family here in West Parley) is disgusting and therefore makes FWP7 and FWP6 and FWP5 unsound and unjust. Build it where it's wanted not where you can think you can easily dump it just to meet EDDC targets for affordable housing. Put it where it would better suited. Put it next to your offices In Furzehill, that a nice big piece of unused land you have around you. Plan for that as it would be easy to oversee from your office windows? Make a whole lot of sense to me ...look out the window not and think ...yes she is right. Thank me later for solving the whole issue here.				510			
656763	Mr B.R Petty		CSPS1551	Policy FWP7							I am writing to complain about the stupidity of your building houses to ruin West Parley especially in the area of Dudsbury Heights (FWP7) this will ruin lots of green countryside and the habitat of many animals including the otter and birds. You need a ???????? is plin stupidity there are plenty of brownfield sites in Bournemouth and Poole. Don't ruin this Dorset countryside.				510			
656796	Mr & Mrs Cornelius		CSPS1543	Policy FWP7							Our view is that to build 520 new houses and 2 link road in a relatively small area would lead to overcrowding and destroy the rural historical green belt of West Parley. By comparison with Corfe Mullen, Ferndown, Wimborne and Verwood this is far in excess for West Parley. We have recently moved from a built up area to West Parley in order to enjoy the rural aspect which would be destroyed if your plan succeeded.				510			
656804	Mrs Joyce Terrill		CSPS1604	Policy FWP7							Have you considered the traffic congestion and problems that will occur when New Road and New Road Bridge floor and have to be closed? Having been born and lived in the area all my life, I have seen New Road closed to traffic because the road is deep in water. It has been known to be closed for 1 or 2 days at a time in past years. With all the extra cars from 520 houses planned for West Parley, traffic chaos will be extreme when the floods occur. There is so much spare open space/ground N.E. & N.W. of Ferndown – loads of open land where houses could be built				510			

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>instead of using the small piece of green belt that separates West Parley from the Bournemouth boundary. There is no need to build on that small piece of green belt land!</p> <p>The Government Minister for Planning, Mr Greg Clark states: "I can't imagine any council would want to build on greenfield when they can use derelict land".</p> <p>We do not need new shops or allotments. Most residents of West Parley have large gardens where they can grow vegetables!!</p> <p>I do hope E.D.D.C. will see fit to throw out the Core Strategy and adopt the Parish Plan.</p>						
656806	Mr S T Terrill		CSPS1608	Policy FWP7							<p>I have lived in the village of West Parley for over 25 years. The previous Parish Council were removed by the electorate for not protecting our village and not carrying out our wishes. The NEW PARISH COUNCIL were voted in by a huge majority of the Residents and NOW, the Residents want you, the Councillors, to LISTEN to our elected Representatives: West Parley Parish Council</p> <p>Please discuss with the W.P. Parish Council and the Residents Association the details of their/our responses to the Core Strategy.</p> <p>We would like our modified Parish Plan to be introduced to a "Higher" planning authority; one which is aware of the Government GREENBELT requirements that have been completely overridden by the E.D.D.C. and planners. They have also ignored all the modifications suggested by West Parley Council & Residents' Association.</p> <p>"I can't imagine any council would want to build on greenfield." Greg Clark:</p> <p>The Minister for Planning, Govt. !!!</p> <p>"Whitehall shouldn't be saying to people in specific places with a history, character and unique way of life, this is what you need to dowe don't want one huge developer dominating the landimposing their will and design on communities"</p> <p>Greg Clark: The Minister for Planning. Govt. !!!!</p> <p>PLEASE LISTEN to Him and Us!!!!!!!</p>				510		
656808	Mrs Pat Couper		CSPS1615	Policy FWP7	No						<p>This document is unsound, unjustified and not in accordance with national policy on green belt development.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This is an area of outstanding natural beauty where there is a historic hill fort and a large parcel of land gifted to the girl guides in perpetuity by Lord Wimborne. The whole area is a haven for wildlife with Badger Sets and deer roaming freely. 2. The field in question is a steep slope which has many natural springs and any small amount of rain causes water to pour down the roads below. 3. The plan for a road across this field would damage the Stour Valley Way and the exit onto New Road is on a dangerous bend just as the road narrows, this would merely move the hold ups in the traffic a little further from the traffic lights but with more junctions would just increase the problem. 				510		
656816	Mr P C Bamborough		CSPS1624	Policy FWP7							<p>I write on behalf of the householders living at 88 and 88a New Road to object to the proposed development of a 32%</p>				510		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
											<p>increase in housing on current green belt land in this village. The infrastructure is totally unsustainable with a busy airport, industrial estate adjoining an already crowded at peak times, very congested roads.</p> <p>I have read the very detailed submissions of our local parish council and agree with them whole heartedly. A more modest increase of say 100 houses would be an acceptable alternative. We don't need more shops, the existing parades in the village struggle to survive and only do so by very specialist services (vet, tile shop, convenience store). Kinson and Ferndown shopping centres serve us well (yet they struggle) – witness the number of empty shops and duplication.</p> <p>It is important the village retains its distinct identity and instead of being totally submerged in a Greater Bournemouth. The proposed "relief road" from outside 86 New Road to Christchurch Road is laughable were it not being taken seriously by planners. It gives more congestion points – especially from/to a clogged Longham.</p> <p>Affordable housing needs to spread across all villages in East Dorset not a few</p>							
656819	Christine Davies		CSPS1628	Policy FWP7		No		Yes			<p>I write in response to the Green Belt proposals for East Dorset specifically those for the village of West Parley. The proposals are unsound and unjustified for a number of reasons, some of which I will outline.</p> <p>Firstly, the plan has been considerably amended and the option set out for West Parley is the one that was designated as 'least preferred' in an earlier round of consultation. The current plan – effectively an entirely new document – was withheld, even from our District Councillors, until the very last moment leaving little opportunity for them or for the residents of the village to be properly involved at an early stage. It has therefore not been 'positively prepared'.</p> <p>FWP 6 and 7: West Parley, at the behest of the District Council, produced a Parish Plan. In this, a majority of residents agreed the need for some more housing – up to a hundred and within the current built-up areas. 520 imposed on the village would be a massive 32% increase in the housing stock; there is no solid evidence that this is needed and it is therefore unjustified. This is also a far higher proportion than any other area is being required to take; this is by anyone's standards unfair. What has happened to the empowerment of local people to shape their surroundings as stated in the National Planning Policy Framework?</p> <p>FWP 6 shows a supermarket, a shopping centre, a church and an orchard – among other surprises – in and around the proposed 300 dwellings and major link road. Nowhere has the need for any of these been documented. What is evident is that by building on the key gap between Bournemouth and West Parley, urban sprawl will turn the area into one huge conurbation; there is no justification for breaching the Green Belt in this way, the need has not been proven, and doing so can only cause detriment to the quality of life of those who live in this sprawl.</p>					510		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>The 'roads' that have been drawn onto the latest plan have not been part of any consultation yet this is a vitally important junction for the whole of the area; on that basis alone the document is unjustified. FWP 7 concerns Dudsbury Heights, an ancient monument and a sensitive area – where are the Environmental Impact Studies for the road that is proposed there?</p> <p>I believe that people of West Parley have been sold short by the production of this plan. They are willing and able – the evidence is there in the Parish Plan – to give their views on how the village should go forward. Top down planning is unjust, we have the right to have our views properly considered.</p>						
359553	Mrs Linda Leeding	West Parley Parish Council	CSPS1638	Policy FWP7		No		No	No	No	<p>This plan is considered Unsound, in that it is not Consistent with National Policy, Justified, Effective, or Deliverable. N.P.P.F. 155 calls for “early and meaningful engagement and collaboration with a wide section of the community”. E.D.D.C.s Statement of Community Involvement (part of the Core Strategy evidence base) calls for “active and continuous community involvement” in the planning process. These policies have been consistently ignored. E.D.D.C. has carried out the required formal consultations after plans have been produced, but the prior planning has been behind closed doors and requests for involvement have been turned down. When plans are published it is seen that little or no attention has been paid to community aspirations. For instance, when the West Parley Parish Plan was delivered in 2011 it had no response or acknowledgement from E.D.D.C. Building on this area of green belt, which is a “key gap” and has a high quality landscape and community value, is not justified by the evidence produced for the claimed housing need (see comment on Policy KS4)</p> <p>This field meets all the requirements in NPPF 77 for a Local Green Space Designation. It is adjacent to the Dudsbury Iron Age Hill Fort. It is crossed by the Stour Valley Walk, one of Dorset’s most celebrated Trans County walks from Christchurch to Stourhead in Wilts. On a clear day one can see all the way to the Needles in the Isle of Wight. Horses are kept on the green slopes. It is a prized and much walked and admired community asset. The community should obviously have been more closely involved in the planning here. The landscape value of the field has been greatly underplayed in the Broadway Malyan report. When these same “areas of search” were studied in the Regional Spatial Strategy the authoritative report by Colin Buchanan (Feb 2006) characterised them as “preventing sprawl, preventing coalescence, safeguarding the countryside and protecting the historic setting” and gave them his landscape value score. His report said that “it was unclear that the weight and importance of each of the SE Dorset areas of search had been understood”; that “wider sustainability issues did not appear to have been fully considered” and that “the extent of areas that couldn’t be released and those more sensitive to release needed to be more carefully defined”.</p>		Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination		510		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>The field is also adjacent to an important and secluded site inside the walls of the ancient hill fort, in which is housed a club used by Girl Guides and Brownies throughout the district, especially suitable for summer camps. Nearby communities have often expressed fears to E.D.D.C. over the impact of a major housing development some 200 yards away and these views appear not to have been taken into consideration. The effect of the FWP7 development on the ancient hill fort, only 100 yards away from the nearest house, has not been assessed. The District Council has yet to engage with English Heritage on the subject. The fears are that the monument, not yet properly studied or excavated, will be damaged beyond repair by being used as a natural playground. The effect of flooding on FWP7 has been underestimated in the Core Strategy. Not surprisingly, the hill fort was built on an area with plentiful springs. After heavy rains there are miniature rivers in Ridgeway Road just below the site. Concreting over much of the field could have considerable effects and it is a concern that only desktop studies on this have been carried out. The proposed Link Road could also find itself impacted in construction, maintenance and costs by seasonal floods. Photos on the Environment Agency website show extensive and periodic floods right up to the Southern part of the proposed link road. It is alarming that this road should be proposed in public Core Strategy plans for consultation before any evidence studies on it have been done. In summary, the FWP7 site is a specially prized and valuable green belt key gap and landscape and community asset that should be the very last place to be considered for housebuilding.</p>						
360271	Cllr Paul Timberlake		CSPS1786	Policy FWP7	No	No	No	No	No	No	<p>Object to FWP7 proposals based upon:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Dudsbury Hill site: The area is steeped in history – ancient monument of Dudsbury Hillfort – form where to the southwest is the dramatic escarpment down to the River Stour. The fields on the slope are currently being used for grazing by horses. They are divided by old hedgerows – important wildlife corridors – and which contain mature trees (eg Quercus robur), with some being of likely veteran status. Linear and area broadleaved woodlands are also a feature which makes Dudsbury Hill so crucial to the natural environment. Numerous bird species, together with bats, owls foxes and badgers frequent the area. 2. The ancient monument of Castle Rings hillfort lies nearby and the fields have been the subject of artefact finds. 3. Non justification. Although affordable dwellings are required in East Dorset district as a whole, the need for a high level of housing in this locale has not been proved. Were this and FWP6 developments to go ahead, they would represent an approximate 32% increase on the existing housing stock of West Parley. This is unacceptable. 4. Green Belt Principles: only two reasons are given at Policy KS2 in the Core Strategy. The Councils have conveniently omitted the remaining three key reasons. The full list in PPG2 	Retain area within the Green Belt and protected from development due to historic setting, high visibility and natural environment considerations.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		510		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>is shown at www.communities.gov.uk/documents/planning/pdf/155499/pdf -</p> <p>'Purposes of including land in Green Belts':</p> <p>1.5 There are five purposes of including land in Green belts;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To check unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas; • To prevent neighbouring towns form merging into one another; • To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment; • To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and • To assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land'. <p>Important principles in this case include-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas; • To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment; and • To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns – presumably this includes other settlements. <p>The final principle about regeneration does not apply.</p> <p>5. Due to the steep gradient of Dudsbury Hill, a Sustainable Urban Drainage System (SUDS), together with large attenuation tanks, would need to be employed as part of any development. This would add additional costs.</p> <p>6. Development of this site and that to the east of Parley Cross, would remove highly valued and necessary open land to the south of the built up area in West Parley. This Green Belt land, together with the River Stour floodplain, help to prevent urban sprawl and stop the urban area of north Bournemouth form merging with West Parley.</p> <p>7. The site is under or close to being under the flight path of aircraft to/from the Bournemouth International Airport, and could therefore present safety issues in addition to effects of noise.</p> <p>8. Economics: Unreasonable to expect developers to not only provide 50% affordable housing at cost price, but to then say they have to contribute to the cost of new roads, shops, first school; in other words, a new village centre.</p> <p>9. Advised that the route of the proposed Link Road and housing layout are only for illustration. The final design could well be different. The public are being asked to agree to a proposal that may change after the close of this consultation and will not, as far as I can see, have another opportunity to comment.</p> <p>10. I understand that the proposed Link Road will not be built until some 100 dwellings have been constructed at this site. Residents will therefore be subject to years of noise, disruption and traffic congestion. Further, it has been stated that the new Link Road – which will go along the edge of the new estate, is likely to have traffic calming measures. Whilst fine for local roads, this would be impractical for the HGVs which would need to use this road when heading form/to Bournemouth or the west and Poole Port.</p> <p>Outcomes:</p>						

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
											<p>This proposal, together with FWP5 and FWP6, come forward as a solution to providing affordable housing, reduce congestion and improve traffic flows around the New Road / Parley Cross area and to create a new village centre. Whilst the motives may be well intentioned, any likely reduction in vehicles navigating Parley Crossroads, will be more than offset by-</p> <p>a) Traffic using the new Link Roads and at their junctions with New road and Christchurch Road, and b) Additional traffic created as a result of c200 homes on this site.</p> <p>Conclusion: The 2011 Localism Act makes much of planning should be from the grassroots up, as opposed to policies being imposed from the top down. This proposal would go against the wishes of most parishioners who gave their views recently, and which are shown in the West Parley Parish Plan. Whilst non statutory, the Plan has nevertheless been ignored and therefore, I feel, goes against the key principles of localism.</p>							
489765	Mr Derek Kearey		CSPS1710	Policy FWP7							<p>I wish to object strongly to the building of 220 houses on the FWP 7 and 300 houses on FWP 6 sites for the under mentioned reasons: The Consultation process is unsatisfactory. (a) Government legislation requires you to consult fully with local communities before setting out proposals. EDDC planners have blatantly ignored this legislation. I understand that there was consultation in 2010 on a similar proposal, to build substantially less houses on the Green Belt than that which is currently proposed, and you, the EDDC, decided at that time to reject those proposals. Now, without consultation, you are bulldozing this Core Strategy through without any consultation whatsoever with West Parley Parish Council or any of the residents of West Parley. Why have you decided to change the original decision of no Green Belt building? Is there some financial gain being made by EDDC, or indeed any individual of the EDDC, which we have not been informed about? Being a Conservative council I thought that you would heed what the esteemed leader of the Conservative party, David Cameron, stated earlier this year: that there will be no more building on Green Belts in this country. May I remind you that you are a democratically elected council – elected by us, the Council Tax payers, to act in our best interests. You do not seem to be listening to us, the residents and Council Tax payers of East Dorset, and you are not listening to the leader of the Conservative party. Exactly whom do you listen to? (b) West Parley has produced, after a lengthy consultation with residents, a well-publicised Parish Plan. Copies of the Parish Plan were sent to EDDC. In this Plan it was plain that us, the residents, are overwhelmingly against having more than about one hundred houses built in West Parley. The West Parley Parish Plan has been totally ignored by EDDC planners. (c) The so-called “Consultation Process”, which the EDDC</p>					510		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>used, relied too much on the use of electronic communication to provide information to residents. It assumed that all residents in West Parley have access to the internet. This is far from the case and therefore there are a huge number of residents who do not have access to it and consequently are completely in the dark over these proposals. All residents who know of it are extremely concerned about the proposals but there are many who are unable to find the information they need to consider the proposals effectively.</p> <p>(d) To build more than one hundred houses in West Parley would create an unbroken urban sprawl from Bournemouth to Ferndown and beyond. West Parley would lose its identity and become just another small part of the very large conurbation of Bournemouth. Both of the proposed building sites in West Parley constitute much valued Green Belt land that provides a break between the Bournemouth and Ferndown boundaries. This was the main reason for introducing the Green Belt system many years ago. Once the Green Belt is built on, and hence no longer exists, we will never be able to get it back. Once it is gone, it will be gone forever.</p> <p>(e) This land brings the countryside into the village and with it many important and protected species of animals. Sightings of badgers, foxes, otters, deer and buzzards are frequently reported as well as lower-order creatures such as lizards and other smaller animals. This improves the quality of life for all residents and visitors who regularly use these fields through which official designated footpaths pass. Such as lizards and other smaller animals. This improves the quality of life for all residents and visitors who regularly use these fields through which official designated footpaths pass.</p> <p>(f) The proposed two new roads around the proposed building sites will be dangerous for everyone living in the new houses especially children. Also, it would do nothing to alleviate the already stretched traffic system in West Parley. In fact, it will only add to it. An increase in traffic jams will be expected with more further down the main roads. Five hundred extra houses will bring up to one thousand extra cars into an already overcrowded area with all of them trying to get out of and into West Parley.</p> <p>(g) Five hundred and twenty extra houses in West Parley represents an increase in housing of about 32%. This is excessive and totally unacceptable. It is more than is proposed for the other East Dorset communities. Without the appropriate infrastructure of adequate school places, doctors, dentists, community centres etc. there will be unacceptable pressure on existing provision.</p> <p>(h) On top of this, both proposed building sites sit underneath the flight path of a very busy airport which is expected to expand threefold in the next few years. The EDDC has obviously not considered the impact on the quality of life on those unfortunate enough to move into and live in the proposed houses. In a worse case scenario, the EDDC also have not considered the awful devastation and loss of life if, God forbid, there were a serious incident involving any aircraft</p>						

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
											<p>coming down in the proposed development.</p> <p>(i) If the EDDC had acted in a democratic fashion and done the job properly of finding a suitable site for building such a large number of houses properly, they should surely consulted us, the East Dorset Council Tax payers, at some point on our thoughts instead of coming out blindly with a Core Strategy that none of us had seen before. It has to be asked why the EDDC did not look at much more suitable sites? Instead of proposing to build on designated Green Belt land why did they not see that there are many suitable Brown Field sites such as that at The Grange in the East Dorset area?</p> <p>Site FWP 7</p> <p>(a) Dudsbury Rings is an important heritage site and this field is too closely connected to the site for the security of this important site to be protected.</p> <p>(b) In wintertime, and in times of heavy rain, the slope of the field at Dudsbury causes water to run downhill and flood the unmade and private road, Ridgeway, every time there is heavy rain. The heavy traffic that services the shops at Parley Cross, and which use Ridgeway every day, causes the road surface to be severely eroded and flooded which makes it very unpleasant for residents who are also responsible for the upkeep of the road. With the large amount of more concrete being laid on the field due to the proposed buildings, flooding would be even worse than it is at present.</p> <p>Site FWP 6</p> <p>(a) Building yet another supermarket in the area is not needed. It would bring in much more traffic to an already overburdened road system which is something that us, and I would imagine the EDDC, certainly do not want. It would only bring more chaos to the already crowded roads of West Parley. Sufficient supermarkets (3xTesco, Asda, 2xSainsbury, Lidl) already exist within a 3-mile radius of West Parley. There are already three Tesco Express shops in a radius of one mile of Parley Cross. Also, there is no demand for allotments, orchards etc. so why propose them?</p> <p>West Parley should not be sacrificed by planners' unrealistic dreams and an attempt at social engineering. I urge you to reconsider these proposals on the principle that they are unsound, unsatisfactory, undemocratic and immoral. The democratically elected EDDC should start talking to the people in West Parley Community. We are entitled to have a say in the drawing up of any proposals for any increase in housing in our village.</p>							
491299	Mr and Mrs Shaw		CSPS1585	Policy FWP7							<p>Re: Your planning proposals of 220 houses on FWP7 and 300 on FWP6 on land at West Parley.</p> <p>My husband and myself object strongly to amount of houses and the urban sprawl which you are going to create. While it may be OK for up to one hundred dwelling places, the amount of buildings, shops and road works etc. is way out of proportion.</p> <p>We must keep this green belt of ours. More concrete and buildings is going to cause havoc with existing sewer system</p>				510			

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
											<p>which is unable to work properly now. Where on earth are all the services coming from to deal with all the people that are going to be moving in to these new homes. This whole area is very important for our wildlife. You are just ripping the heart out of the countryside. I could go on and on but you are just going to ride rough shod what ever peoples feelings are.</p>							
495348	Mr and Mrs RJ Veal		CSPS1673	Policy FWP7							<p>I with my Husband are objecting strongly to these proposals. 220 Houses on the FWP7 and 300 on FWP6 sites. We own the land near to the road proposed from Dudsbury Heights to New Road. Concreting a road and building houses on that site is madness. The flood plains are already higher everytime we have it flooded. It will end up like the floods in area's that have been built on else where (Littlehampton, Bognor, etc). We do not want or need a concrete sprawl. The wildlife have a hard enough time as it is. They will be lost for ever for a further generation. There is no need for more super markets in this area. Leave the Greenbelt alone. Use Brownfill. There's plenty around.</p>				510			
498044	Miss Carolyne Banks		CSPS1798	Policy FWP7	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	<p>Policy has not adequately provided for increase in traffic or dealt with congestion that will result. The junctions at either end of the link road will be impossible to get out of, and will cause even more congestion that the bad state we currently have. Policy takes the link road and SANG ththrough a floodplain! Policy has not addressed provision for the safety and the many horses ans horse riders in the area, seperating animals from severely increased traffic. Ignoring the problem will not make it go away. Policy goes against promises made by councillors and politicians.</p>	Scrap the plan.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		510			
501039	Dr and Mrs Peter Liebling		CSPS1654	Policy FWP7							<p>I would like to object to the recent plans for more housing at West Parley on the following grounds. 1) We would lose a large part of our greenbelt. Like honesty, good manners, the Green Belt should stay as Green Belt. If loss would mean a loss of a basic sound principle and lead to urban sprawl. 2) 'Parley' comes from the French meaning the place where pears grow! 'poire – lieu' – the whole character and 'village' charm of Parley would be lost. 3) Traffic at West Parley Cross Roads is already too great. Adding side roads to New Road and Christchurch Road would only add to the confusion. 4) Putting roads through a new housing estate with young children playing seems far too dangerous. 5) The new houses are very close to the flight path out of Hurn (Bournemouth) International Airport. This would mean people living under noise, pollution, and possible danger of falling aircraft – yes it does happen! 6) Since we were last consulted this new plan suggests a</p>				510			

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
											<p>huge increase in the number of houses to be built. Where is the proof that this is affordable, & desirable or necessary. Where is the infrastructure? It seems there is a nice green field which is easy to build on and accessible to builders, and that local feeling plays no part. Please listen to those who live in West Parley and chose to live here for some peace and quiet. Many thanks for trying to read this.</p>							
503479	Mr & Mrs Robert Eastham		CSPS1651	Policy FWP7							<p>Re: Objections to planning policies FWP6 & 7 We have lived here since 1961 having been drawn by the pleasing environment with its green belt fields assured of continuation. Accountability & democracy mean little to this council with only 2 out of the 36 living in the village. Gradual development has gone on over the decades along with a build up of traffic. The village straddles two major roads which leads to gridlock at anytime. R,T,A,s on the road from the cross to the airport has been closed as a result. This council is hell bent on swamping this village with 520 houses in policies FWP6 and 7 as the needs of the next 14 years. At no stage attempting to justify or give reasons for this 32% expansion to residents, parish councillors and MP against their wishes. The recent changes are ludicrous and unsound diverting traffic to use estate roads to by-pass the cross-roads creating added entry exit points east and west on Christchurch Road and south on New Road. This will lead to additional delays and potential accident black spots. We object to the erosion of the green fields and the green belt protection in defiance of the overwhelming wishes of the residents. The policies have not been justified and are unsound.</p>				510			
535063	Ms Karen Morris		CSPS1688	Policy FWP7	No		Yes				<p>I have lived in West Parley for 22 years. In that time I have watched the high street change and the shops go from Butchers and Bakers to Bathroom tiles and garden sheds. FWP6, FWP5 and FWP7 are unsound because the shopping issue is not properly addressed. Whilst you propose to build shops you have not identified what they would be and their relevance to Qwest Parley. I have investigated with you and you have also said that you are not responsible for the type of business that can then occupy these shops. What good is that if we have another toilet and bath selling shop? Therefore your document in these areas is totally unsound. Additionally you say that people have requested more retail shop in Parley which is a lie. No residents have requested more superstores, I am told that at a meeting on 11 June in your chambers you said that people in West Parley had asked for a superstore and that when pressed you changed this to other retailers had asked. Naturally competitors to the current Tesco in Parley would suggest another store (E, G. Co-OP Sainsbury). No locals have. You constantly devise and distort the content of all your proposed evidence for building homes in West Parley that are not required, cannot be serviced properly by roads,</p>				510			

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
											<p>schools or doctors surgeries and you indicate no realistic funding for any of these. You suggest that money for the roads will after the houses have been built. This is ridiculous unsound and even a child planning a toy house starts with roads and improvement.</p> <p>Finally I have constantly defended the Greenbelt fields in this area and will continue to do so. The fields are part of the Key gap structure to prevent convergence with Bournemouth and Ferndown and Kinston. This gap gives the village its identity and your document does nothing to accommodate this identity or the villagers and residents concerns to preserve it. Your document is Unjustified in this area too with reference to FWP5,6 and 7. It is unsound in its approach as the local conservative MP Chris Chope has told me personally and written to me personally to say that the Green Belt in Parley is Sacrosanct. David Cameron also indicates under the Big Society and localism bill you are suppose to take your lead and consult with the Locals. I am a local and you have never listened too and acted on my copious correspondence before. Therefore you proposal is unsound and unjustified because it fails to consult with residents in the directly affected area of West Parley.</p> <p>The proposal uses misguidance and evidence manipulation and spin to fabricate evidence that is untrue and unfair in its representation.. This makes the document unfair, unsound and unjustified. You have no money in the council to fund this proposal in full and you are highly likely to fail to complete any of the proposals fully. You should be ashamed to reference building high density housing in areas (FWP6, FWP7) without proper infrastructure proposals, funding, amenities or evidence from those affected or those who need it. Until the 3000 people waiting on the housing list are identified as from this area and absolutely in need then I feel the document is entirely unsound.</p>							
536830	Mrs Janet Sutcliffe		CSPS1703	Policy FWP7							<p>Whilst ignoring the over-complicated response form to the official consultation, I am writing to object to the plans to build 520 houses in West Parley, 300 on FWP6 and 220 on FWP7. The consultation process requires that you listen to the local community and take their views into account. West Parley Parish Council is the mouthpiece of this community. Their views are formed by living and working amongst us. They work tirelessly on our behalf and we trust them to represent us. However, it seems not to be enough in this case, so we are being asked to respond personally to the plans outlined in the Core Strategy.</p> <p>WPPC has produced a carefully considered Parish Plan, which states that building more than 100 extra homes would have a detrimental effect on West Parley and it's neighbours. The building of 520 homes seems excessive to say the least and will create an unbroken urban sprawl from Ferndown to Bournemouth. The Green Belt was put in place so that all communities would benefit from the "green lungs" that these spaces provide.</p> <p>Apart from affecting the quality of life or residents and those</p>					510		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>people who commute through West Parley, there is the very serious threat to the habitat of a wide variety of wildlife, some of it protected.</p> <p>The proposed 520 homes is social engineering on a scale unseen anywhere else in East Dorset. There is no evidence to show that an appropriate level of infrastructure will be in place. The existing provision will be unable to cope. 520 extra homes will mean 1,000 extra cars. West Parley Cross is congested now. By generating another 1,000 car journeys and redirecting existing traffic, vans, buses, huge lorries, through the proposed sites you will be exacerbating, rather than alleviating, the traffic problems. Traffic is noisy, dirty and dangerous, as anyone living on the new development will come to know. The proposed plans will result in more gridlock, more often.</p> <p>In spite of the traffic problems it seems that FWP6 shows plans for a large supermarket. Not only is the location questionable, with Tesco, Asda, Sainsbury and Lidl providing excellent facilities with generous parking nearby, there is no demand for yet another supermarket. With several "Express" stores close at hand West Parley is very well served.</p> <p>With reference to FWP7, it seems that there has been a complete disregard for the importance of Dudsbury Rings as a local heritage site. We must secure the site for others. A more obvious problem occurs after the sort of heavy rain we have experienced in the last few weeks. Water runs off the concrete and paved areas to cause flooding of paths and roads. Any new development will make further demands on an overstretched drainage system.</p> <p>As a resident of West Parley I am not opposed to development, or to the building of affordable homes and the creation of new communities but "proportionality" is vital if both the established and proposed communities are to share a good quality of life. It is what we all deserve. Please listen to West Parley residents, and consider the lives of the prospective new comers to our neighbourhood, and do your best to give us "quality" over "quantity", something we can all be happy with.</p>						
537014	Master Kieran Morris		CSPS1695	Policy FWP7		No					<p>I have lived and played round here all my life, 18 years. I love my village and my home in West Parley and I am disappointed that you are planning to destroy the Green Belt fields in my village. FWP7, FWP6 and FWP5 are unsound because they take no account of people my age, teenagers who already live and enjoy staying here. There are no sound plans or money for facilities and communities that would accommodate my peer group. More housing would just add to the problem as you have clearly not thought about or have funding for roads or schools. My name should be on the housing list because I live here. Who are the 3000 plus other people on this list? Until this need for housing is accurately identified then this document is unsound and wholly unjustified.</p> <p>On a personal not it will destroy my home village and its identity which makes the core strategy proposal UNFAIR to!!!!</p>				510		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
359856	Mrs B Breeze		CSPS1832	Policy FWP7	Yes	No	No	No	No	No		Soundness. I am concerned the Proposal 'SANG' is not deliverable, due to the lay of the land, flooding, steep valleys, etc. Replacement SANG is needed. The link road will not help traffic congestion, which is already very bad. It needs a better solution.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		510		
495437	Mr Andrew Scott		CSPS1867	Policy FWP7	No	No		Yes		Yes	Document has not seen complied with relevance to European Habitats Directive. An Environmental Impact assessment, or Arb Impact Assessment. The SANG areas are not usable. Does not consider sections 81, 84, 85, 86 and 99 of the NPPF. Please see enclosure. I write to draw to your attention the reasons why proposals FWP6 and FWP7 are not viable. The proposals are unsound and not legally compliant with the sections of the National Planning Policy Framework and other legislation that I list below. I detail each article and reasoning further on. The proposal does not comply with: The European Habitats directive. British Standard 5837 (2012) Trees, Design Demolition and Building near trees, and Planning Policy Statement 3. National Planning Policy Framework sections 81,84,85,86 and 99. The proposal also contains misleading information provided by EDDC. It should also be noted that the proposed SANG area South of FWP7 incorporates the floodplane of the river Stour and that from the contour lines shown the topography is such that the remainder of the SANG is not viable as it is inaccessible to members of the public especially the less able. The resultant effect would be an increased use of the Heathland area to the North which is itself a protected European Habitats area due to the rare species found. The European Habitats Directive. The European Habitats Directive protects not just the fauna themselves but also their feeding ground and the permanent and temporary roosts of the species. The new link road South of FWP7 is located directly over an important woodland wildlife corridor which contains several veteran trees. It is known that several species of bat use this area including Pipistrels from the largest single roost in Europe. (Bryanstone School. The bats then follow the river, feeding on the flies ect found in the surrounding woodlands) Disruption of this feeding ground could be devastating to this population which would	It would be necessary to prepare an Environmental Impact Assessment and find new SANG area for FWP7 and relocate the link road, changing angle through the wood.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	Because I believe I am adequately qualified to address the issues raised, especially relating to tree and woodland issues.	510		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>have significant impact upon European bat numbers. The loss of Veteran oak trees in itself would also be detrimental to the wider community as these rare features provided ecological niches not found in younger trees.</p> <p>To summarise, No ecological survey has been undertaken before this proposal was formalised. Disruption to the bat colony and the veteran trees is not justified planning policy. Tree in Relation to Design, Demolition and Construction and Planning Policy Statement 3.</p> <p>The review of the BS 5837 Standard in 2005 was designed to integrate the document with PPGs and PPS. Sections within PPS3 stated that "salient landscape features should lead the design". These principles would apply to features such as rivers, lakes important wildlife corridors and significant trees. This proposal calls for the removal of the entire existing trees stock immediately adjacent to the cross roads. These mature large trees are the subject of a Tree Preservation Order. (TPO) Given the extent of the proposal one must question why these trees are lost.</p> <p>The proposed location of the "New Link Road" and FWP7 are unacceptably close to other mature trees (which are also subject to TPO) located on the higher land at the public house. No consideration has been given to intrusion into Root Protection Areas, (RPAs) the effects of shading of large trees on dwellings to the east and the post development requirement of occupiers to prune trees which would be aesthetically unacceptable, requirements</p> <p>The 2012 revision of BS5837 accentuates this reasoning further as it ties into the RIBA phasing scheme.</p> <p>To Summarise: The proposal has not been based upon site survey that incorporates important landscape features. The resultant design requires unjustifiable tree loss given the amount of space available.</p> <p>Misleading Documents Re Tree Loss.</p> <p>It should also be noted that the documents produced by EDDC are misleading as when producing before and after pictures they do not clearly state that the latter is artificially enhanced to the extent that it is unachievable in landscape terms. The future trees shown are not those currently on site.</p> <p>Non-Compliance with Sections 81,84,85,86, and 99. Of the NPPF.</p> <p>It is accepted that the LPA may review the boundaries of the Greenbelt from time to time but in doing so they must have regard to existing features and future development and take an overview of the situation.</p> <p>The purpose of a greenbelt is to separate distinct urban areas and to contain development sprawl.</p> <p>Section 86 states that "if the openness of the village is a characteristic of the area then the village should be incorporated within the greenbelt."</p> <p>In this instance the main feature of the village is the open space opposite the shopping area. When exiting Bournemouth it is the first rural space clearly seen after the floodplane. Travellers would have to travel a further 3 miles to see rural fields from a main road. The loss of this rural</p>						

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>amenity feature will significantly diminish the greenbelt and significantly reduce the juxtaposition of the two elements of the conurbation.</p> <p>Section 85. The review of the greenbelt should make provision for "further safeguarded land for sustainable development that will enable further development stretching well beyond the initial plan phase.</p> <p>This proposal is bounded existing development and the flood plane. No further development would be possible without further impact upon the environment.</p> <p>Section 99. Climate Change. As alluded to earlier this proposal uses the flood plane as part of the SANG. This space is constantly underwater despite canalisation works to the river in the 1980s. If not under 600mm of water the ground is not traversable as it is too boggy. Current climate change predictions of England indicate that although the temperature will rise, rainfall will also increase. This factor has not been considered.</p> <p>Summary. The proposal has been compiled without a detailed environmental impact assessment and without consultation with all LPA department. It is therefore unsound.</p> <p>Conclusions. This proposal was formulated without consideration of an Environmental Impact Assessment, or an Arboricultural Impact Assessment.</p> <p>Were this proposal to proceed it would have an unacceptable impact upon the sylvan setting of the area and have a significant impact upon several protected European species. The document provided by the LPA are misleading as they do not reflect the true nature and immediate impact of the proposal on tree loss.</p> <p>The proposal uses the floodplane as part of the SANG and the other topography of the remaining section restricts access. (see contour lines)</p> <p>The LPA have produced this planning proposal to alter the greenbelt without full consideration of all sections of the NPPF. This is understandable as the proposal was formulated before the NPPF was introduced.</p> <p>Thus I must conclude that this proposal is: Not justifiable in terms of tree loss, Not justifiable in terms of environmental impact, It is based upon unsound in planning principles.</p>						
656940	Mrs Sheila Edwards		CSPS1682	Policy FWP7	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes		<p>The response form on the above matter is far from user friendly and must, by intention or otherwise, be devoid of easy understanding for many residents who will not reply because of inability to carry out in depth research to comply with the set out requirements.</p> <p>A high proportion of residents (and voters) are seriously concerned as evidenced by the WPPC. There is a strong feeling of being steamrollered into a not viable, ill conceived and poorly analysed situation that is judged to have so many flaws.</p>				510		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
											<p>It appears that the District Council ha acceded to pressure and will accept written letters in lieu of the printed form. Given sufficient publicity it is an improvement, but is indicative of the odious air surrounding the whole proposal and action by many Councillors.</p> <p>Since Policies FW7, 6 and 5 are deemed to be unsound, not legally complaint, nor justified not effective and not consistent with National Policy, and bearing in mind Government Document PPS12, is now irrelevant. Any constructive support is negated by the lack of publicly widely reported analytical research to support viability.</p> <p>That such porous proposals should be enacted for the betterment of the West Parley area has at least to be highly questionable.</p> <p>At a time of national hardship, and possible future uncertainty of national wealth, to proceed must impose measures by councils and supportive interests of prolonged misery for which they must become accountable.</p> <p>The situation is such that it has become virtually impossible to analytically discuss with the District Council potential problems such as:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Increasing probability of flooding. 2) Full public analysis of true housing requirements, devoid of promoting house building and construction work. 3) Excessive affordable housing will inevitably attract or be allocated to many families who are not self supporting. Consequently, rate payers will have to heavily subsidise the numerous forms of support requirements. 4) Infrastructure in the form of schools, church, medical, care and pastime facilities will be further burdens to be carried. 5) The 100 houses as originally proposed by WPPC would be viable and support local shops. A supermarket would kill local traders and add further road chaos. 6) Current West Parley traffic problems are of short duration and no more than many other spots in the area. Road changes may well lead to estate road hazards. 7) Sites of interest, green belt land and wooded areas should not be decimated and sacrificed at the seemingly whim of Councillors or others who seem to dismiss the word sacrosanct when associated with West Parley and other contentious areas in the Core Strategy Plan. 							
656943	Mr and Mrs T Scott		CSPS1683	Policy FWP7							<p>We would like to register out objections to the proposed plans for West Parley. With reference to Policy FWP7 and FWP6 for housing you are proposing to build on green belt land near the old hill fort and the New Road field which is agricultural land and not building land.</p> <p>We moved to West Parley nearly 2 years ago and nothing came up in searches by our Solicitors referring to the proposed schemes which are far too big and not wanted here in West Parley as schools, doctors, hospitals etc. could not cope with the increased population.we are told that the new link road would not be started until half the houses are built so until then which may be years Parley Cross will have to take hundreds more cars a day – what a joke have you seen the</p>					510		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description					
											<p>traffic chaos now if a road nearly is closed for whatever reason . It is over capacity already.</p> <p>The link road you propose will go straight through a new housing estate and not ideal for families with children. The other through a flood plain – have you not seen what the recent weather has done there? With the unpredictable weather we now have this would only get worse.</p> <p>These green fields i.e. green belt are to prevent urban sprawl which in effect would make Bournemouth West Parley ! And Ferndown one big town – West Parley is a village.</p> <p>The West Parley parish plan which over 1000 residents contributed to has been virtually ignored so maybe you will listen now and leave West Parley as it is now a safe and peaceful place to live which is why we moved here.</p> <p>PLEASE LISTEN TO THE PEOPLE OF WEST PARLEY.</p>											
656999	Mrs Sheila Gooden		CSPS1699	Policy FWP7							<p>1) Loss of Green Belt. This is the last green space of any note between West Parley and the coast. This needs to be kept as a breathing space from Urban Sprawl.</p> <p>2) The infrastructure is not adequate to take such large scale development.</p> <p>3) The planned road system does not seem to have been thought through. Bringing a road across ground which is of scientific and historical interest including broad leaf trees seems to fly in the face of all the Oak Trees that have TPO's on them. The field that the road is due to connect with is a well known flood plain and was totally underwater only a few weeks ago. Taking a road through a housing development that will no doubt have probably many children living there seems to be an accident waiting to happen.</p> <p>4) It appears that the concerns voiced by the residents of West Parley in the exercise undertaken a year or two ago seem to have been totally ignored. I have yet to meet anyone who said we needed a High Street or an even larger Supermarket. Where did that come from? We have a Tesco's Express that stocks all basic needs, we also have a very good Chemists and also a Post Office so most day to day needs are covered. The shops that are here are businesses that have been in West Parley for many years and we do not end up with empty shops for months on end. The only place in West Parley Village which is a bit of an eyesore is the Old Garage Site.</p> <p>5) Where are the people who need these houses? Are they local residents to Dorset or are we to be used as a lung for people from inner cities who have had their rent allowances cut. When we have had meetings regarding the development of West Parley not once have we had anyone come and stand up and say that they need housing and that we are being NIMBY ish! We agreed that we were willing to accept some development but not once have we been fully consulted on any strategy.</p> <p>6) Schools and Clinical Facilities. Where are the plans for children to be schooled.? I understand that the schools are already to capacity in which case surely a new or much extended school would be needed. I understand that there is</p>					510						

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
											<p>not enough space to extend the school that we have. With so many new houses the Doctor's Surgery in Glenmoor Road would not be able to cope and this is possibly the same for the Dentists in the area assuming a lot of new residents would need an NHS dentist.</p> <p>7) The planned houses would also be under the flight area of planes coming in and out of Bournemouth Airport. This cannot be a healthy situation for residents and also the fact that it is not unknown for planes to crash in the area.</p> <p>8) We have next to no problems with damage or vandalism and doing some research these types of development lead to damage, graffiti and poor relations with neighbours. It is also known that trying to sell affordable houses can be problematic because of this type of damage, which could mean that the whole development becomes social housing.</p> <p>9) Where is the Public Transport. The buses that there are take an eternity to get anywhere quickly. They are also very expensive to use. Dorset is classed a a wealthy county. There maybe a lot of expensive properties but the salaries paid in this are are mostly low paid.</p> <p>10) Jobs. Where are all these people going to work? Even if Ferndown Industrial Estate is extended most of these types of units only employ a few people. Assuming that the current world situation improves in the near future it could possibly be many years before there is any meaningful employment in the area.</p> <p>11) It does appear that the planners have looked at a nice green area, and without any consideration for the local people, decided it could solve a large number of Dorset's housing problems.</p> <p>12) This needs to go back to the drawing board with West Parley residents properly consulted.</p>							
657001	Mr and Mrs S Wood		CSPS1701	Policy FWP7							<p>We are writing this letter to protest against the new housing proposals that are being considered for West Parley. The amount of new houses (500) represent more than 30% of the current housing in West Parley. You propose to build the 2 new link roads after the building of the new houses is 50% done, how can West Parley cope with this, we can hardly cope with the amount of traffic we get now. We are classified as a Village, not a town. We do not want to be part of Bournemouth, this new building will take away our individuality, there will be no gap between us and Bournemouth. With all this new housing where will the extra children go to school and people go to Doctors etc. There has been no thought given to this, our existing network will not cope with the huge influx you are proposing. Promises were made to us when the Airport was expanded regarding new wider roads. This has not happened, and who would want to live in new housing that is going to be in the flight path to the airport. (FWP6) You are going to be building on greenbelt, which as far as we are aware was something the Government is against. How can you build on an historical site as Dudsbury heights near the old forthill (Policy FWP7). The District Council has ignored our protests and do nothing about</p>				510			

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
											<p>them. The Link Roads are going through areas that have tree preservations on them, has any thought been given to this? We have had no evidence that checks on Bats and other animals that are preserved have been done. West Parley cannot cope with the size of this development, there is no infrastructure in place. It is planned on high value agricultural land, there is no evidence we need this amount of new housing.</p> <p>Where will people work? Please Please reconsider this application, a much smaller amount of housing would be more suitable for this area.</p>							
657003	Mr Robin Gooden		CSPS1707	Policy FWP7							<p>The proposed massive housing expansion at West Parley is totally un-acceptable, it increases the housing stock by a huge 32% without the additional infrastructure increase to match it. The new residents will have no schools and no work opportunities in the local area. This will in turn lead to additional traffic on already overcrowded roads due to the additional travel they will have to undertake to reach work. The proposed road runs across the flood plain adjacent to the river Stour and floods following heavy rains and will require extensive piling and building up as a raised structure or on a causeway. It appears that the concerns voiced by the residents of West Parley in the exercise undertaken a year or two ago seem to have been totally ignored. I have yet to meet anyone who said we needed a High Street or an even larger Supermarket. Where did that come from? We have a Tesco's Express that stocks all basic needs, we also have a very good Chemists and also a Post office so most day to day needs are covered. The shops that are here are businesses that have been in West Parley for many years and we do not end up with empty shops for months on end. The only place in West Parley Village which is a bit of an eyesore is the Old Garage Site.</p> <p>The public consultation appears to have been a complete farce as all the resident's fears and concerns have been totally ignored. Whilst we appreciate everyone has to live somewhere a reduced scheme would be more appropriate. The plans should be amended I suggest this is the best course of acting for this area and expect you to support this approach.</p>				510			
657007	Mrs Hilary Jordan		CSPS1718	Policy FWP7							<p>In response to the core strategy consultation, which I believe is unsound in numerous areas.</p> <p>Firstly I am amazed at the lack of consultation with Local Residents and the Parish Council; I would suggest they know more about the local area than you do.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What about the need for Schools, and the funding? • What about the road improvements, additional traffic lights is not the answer? • What about the Historical sites such as Dudsbury Rings Fort? <p>To conclude, not only am I appalled by the Core Strategy Consultation, but disgusted at the total waste in tax payers' money of producing it and all the pointless meetings I am sure you have undertaken.</p>				510			

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
657018	Mr Stuart Couper		CSPS1722	Policy FWP7		No		Yes		Yes	<p>This document is unsound, unjustified and not in accordance with national policy on green belt development.</p> <p>1. This is an area of outstanding natural beauty where there is a historic hill fort and a large parcel of land gifted to the girl guides in perpetuity by Lord Wimborne. The whole area is a haven for wildlife with Badger sets and deer roaming freely.</p> <p>2. The field in question is a steep slope which has many natural springs and any small amount of rain causes water to pour down the roads below.</p> <p>3. The plan for a road across this field would damage the Stour Valley Way and the exit onto New Road is on a dangerous bend just as the road narrows, this would merely move the hold ups in the traffic a little further from the traffic lights but with more junctions would just increase the problem.</p>				510		
360103	Mr J Edwards		CSPS2189	Policy FWP7							<p>I write to object to the core strategy plans with regard to the plan to build 220 houses at Dudsbury Heights, policy number FWP7 and 300 in the New Road field, policy number FWP6, at West Parley.</p> <p>Neither of these proposals I find to be Justified, Effective or Consistent with National Policy.</p> <p>I decline to submit these objections in the biased and deliberately incomprehensible format originally requested. The very nature of these proposals and the manner that they have been put forward to premature consultation is undemocratic and outside government policy. At no point have the people of West Parley been involved in the drawing up of these plans and indeed the publicly funded, council driven Parish Plan that 1000 residents contributed to has been ignored. This document was supposed to be the driver for locally led shaping of our village and area.</p> <p>The green belt is not for cheap housing or to be sold to dig the Council out of a financial hole whenever it suits, despite what East Dorset's Alan Breakwell (ex Chief Executive) claimed at a very public meeting in the council chambers at Furzehill. I quote "the houses will be built, we need the money".</p> <p>These green belt fields are key gaps with our neighbours in Bournemouth and to a lesser degree Ferndown. They fulfil the exact purpose the green belt policy was enacted for, they prevent urban sprawl. I see no exceptional circumstances for sacrificing this exceptional green belt on the altar of cheap housing estates.</p> <p>Parley Cross is already the busiest crossroads in Dorset and yet these proposals would massively increase the volume of cars on this road, a previous local plan warned against any further development until the road system could be improved. Under these proposals half the houses could be built before either link road was started, years of greater misery for not only residents of Parley but all the other commuters who currently use these roads. One of the link roads which would be taking heavy traffic would go right through a housing estate, a concern for safety surely, but then the wisdom of placing family housing beneath a busy flightpath seems to have little concern for well being or possible safety anyway,</p>				510		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description						
											perhaps this must come secondary to the council when the temptation of large amounts of cash from builders is on the table. There can be few areas, if any, being asked to take on board a massive 32% increase in housing stock and to assimilate so many new people into a existing population in such a way as this proposal suggests. The well being of existing residents, who are tax payers and voters is not being taken into account. Residents here value our semi rural life and object most strongly to these attempts to wipe it out. No thought has been given to the wildlife that abounds here or the protected heathland East Dorset is so pleased to boast of, and take grants to maintain, but cares so little for in reality. That there would be hundreds more residents on its doorstep who will no doubt be tramping all over it is of no regard. Please do not think that other token offerings of accessible green space will prevent the SSSI's being abused.												
612430	Mr Nick Squirrel	Natural England, Dorset and Somerset Team	CSPS1944	Policy FWP7	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	No	Policies; CN 1, CN 2, CN 3, WMC 3, WMC 4, WMC 5, WMC 6, FWP 3, FWP 4, FWP 6, FWP 7, FWP 8, VTSW 2, VTSW3, VTSW 4, VTSW 8 etc are all proposing development and or mitigation in the form of SANGs on greenfield locations. In order to avoid a conflict with policy ME1 at a later stage in the planning process Natural England advise the authorities to bring to the attention of those with an interest in these locations the need to carry out a basic biodiversity survey eg Phase 1 habitat survey including assessment of the likely presence or evidence of other features likely to restrict or delay development eg badger setts, priority species such as reptiles, water voles etc in time for consideration at the EIP. In many cases this will simply be a statement as the proposer has already engaged an ecological advisor. These policies appear to have been brought forward in an absence of adequate information and assessment on the biodiversity features held by the policy land. There is reason to suspect that on some there may be a significant biodiversity interest owing to close proximity with designated sites and or other biodiversity sites. The NPPF requires that planning policies should be based on up-to date information on the natural environment (paragraph 165). These policies are not shown to be compliant with this requirement. Thus, irrespective of the above matters concerning other nearby designated sites, it is not possible to identify whether the policies are compliant with policy considerations in the NPPF on sustainable development for the sites alone, especially the aspect on sustainable development set out in paragraph 9 of moving from a net loss of biodiversity to achieving net gains (for example on priory habitats and species).	The policies may need to include specific paragraphs about features of biodiversity importance which are to be secured or enhanced.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	Natural England has provided extensive advice to a number of the parties concerned with these policies and may be able to offer advice and reassurance to the Inspector about the reliance he may have on the effectiveness of the policy and any modification proposed.	510								
359553	Mrs Linda Leeding	West Parley Parish Council	CSPS2004	Policy FWP7		No		Yes	Yes	Yes	This plan is considered Unsound, in that it is not Consistent with National Policy, Justified, Effective, or Deliverable. N.P.P.F. 155 calls for "early and meaningful engagement and collaboration with a wide section of the community". E.D.D.C.s Statement of Community Involvement (part of the Core Strategy evidence base) calls for "active and continuous community involvement" in the planning process.		Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination		510								

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>These policies have been consistently ignored. E.D.D.C. has carried out the required formal consultations after plans have been produced, but the prior planning has been behind closed doors and requests for involvement have been turned down. When plans are published it is seen that little or no attention has been paid to community aspirations. For instance, when the West Parley Parish Plan was delivered in 2011 it had no response or acknowledgement from E.D.D.C. Building on this area of green belt, which is a “key gap” and has a high quality landscape and community value, is not justified by the evidence produced for the claimed housing need (see comment on Policy KS4)</p> <p>This field meets all the requirements in NPPF 77 for a Local Green Space Designation. It is adjacent to the Dudsbury Iron Age Hill Fort. It is crossed by the Stour Valley Walk, one of Dorset’s most celebrated Trans County walks from Christchurch to Stourhead in Wilts. On a clear day one can see all the way to the Needles in the Isle of Wight. Horses are kept on the green slopes.</p> <p>It is a prized and much walked and admired community asset. The community should obviously have been more closely involved in the planning here.</p> <p>The landscape value of the field has been greatly underplayed in the Broadway Malyan report. When these same “areas of search” were studied in the Regional Spatial Strategy the authoritative report by Colin Buchanan (Feb 2006) characterised them as “preventing sprawl, preventing coalescence, safeguarding the countryside and protecting the historic setting” and gave them his highest landscape value score. His report said that “it was unclear that the weight and importance of each of the SE Dorset areas of search had been understood”; that “wider sustainability issues did not appear to have been fully considered” and that “the extent of areas that couldn’t be released and those more sensitive to release needed to be more carefully defined”</p> <p>The field is also adjacent to an important and secluded site inside the walls of the ancient hill fort, in which is housed a club used by Girl Guides and Brownies throughout the district, especially suitable for summer camps. Nearby communities have often expressed fears to E.D.D.C. over the impact of a major housing development some 200 yards away and these views appear not to have been taken into consideration.</p> <p>The effect of the FWP7 development on the ancient hill fort, only 100 yards away from the nearest house, has not been assessed. The District Council has yet to engage with English Heritage on the subject. The fears are that the monument, not yet properly studied or excavated, will be damaged beyond repair by being used as a natural playground.</p> <p>The effect of flooding on FWP7 has been underestimated in the Core Strategy. Not surprisingly, the hill fort was built on an area with plentiful springs. After heavy rains there are miniature rivers in Ridgeway Road just below the site. Concreting over much of the field could have considerable effects and it is a concern that only desktop studies on this</p>						

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description			
											<p>have been carried out.</p> <p>The proposed Link Road could also find itself impacted in construction, maintenance and costs by seasonal floods. Photos on the Environment Agency website show extensive and periodic floods right up to the Southern part of the proposed link road. It is alarming that this road should be proposed in public Core Strategy plans for consultation before any evidence studies on it have been done.</p> <p>In summary, the FWP7 site is a specially prized and valuable green belt key gap and landscape and community asset that should be the very last place to be considered for housebuilding.</p>									
361035	Mrs H.L O'Sullivan		CSPS2280	Policy FWP7							<p>I strongly object to the proposed imposition of 500+ houses on West Parley. Increasing the current housing stock by 32%! For the following reasons I would consider the proposal to be not legally compliant and unsound.</p> <p>1) These developments will seriously erode the green belt gap, designed to prevent urban sprawl and the merger of settlements. West Parley will be a suburb of Bournemouth leaving only a very narrow river corridor between the Bournemouth and Ferndown.</p> <p>2) Previous documents have also expressed concern with regards flooding resulting from substantial development in the area so close to the river. : "Insufficient weight given in the Strategy to the desirability of maintaining, protecting and wherever possible restoring the rivers and their corridors. Any type of built development close to or within the river corridors will increase existing floor risk." (Quote – Non Preferred Option CS PreSub 08 Ferndown and West Parley Proposals Background Paper)</p> <p>3) The development is being forced on the area despite the opinions of residents</p> <p>Against the government's policy of not imposing top down planning. The consultation document states there have been numerous consultation meetings with West Parley Residents Association, but little notice seems to have been taken of the opinions expressed by the WRPA. More than 1000 residents contributed to the local parish plan, suggesting 100 new homes would be more realistic. The suggestion is made in the core strategy document that there has been little interest and local response to previous planning documents. Could this be because in the previous planning document, development at West Parley was the "non-preferred option"? Local residents were mislead into thinking a "non-preferred option" meant the council would not want to further pursue development in this area and thus there was no need to respond.</p> <p>4) Although just outside the protection zone surrounding the Parley Common heathland the developments, particularly FWP6, are very close to Parley Common. Additional housing and population moving into the area will inevitably cause extra pressure on the rare habitat. Natural England and RSPB have expressed concerns regarding the developments. FWP6 & 7</p>					510				

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>“Natural England – Object. This site offers significant green infrastructure that could remove potential adverse effects (from recreational pressure) on the Dorset heaths and increase the value for biodiversity. Disproportionate ratio of housing to the Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG) proposed.</p> <p>English Heritage – Object. To ensure the national significance of Dudsbury Camp is conserved, its values must first be fully appreciated. Specific detailed evidence must therefore be gathered to inform consideration of the areas suitability, the proximity and the form of any future potential development.</p> <p>RSPB – We agree with the findings of the Habitats Regulations Assessment in connection with the proposed housing sites within these areas. We Object “(Quote – Non Preferred Option CS PreSub 08 Ferndown and West Parley Proposals Background Paper)</p> <p>5) FWP6 development is very close to the flight path. Noise levels from aircraft Are considerable in this area and will only increase as the air traffic increases. This will not make for very pleasant living conditions.</p> <p>6) The proposed roads through the developments will not alleviate the pressure On New Road and the Parley Cross junction. The additional car movements caused by the increase in houses will add to the problems on New Road. Frequently during the day, not just at rush hours, the traffic queues back from the Northbourne Roundabout past the Parley Cross traffic lights back to Ferndown. This situation will not be improved by 2 new junctions feeding into New Road through the two new estates. Added congestion on New Road can only lead to more congestion on Christchurch Road as Parley crossroads try to accommodate the additional traffic.</p> <p>7) The increase of 30% in West Parley housing stock will totally swamp the Current village. Changing a semi rural village into a suburban location.</p> <p>8) A large supermarket will also increase the traffic coming into the area. We are Already served well by supermarkets in Ferndown, and a substantial Tesco express at Parley Cross.</p> <p>9) There does not appear to have been any consideration of additional strain On other local amenities such as schools, doctors, sewerage systems etc.</p>						
474971	Mr Peter Durant		CSPS2210	Policy FWP7							<p>I am writing to protest about the proposed building plans for West Parley. I have major concerns about the whole thrust of the proposals. I am appalled at the manner in which East Dorset has carried out substantial consultations in West Parley, and then completely ignored the results. It was not long ago that the Prime Minister stated that it was his intention that local matters should be determined locally. I recognise that East Dorset Council has cynically combined West Parley with</p>				510		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>Ferndown in their deliberations to justify their plans. This is neither fair nor justifiable. The people of Ferndown are not directly affected by the proposals. The ancient parish of West Parley has throughout history to the present day been regarded as a proper village, with an identity distinct from Ferndown. It appears that East Dorset Council has conveniently ignored this aspect.</p> <p>This leads directly to the first point that I wish to make.</p> <p>1st. The proposed plans would produce a 32% increase in the housing stock of West Parley which would be far in excess of the proposals for other communities in East Dorset.</p> <p>2nd I believe that the proposal to build on Greenbelt land is flawed in a number of regards. The green belt designation was originally set up to avoid the sort of development that is proposed for West Parley. There will be very little to separate West Parley from the northern fringes of Bournemouth if the development goes ahead. The open fields that provide pleasant vistas to the east of New Road, and to the south of Christchurch Road will be replaced by urbanisation. The extent of the additional buildings will create many more vehicle movements at the West Parley junction, and despite the planned diversions, will cause yet more traffic chaos.</p> <p>3rd. The proposed filter roads connecting Christchurch Road to the southern section of New Road will be passing through the proposed urban development, which will almost certainly bring children into close proximity with substantial traffic movements, many of which will be heavy goods vehicles.</p> <p>4th The idea that alterations to the road network will bring about long term easing of congestion is naïve. There is almost certainly a substantial unmet demand for rush hour commuters to travel the east-west, and the north south corridors, which will probably flood these roads if additional road space is provided. The evidence for that is that when the previous alterations were made to the junction, it took just 6 months for the designed capacity to be exceeded by the flood of extra vehicles.</p> <p>5th. The District Council encouraged West Parley to provide a Parish plan. Before this was adopted by the Parish Council, the local citizens were formally consulted. The District Council have ignored it.</p> <p>I have identified most of my points. However, just in case these need to be linked to the planning policy numbering I will respond to these.</p> <p>FWP5 I see no need for an additional supermarket. Any additional local shops be it Baker, Greengrocer or other would fail in any attempt to compete with supermarkets just as they have before. I do not believe that there are enough Plymouth Brethren in West Parley to warrant a new church.</p> <p>FWP6 The main reason such a large number of houses are being proposed is so that alterations to the road network can be funded by developers. They should not be being built on greenbelt land for the reasons that I have already identified. The junction is at full capacity throughout the rush hour period. The traffic engineers have agreed on that, so the only way things could get worse is by an extension of the period</p>						

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
											during which chaos reigns. I believe that alterations to the road network will almost certainly encourage yet more vehicles. Emerging from this is that additional road space is an exercise in futility. So, if the junction remains largely as it is, there is less justification for using greenbelt land. FWP7 The same objections that I identified in my response to FWP6 apply to this. To finish: Various suggestions were made at the meetings for alternative land fit for development. There is the brown field land around Boundary Lane. The water company suggested their site off Old Ham Lane. So there are alternatives around. It appears to me that authorities are fixated about the traffic at West Parley and all the extra housing changes are being made so that changes to the road infrastructure can be funded.							
475502	Mr Richard Croom		CSPS2282	Policy FWP7							We wish to make the following representation, as having lived in Parley since 1985 we are very concerned indeed at the District Council's proposed plans for development. The Core Strategy Response Form included at the back of the Spring EXTRA 2012 edition of eastdorsetnews seeks the views of residents as to whether the document is legally compliant or unsound. However we feel that a much more practical approach is required by the District Council to be aware of the effect the proposed development will have on the lives of the residents of West Parley. The District Council should be more concerned about the detrimental effect the building of 520 additional houses will have upon the environment, and the lives of the existing Parley residents. 1,000 residents of West Parley contributed to the Parish Plan having been encouraged to do so by the District Council, and yet despite the clear message contained in the Plan regarding future building and the effect it would have upon the environment, the residents' views have been ignored. The proposed policies FWP6 and FWP7 to build an additional 520 houses represents a massive increase in the housing stock of 32% which is absolutely ridiculous, and cannot have been thought through properly. The new proposals are very different indeed to the plans originally released in 2010, and quite undemocratically the Parish Council has not been consulted by the District Council. Why has West Parley been selected by the District Council for this totally unacceptable level of development? The number of new houses proposed will be unmanageable and totally disproportionate to the existing housing stock. It is also considerably higher than the proposals put forward by the District Council for Corfe Mullen, Ferndown, Verwood or West Moors. 520 additional houses will no doubt mean at least another 500 cars, and probably nearer 700 extra vehicles on our roads that are already very busy especially during commuter and school peak travelling times. Whilst being aware that 2 new link roads are proposed I believe these will not be constructed until half the intended houses have been completed, so the					510		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>effect upon the existing roads and the residents will surely be chaotic.</p> <p>Referring once again to Policies FWP6 and FWP7 both these sites are I believe part of the existing green belt. Was not the main reason initially for the establishment of the green belt to provide so called Key Gaps between existing towns to counteract urban sprawl?</p> <p>Why has the District Council seen fit to ignore this very vital aspect of Town Planning?</p> <p>The road junction at Parley Cross is already a very busy bottleneck particularly at peak commuter and school travelling times. The proposed development of over 500 houses will exacerbate traffic and environmental problems, and ruin what has been a very pleasant place to live for many years. This will undoubtedly cause a great deal of frustration and unhappiness for the existing residents, and one further point that the District Council seems to have ignored with regard to FWP6 and FWP7 is that many of the proposed new dwellings will be erected directly under the flight path to and from Bournemouth International Airport.</p> <p>We know that many of the residents of West Parley are very upset at the prospect of over 500 additional houses being built, and we urge the District Council to listen to the views being expressed by the residents and the Parish Council, and give urgent and sympathetic re-consideration to the proposed development.</p>						
494600	Mrs Audrey Russell		CSPS2248	Policy FWP7							<p>Initially I would like to state that this the first time that these plans have been made available to local residents, and the proposals that have been put forward in them show that comments made by the public to previous plans appear, in the main, to have been ignored.</p> <p>I live in the area between two of the proposed areas of redevelopment – Coppins Nursery (FWP4) and West Parley crossroads (FWP5, 6 and 7).</p> <p>My concerns regarding the 30 proposed houses at Coppins is that you could, potentially, have 60 vehicles entering and leaving this area via the Christchurch Road. This is a road that is already carrying more traffic than it was designed for, and where it is the norm for the traffic to be travelling in excess of the speed limit. There have been a number of deaths and 'near misses' on this stretch of road, and adding another busy junction will only exacerbate this situation.</p> <p>West Parley is a village, but you are suggesting increasing its housing stock by one third. This will change the whole character of the area and I do not believe that the need for this scale of development in the village has been proved.</p> <p>Green Belt was put in place to prevent 'urban sprawl', and yet you are planning to redefine its boundaries to allow just that.</p> <p>An increase in the number of houses in West Parley by 520 will result in an increase in the number of cars – possibly by 1000. New Link roads may appear to ease the flow of traffic through the Parley crossroad junction, but the traffic on the entry roads to the village (Christchurch Road – west and east, and New Road – north and south) will be carrying even more</p>				510		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
											<p>traffic that they do currently. You are just moving the current congestion further away from the junction but not resolving the problem.</p> <p>With the proposed increase in population in the village, I feel that there will be an increased need for medical services (doctors and dentists), and for schools. These do not appear to have been considered in the proposed plan,.</p> <p>I would appreciate you taking these points into consideration before a final decision is made regarding the future of our area</p>							
495662	Mr & Mrs B Abbott		CSPS2288	Policy FWP7							<p>I have lived at West Parley for about 30 years and in that time have seen many changes, not all of them favourable to residents of the area.</p> <p>The proposed plans for additional housing at Dudsbury Heights (Policy FWP7) and at the New Road field (FWP6) would further destroy this once green and quiet village and make it merely a part of the urban sprawl of Bournemouth, Poole & Ferndown.</p> <p>Most people would accept that there is a requirement for some additional housing but what I cannot understand is why prime green belt sites are being used for additional housing when there are spaces for infill and other more suitable sites. Why are such large developments to be inflicted on West Parley? To do so is to destroy countryside that can never be replaced.</p> <p>The plans proposed at New Road, right under the flight path, with a major road route through the centre of the proposed dwellings seems to me to be ill thought out. Not only will the proposed dwellings be subject to noise and environmental pollution from aircraft, they will also suffer from the effects of volumes of traffic. The volume of traffic at Parley is bad enough now and can only be made worse by the proposed developments. Who would want to purchase such properties? Is the idea to have another Tricketts Cross type estate at Parley?</p> <p>To summarise, we object most strongly to the proposals because of the following factors:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Use of prime green belt locations. 2. Unsuitable location for housing under flight path. 3. Unacceptable traffic consequences. 4. Extent of proposed developments. 5. Views of residents expressed at earlier consultations appear to have been completely ignored. <p>Please, please reconsider the proposals.</p>					510		
497056	Mrs Gillian Miles		CSPS2201	Policy FWP7							<p>I wish to object to Policy FWP6 and FWP7 for the following reasons.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The consultation process is unsatisfactory. Government legislation requires you to consult fully with local communities before setting out proposals, but this has been ignored. West Parley produced, following lengthy consultation with residents, a Parish Plan. East Dorset District Council encouraged the production of this document and over 1000 residents contributed to it, showing that they were overwhelmingly against having more than about 100 houses 					510		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>built in West Parley. This source of information has been ignored by EDDC planners.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To build more than 100 houses in West Parley would create an unbroken urban sprawl from Bournemouth to Ferndown and beyond. West Parley would lose its identity and become just another small part of a very large conurbation. Both of the proposed development sites constitute much valued Green Belt land and provide key gaps between the Bournemouth and Ferndown boundaries. This was the reason for introducing the Green Belt system many years ago. • The Green Belt land enhances the setting of the village and provides a habitat for a number of species of animals and birds, such as badgers, foxes, otters, deer and buzzards. Many local people use the footpaths that cross these fields for exercising dogs and walking. • The proposed new link roads will not ease the traffic problems in West Parley, but merely move the traffic jams to a different location. My husband and I both drive through Parley Cross each day and are all too aware that, at peak times, the traffic queues from Parley Cross often extend for a mile in each direction. If over 500 new homes were to be built, there is the potential for 1000 or so additional vehicles using these roads each day. Similarly, traffic travelling in the direction of Poole often queues back from the mini roundabouts in Longham. Other proposals for housing at Coppins Nursery and Holmwood House would exacerbate these traffic problems even further. • 520 extra houses in West Parley represent an increase in housing of about 32%. This is excessive and is far more than is proposed for any of the other East Dorset communities. Without the provision of additional educational, health and community facilities, the pressure on the existing provision will be unacceptable. • Dudsbury Fort is an important heritage site and the proposed development site at FWP7 is too closely connected to the site for this site to be adequately protected. The proposed development would be detrimental the setting of Dudsbury Fort. • The creation of another supermarket on site FWP6 is totally unnecessary. Various supermarkets already exist within a three mile radius of West Parley, with no fewer than three Tesco Express shops within a one mile radius of Parley Cross. Another supermarket would merely add to the traffic congestion in the area. <p>I appreciate the Council's need to provide housing for the future, but feel that it could be better accommodated elsewhere, perhaps thought a comprehensive redevelopment and regeneration of Ferndown town centre.</p> <p>Please reconsider these proposals and listen to the views of us, the local residents.</p>						
498084	Mr P Hartley		CSPS2174	Policy FWP7							<p>I am writing on behalf of myself and my family to voice our disgust and disappointment at the proposals to build over 500 houses and new main roads on beautiful and treasured Green Belt and Key Gap areas in West Parley. It is particularly</p>				510		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>distressing to us and the local inhabitants as when building in these areas has been proposed in the past, local objections have been so evident that the proposals were retracted. Despite the fact that the local councils should be acting on the behalf of their residents, they appear to be constantly engaging in battles with them, trying to impose actions that are strongly opposed.</p> <p>For clarity, the policies referred to in this letter are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy FWP7 – 220 houses and new road in Dudsbury heights field. • Policy FWP6 – 300 houses, supermarket, shopping centre and link road by New Road field. <p>The additional 520 houses is 32% increase in West Parleys housing stock. This would have an enormous impact on West Parley and is far more than is being imposed on Corfe Mullen, Ferndown, Wimborne and Verwood. With the erosion of the Key Gaps defending West Parley from the urban sprawl from Bournemouth and increasing the population by almost a third, the charm and village feel of West Parley will be completely destroyed and the primary reasons for wanting to live here gone.</p> <p>The new link roads include a new main road with extremely high traffic loads running through the new 300 houses, which is ludicrous due to the inherent dangers that will be imposed on the residents, particularly the children.</p> <p>West Parley does not cope with the current traffic demands with large traffic jams every working day. Any additional housing will increase the traffic causing more problems. Building of the proposed new link roads will not commence until half the houses have been built – there would create a large increase in traffic with no alternative traffic route, potentially for years.</p> <p>These plans are very different form the 2010 plans, but local residents have not been involved or consulted at all in their preparation. West Parley's Parish Plan was encouraged by the District Council with 1000 residents contributing to it, however the District Council has completely ignored it. This sort of behaviour from the local councils is atrocious and destroys all trust from residents and demonstrates that there is no care taken in decision making on behalf of the local inhabitants No doubt the Council is of the opinion that the local populations views are irrelevant, to the point where they are completely ignored – no doubt things would be a lot easier if there were no residents!</p> <p>It has been shown time and again that the residents are strongly against this mutilation of Green Belt, Key Gaps and West Parley, so why do the councils insist on continuingly perusing this agenda.</p> <p>Please do what you are employed to do and act on behalf of your residents and take on board our views and requirements and remove this threat to our over 1000 year old village. Do not destroy West Parley.</p>						
498555	Mrs Della Edwards		CSPS2192	Policy FWP7							I write to object to the core strategy plans with regard to the plan to build 220 houses at Dudsbury Heights, policy number		Yes, I wish to participate at the oral	My reasons are that I have been involved in	510		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>FWP7 and 300 in the New Road field, policy number FWP6, at West Parley.</p> <p>Neither of these proposals I find to be Justified, Effective or Consistent with National Policy.</p> <p>I decline to submit these objections in the biased and deliberately incomprehensible format originally requested. The very nature of these proposals and the manner that they have been put forward to premature consultation is undemocratic and outside government policy. At no point have the people of West Parley been involved in the drawing up of these plans and indeed the publicly funded, council driven Parish Plan that 1000 residents contributed to has been ignored. This document was supposed to the driver for locally led shaping of our village and area.</p> <p>The green belt is not for cheap housing or to be sold to dig the Council out of a financial hole whenever it suits, despite what East Dorset's Alan Breakwell (ex-Chief Executive) claimed at a very public meeting in the council chambers at Furzehill. I quote "the houses will be built, we need the money".</p> <p>These green belt fields are key gaps with our neighbours in Bournemouth and to a lesser degree Ferndown. They fulfil the exact purpose the green belt policy was enacted for, they prevent urban sprawl. I see no exceptional circumstances for sacrificing this exceptional green belt on the altar of cheap housing estates.</p> <p>Parley Cross is already the busiest crossroads in Dorset and yet these proposals would massively increase the volume of cars on this road, a previous local plan warned against any further development until the road system could be improved. Under these proposals half the houses could be built before either link road was started, years of greater misery for not only residents of Parley but all the other commuters who currently use these roads.</p> <p>One of the link roads which would be taking heavy traffic would go right through a housing estate, a concern for safety surely, but then the wisdom of placing family housing beneath a busy flight path seems to have little concern for well-being or possible safety anyway, perhaps this must come secondary to the council when the temptation of large amounts of cash from builders is on the table.</p> <p>There can be few areas, if any, being asked to take on board a massive 32% increase in housing stock and to assimilate so many new people into a existing population in such a way as this proposal suggests. The well being of existing residents, who are tax payers and voters is not being taken into account. Residents here value our semi rural life and object most strongly to these attempts to wipe it out.</p> <p>No thought has been given to the wildlife that abounds here or the protected heathland East Dorset is so pleased to boast of, and take grants to maintain, but cares so little for in reality. That there would be hundreds more residents on its doorstep who will no doubt be tramping all over it is of no regard.</p> <p>Please do not think that other token offerings of accessible green space will prevent the SSSI's being abused.</p>		examination	fighting the use of this green belt for many years and have an excellent back catalogue of documents and evidence that I feel would be of great use and interest to the inspector. I feel it is necessary to provide the Inspector with all the relevant historical background to the attempts upon this greenbelt and the utter contempt that has been shown to the people and democratic process by the many twists and turns that EDDC have made over the years with regard to the RSS and now this Core Strategy cooked up in secret with Christchurch Borough Council without any local involvement not even our Parish Council.			

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
											<p>Lastly I have no doubt that this will go forward, despite massive opposition from the public, to an examination before a Government Inspector, even though the very information that you referred the public to was incorrect (PPS12). That you have totally ignored the Parish Plan, which used tax payers money to produce, and the fact that until recently East Dorset District Council found proposals with far fewer houses unacceptable (because it was on Green Belt) are two other reasons this strategy is premature and ill founded. I am sure that eventually this strategy will be consigned to the bin where it belongs but I for one would like to know how much of our money has been wasted on the same proposals again and again and will EDDC keep coming back with the same proposals in various formats in the attempt to get the land used until hell freezes over. What is it about this particular green belt? Perhaps a different type of inspection or investigation is required to answer that question. How many more hundreds of thousands of pounds will be spent before EDDC devote some of their time and our money to finding a more acceptable alternative solution. Or shall we do the whole thing again, say in three years!</p> <p>For the record I do wish to participate at the oral examination before the Government Inspector.</p> <p>My reasons are that I have been involved in fighting the use of this green belt for many years and have an excellent back catalogue of documents and evidence that I feel would be of great use and interest to the inspector. I feel it is necessary to provide the Inspector with all the relevant historical background to the attempts upon this greenbelt and the utter contempt that has been shown to the people and democratic process by the many twists and turns that EDDC have made over the years with regard to the RSS and now this Core Strategy cooked up in secret with Christchurch Borough Council without any local involvement not even our Parish Council.</p>							
500646	Mr and Mrs L A Searle		CSPS2177	Policy FWP7							<p>We are writing to strongly object to the proposed building plans for West Parley. If it goes ahead it will cause more problems than it solves. Roads already crowded especially at peak times, getting out on to New Road will be almost impossible. The green belt will be gone forever, where will the green belt be? The semi-rural area will become urban bringing all the problems of too many people in too small a space. Do we really have a say? Does anyone really listen to local people? Link roads not being built until half the houses are built so how does that work? The idea needs reducing much more 32% increase just doesn't make sense.</p>				510			
503835	Mr & Mrs D Phillips		CSPS2181	Policy FWP7							<p>As we have seen by the continuous bed weather of late the fields at Dudsbury Heights have been completely saturated, causing water to flow from them at an alarming rate, the force of water even causing pavements to break up. If this kind of weather is to be repeated then it would be near impossible to</p>				510			

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description					
											<p>activate Policy FWP7.</p> <p>Having lived in West Parley for 37 years and started working here in January 1950, we have seen many changes, but what the council now propose will completely change our lives for the worse. We are well catered for by the shops and businesses already here, why should we want more?</p> <p>As for the traffic, you have to live here to see the volume of traffic we have to cope with at peak hours, we are gridlocked. Having attended your meetings, seen your plans, I still can not take in what you plan for this green, and at the moment, pleasant land.</p> <p>Are councillors really in touch with the people they represent? What happened to David Camerons manifesto pledge saying he was handing back decisions of this kind to the people? If you insist on going ahead with these large and unwelcome building plans, bringing misery to all of us, all this will be on your heads.</p>											
506116	Mr and Mrs P and SJ Simpson		CSPS2204	Policy FWP7							<p>We would like to object to the proposed housing plans to build 520 houses on the Green Belt land at West Parley for the following reasons:</p> <p>1. This is a 32% increase in the current housing stock for this area and more than any other community is being asked to take making it an unsound and unsustainable proposal. The residents felt that 100 houses would be a realistic increase to the existing 1630 in the area. You have proposed 520 which is ridiculously high and to be built on green belt. As per the PPG2 policy, the whole idea of green belt land is to preserve the character of local areas, prevent them from becoming over developed and spoilt plus ensure they remain pleasant areas to live in.</p> <p>2. In the government green belt policy there is a general presumption against inappropriate development, unless very special circumstances can be demonstrated to show that the benefits of the development will outweigh the harm caused to the green belt. PPG2 also sets out a number of examples of what would constitute appropriate or inappropriate development in the green belt.</p> <p>According to PPG2, there are five stated purposes of including land within the green belt:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas • To prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another • To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment • To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns • To assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. <p>Once an area of land has been defined as green belt, opportunities and benefits include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Providing opportunities for access to the open countryside for the urban population • Providing opportunities for outdoor sport and outdoor 					510						

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>recreation near urban areas</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The retention of attractive landscapes and the enhancement of landscapes, near to where people live • Improvement of damaged and derelict land around towns • The securing of nature conservation interests • The retention of land in agricultural, forestry and related uses. <p>The proposed developments in policy FWP6 & FWP7 would contravene at least the first four listed reasons in section 1 and all the reasons in section 2 for which the areas in West Parley were designated as green belt. Your proposals are therefore, not legally compliant.</p> <p>3. Even with the proposed improvements to the road infrastructure at the Parley</p> <p>Traffic lights, the volume of additional traffic created by the new development would cause even more congestions than we have at present. If we had even one set of road works on any of the access roads leading up to this, the whole area would be grid locked. The proposed new link road from Christchurch Road to New Road runs right through the middle of the 300 houses in FWP6. This would be extremely dangerous for young families not to mention an undesirable place to live with the vast amounts of traffic that will pass through right next to their homes.</p> <p>4. There is no mention of how the demand for local nursery and school places</p> <p>Would be met and what catchments they would come under. Our local schools are already nearly full to capacity and, with the government limits on class sizes, where would the additional children be placed? I don't see why the education of children of existing local residents should be threatened or compromised by even more demand and competition for local school places. As local government have also proposed 'traveller sites' in the Hurn, Ferndown and Verwood area, these children could also put increased demand on our schools. We feel that we are, to put it mildly, being dumped on from all angles with the types of development proposals local councillors wouldn't want on their own doorsteps.</p> <p>As we know, over development of an area normally leads to an eventual decline in the quality of living and standards maintained. This is not something we are willing to see happen to West Parley which is a an extremely pleasant area to live in, still has village status due to the green belt surrounding it and a good quality of life for the residents. This would be lost if you are allowed to over developed the area as per your proposals.</p> <p>To conclude, whilst we accept that a small development of 100 houses as proposed by the residents is needed, your proposal of 520 houses is ridiculous, unsustainable both for local facilities and the road infrastructure, a destruction of previously protected Green Belt and damaging to the local environment and character of the area that we live in.</p> <p>We hope that a more sensible and realistic approach is taken to any building development proposal approved for West Parley and that you listen carefully to what the local residents</p>						

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
											actually want.							
508590	Mr Jamie Ball		CSPS2236	Policy FWP7							<p>I oppose your green belt housing proposals in West Parley on the Dudsbury Heights and New Road fields. Essentially the reasons I oppose your plans are as follows:</p> <p>1) Democracy. Fully 80% of residents are against housing on the scale that the District Council proposes (but would accept about 100 houses in sites along the Christchurch road, as West Parley's fair share) This is fully and factually shown in several surveys, including the very widely completed Parish Plan survey. So to inflict these plans on us is the very worst kind of top down planning, completely regardless of local wishes.</p> <p>2) This is being done by a Conservative Council, for goodness sake. Although the Conservative party and Government Ministers have consistently said that their policy is to have communities more involved and to stop top down planning being forced on them.</p> <p>3) The lack of infrastructure for these planned houses, particularly the roads. Our roads are quite inadequate as it is, never mind another few hundred cars being added to them. Parley Cross is over capacity now. There is no money in the local plans for improvements.</p> <p>4) Our Identity. The introduction of the green belts is widely seen as the most important piece of post WW II planning. The top reason given for the green belts was to stop urban sprawl – to stop communities from spreading into each other. The planning term used is the maintenance of what is called a Key Gap between town and villages. All the qualified town planners I have consulted see the two big West Parley fields in question as part of West Parley's Key Gap with Bournemouth.</p> <p>5) The plans under Policy FWP7 has the new link road coming out onto New Road right slap bang where our driveway is which is bound to make it extremely difficult for us to exit our property. Traffic congestion is already at breaking point along New road and peak times of the day and this will not improve with the addition of this new link road. This new link road is not due to be started until half of the houses are built. So until then, which may be years, Parley Cross will have to take hundreds more cars a day, but is already at over capacity.</p> <p>6) The plans under Policy FWP6 has a new link road which will undoubtedly become a cut through and become very dangerous for the new families that will be moving into this area and cause further congestion with traffic coming from the Ferndown direction trying to join New Road but further down nearer to our property. This new link road is not due to be started until half of the houses are built. So until then, which may be years, Parley Cross will have to take hundreds more cars a day, but is already at over capacity.</p> <p>7) The plans under Policy FWP6 for the high density housing will cause us a massive increase in noise and light pollution.</p>							

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>8) The plans under Policy FWP6 for the high density and medium density housing will Obviously include a number of young families. There appears to be no plans anywhere for the provision of new schools or new school places. Where are these children going to go to school? I have directly seen how much of a problem this currently is, as only this month, my own Daughter did not receive her place for her catchment middle school!!!!!! How on earth will that improve once another 320 houses are built 100 meters from where I live????????</p> <p>9) The Policy FWP6 will cause a devaluation of my property, why should I have to suffer This shortfall due to something that is going to be imposed on me? My reason for moving to this area in the first place was for a location that had some rural areas nearby and when I moved here I gladly increased my affordability to accommodate this, this 'nearby rural area' is now going to be taken away from me under these plans and appears to be out of my control.</p> <p>10) I am concerned that the local wildlife regularly seen to use and inhabit the area of the Proposed Policy FWP6, namely pheasants, rabbits, buzzards, birds of prey, badgers and deer will all be pushed out/decimated.</p> <p>If these plans go ahead I, my neighbours and local friends and family will not be voting for any of you in the next District Council Elections in Spring 2015.</p>						
509299	Mr R Moore		CSPS2257	Policy FWP7							<p>I feel I must write and let you know my opinion of your proposals for additional housing in West Parley. As I am sure you are aware, residents in West Parley recently took part in producing a Parish Plan. In it, we realised that some additional housing was needed and in consultation with residents we put forward several proposals. However, it appears that you have not even taken resident's opinions into consideration.</p> <p>You produced plans in 2010 which we were not in agreement with and you were made fully aware of this, yet now two years later you have discarded these plans and submitted others, which, for the residents of West Parley are even worse than the 2010 plans.</p> <p>It seems as if you are determined to wipe West Parley off the map and merge us totally with Bournemouth.</p> <p>The policy proposal FWP6 will totally destroy West Parley as it exists today. I hate to think of the consequences of 300 hundred homes being built on this site. In addition to the proposed unnecessary supermarket, a school and probably a church will also be required and obviously a new road layout. The housing will have to be very cheap too as not many people are going to want to live under the flight path of the ever expanding Bournemouth airport. If this goes ahead in this location you will be sentencing the new residents to a very poor quality of life and I speak from experience having previously lived under the flight path of a small, but growing provincial airport.</p>				510		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description				
											<p>The shops at Parley Cross are clearly struggling to make ends meet and you are now proposing to build an additional supermarket nearby. Is it your aim to take customers away from the supermarkets in Ferndown and cause them further hardship in these very hard economic times?</p> <p>The proposed new road layout is doomed from the start. The new link roads which even now are badly needed will soon be over capacity with the increase in housing. In a few years time it will be back to where we are now, hopelessly congested.</p> <p>And</p> <p>Whoever came up with the brainwave of not building the roads until half the houses have been built? The mind boggles as to who these experts were.</p> <p>It is blatantly obvious that not enough thought has been given to these proposals and I urge you to reject them and reconsider them in consultation with us – the residents of West Parley. After all we live here and know what we want and what is good for the area.</p>										
511953	Mr and Mrs Alan and Julie Ridout		CSPS2214	Policy FWP7							<p>I wish to object to the building of 220 houses on the FWP 7 and 300 on FWP 6 sites for the u/m reasons:</p> <p>(1) The Consultation process is unsatisfactory.</p> <p>(a) Government legislation requires you to consult fully with local communities before setting out proposals. EDDC planners have ignored this legislation.</p> <p>(b) West Parley has produced, after a lengthy consultation with residents, a well publicised Parish Plan, copies of which were sent to EDDC. In this Plan residents are overwhelmingly against having more than about 100 houses built in West Parley. This source of information has been ignored by EDDC planners.</p> <p>(c) EDDC have relied too much on the use of electronic communication to provide information to residents for this consultation and assumed that all residents in West Parley have access to the internet. This is far from the case and most residents are extremely concerned about the proposals but are unable to find the information they need to consider the proposals effectively.</p> <p>(d) To build more than 100 houses in West Parley would create an unbroken Urban sprawl from Bournemouth to Ferndown and beyond. West Parley would lose its identity and become just another small part of a very large conurbation. Both of the proposed building sites constitute much valued green belt land which provides this break between the Bournemouth and Ferndown boundaries. This was the reason for introducing the Green Belt system many years ago.</p> <p>(d) This land brings the countryside into the village and with it many important And protected species of animals. Sightings of badgers, foxes, otters, deer, buzzards are frequently reported. This improves the quality of life of all residents who regularly use these fields through which official footpaths pass.</p>						510				

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>(e) The 2 new roads proposed around the proposed building sites will be dangerous for children living in the new houses and will not ease the already stretched traffic system in West Parley. Traffic jams will be merely moved further down the main roads. 500 extra houses will bring up to 1000 extra cars all trying to get out of and into West Parley which is already ridiculously over crowded.</p> <p>(e) 520 extra houses in West Parley represents an increase in housing of about 32%. This is excessive and is far more than is proposed for the other East Dorset communities. Without the appropriate infrastructure of adequate school places, doctors, dentists, community centres etc there will be unacceptable pressure on existing provision.</p> <p>Site FWP 7</p> <p>(a) Dudsbury Rings is an important heritage site and this field is to closely connected to the site for the security of this important site to be protected.</p> <p>(b) In winter time and in times of heavy rain the slope of the field causes water to run down hill to flood the unmade and private road, Ridgeway, every time. With heavy traffic, servicing the shops at Parley Cross using Ridgeway every day, the road surface is severely eroded and flooded which makes it very unpleasant for residents who are also responsible for the upkeep of the road. With so much more concrete laid on the field due to the proposed buildings flooding would be even worse.</p> <p>Site FWP 6</p> <p>(a) Yet another Supermarket in the area is not needed and will only bring in Much more traffic to bring chaos to the already crowded roads of West Parley. Sufficient supermarkets (Tesco, Asda, Sainsbury 2, Lidl) already exist within 3 mile radius of West Parley and 3 Tesco Express shops exist in a radius of 1 mile of Parley Cross. There is no demand for allotments, orchards etc.</p> <p>West Parley should not be sacrificed by planners' unrealistic dreams and an attempt at social engineering. I urge you to reconsider these proposals and to start talking to the people in West Parley Community who are entitled to have a say in the drawing up of proposals for any increase in housing in their village.</p> <p>Yours faithfully</p>						
512007	Mr & Mrs Neil Hayward		CSPS2221	Policy FWP7							<p>My wife and I find it inconceivable that after all the previous proposals that have been put forward for West Parley, you are now attempting, quite undemocratically, to railroad in policies FWP6 and FWP7 which completely ignore the West Parley Parish plan to which 1000 residents contributed. Not only will these policies exacerbate the current traffic problems at West Parley by increasing the amount of cars generated from the new housing, it will also destroy a huge area of</p>				510		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>Green Belt Land which currently acts as a Key Gap separating West Parley from Bournemouth. Building these houses and the new link road will destroy the prime countryside between Bournemouth and West Parley. Furthermore the proposed link road is partially being built on the floodplain of the River Stour, which after periods of prolonged rain reaches and covers the area where the link road will start from the New Road end.</p> <p>We are also opposed to the building of a new supermarket. As you are no doubt aware West Parley currently has a Tesco store which is quite adequate for the needs of the local population and there are at least 5 major supermarkets within a 5 mile radius of West Parley. Not only is a new store unnecessary, it will also attract additional traffic to an already saturated road network.</p> <p>Further more both the areas for housing in FWP7, and in particular FWP6 are approximately 1 mile from the end of the runway at Bournemouth Airport. Whilst I am sure that the majority of people who currently live at West Parley are used to the noise that the commercial and other jets make on take off and landing over this area I am sure that will not be the case for the residents of the 520 new houses you are proposing.</p> <p>Whilst we are not completely opposed to development at West Parley, we sincerely hope that your undemocratic policies FWP6 and FWP7 will be scrapped thus preventing the desecration and destruction of West Parley as we know it today.</p>						
512134	Mrs Anthea Scott		CSPS2225	Policy FWP7							<p>I write to voice my objections to the large scale development proposed at West Parley – both the 220 houses and new road planned for Dudsbury heights field near the old hill fort – and also the 300 houses, supermarket, shopping centre and link road scheduled to be built on the field at New Road – just south of Parley Cross traffic lights.</p> <p>This junction is already one of the busiest in Dorset, and to add a potential further 1000+ vehicles will make it gridlocked, even more dangerous and extremely harmful to health due to the increase in pollution. At certain times the traffic already backs northwards up New Road as far, if not further than the Porsche garage.</p> <p>The two link roads proposed for policy FWP6 travel straight through an area of “Higher Density” residential - and will be extremely dangerous to the residents, probably young families, who live there.</p> <p>In reality, these link roads will not be constructed to alleviate the congestion at the beginning of the development – they will most likely be built at the end – possibly years away!!</p> <p>In addition, all traffic heading Southwards through Parley Cross still has to travel over the New Road bridge – which is narrow and situated on a road with quite severe bends – so in reality the queues will just move further South.</p> <p>The trees on the South East side of Parley Cross traffic lights are protected – so any alteration to this junction which affects</p>				510		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>them, or their root system, will require permission. Development on such an enormous scale – increasing the housing stock of our ancient village by a third – will have a detrimental effect on the “Special Character” of West Parley and its residents – many of which have lived here for many years. We</p> <p>Currently enjoy a semi-rural way of life, suffer virtually no anti-social behaviour – and to build all over the green belt and make this junction even busier is just plain wrong. The green belt areas are the crucial lungs between semi-rural East Dorset and neighbouring Bournemouth – to remove this gap by developing these areas would create urban sprawl – and change for ever the village setting which all residents feel is so special about living in West Parley.</p> <p>The potential SANG (FWP7) spends a proportion of every year under water – such a high volume of development so near to the river can only serve to increase the flooding to this area.</p> <p>The area along the River Stour is inhabited by bats – which are protected species – how close is development allowed? The field to the South of Parley Cross traffic lights is frequently used for livestock – is it permitted to build on farm land?</p> <p>Why has West Parley been given such a large proportion of houses to build in relation to its size? Why should we be forced to spoil for ever the entrance to our beautiful village – when it is gone – its gone – we will never again be able to drive home and heave a sigh of relief at leaving the congested over-development behind, and view our green open spaces with joy!!</p>						
535509	Mrs S Durant		CSPS2206	Policy FWP7							<p>I am writing with regard to the proposed building plans for West Parley Village.</p> <p>I do not believe that the proposed plans are positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy.</p> <p>Policy FWP6 and FWP7 both involve building extensively on Green Belt land, Green belt land is designated as such for a purpose – it has been identified as valuable open green space which should be left in that condition and not built upon. There is no point in identifying land that should not be built on if you then build on it. This undermines the whole notion of designating land as green belt and means that all other green belt land is not safe from development.</p> <p>While it is clear that the traffic situation at Parley Crossroads is extremely unsatisfactory at the moment it is not clear that building hundreds of additional houses and other buildings in the vicinity is going to alleviate this situation, notwithstanding the changes being proposed at the crossroads itself. The huge number of extra houses plus shops and community buildings will generate a huge number of extra traffic movements. It is possible that the proposed changes to the crossroads and the building of the new link roads will not be sufficient to mitigate the effects of the extra traffic. If this is the case the capacity of the crossroads could be exceeded in a</p>				510		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>very short time, as happened the last time changes were made to the crossroads.</p> <p>The proposed plans would mean an increase of 32% in the West Parley housing stock – a very large amount and much more than the proposed increase in other areas. There appears to be very little in the way of extra facilities to serve the extra population. There is possible provision for a church for the Plymouth Brethren (a minority religion) but no school or GP surgery.</p> <p>There is substantial disagreement with the proposed developments among the residents of West Parley, but the general feeling is that they are a “fait accompli”.</p>						
626227	Mr and Mrs J Parsons		CSPS2292	Policy FWP7							<p>Re: Policy FWP 7</p> <p>It is absolutely ridiculous to consider putting houses in this area.</p> <p>Putting a slip road & traffic lights here on Christchurch Road will make a congested area even worse. It will be more dangerous and nosier. The traffic lights will hold up traffic & make it hard to get out of drives, Gallows Drive & Chine Walk. It will make it harder for pedestrians too.</p> <p>If the houses are to be built before the road how is the building traffic ie lorries & building vehicles going to be able to get on site? This will create even more congestion.</p> <p>Losing all this green belt is bad for people who love the view & walk across the fields, especially those who are unable to walk far but would still like a country walk/</p> <p>There will be a need for more schools, a Dr surgery & a NHS dentist. A private run butcher, baker, greengrocer & keep our local chemist.</p>				510		
656195	Mrs A Andrew		CSPS2194	Policy FWP7							<p>I would like to register my objection to the proposed major development of the Green Belt land in West Parley.</p> <p>I am particularly concerned about the irreversible destruction of these large areas of land which are so highly valued for their natural beauty, peace and tranquillity by so many in the locality. They are highly valued too for the break they create between the Bournemouth conurbation and the built-up area of Ferndown. In the past people living in these areas have been promised this land is protected by being designated Green Belt.</p> <p>I also object to the significant impact this will have on the local infrastructure: access to doctors, school places and most of all the roads. If most of the 500 houses proposed have two-car ownership then local roads, already busy, will have to handle up to another 1,000 cars.</p> <p>The size of the rooms in these houses are too small with inadequate storage and too many of them are being squeezed into too small an area.</p>				510		
656201	M G Miller		CSPS2195	Policy FWP7							<p>East Dorset District Council Proposals re Housing in West Parley</p> <p>1) Objection</p> <p>I wish to object to the building of 520 houses on the FWP 6/7 sites.</p> <p>2) Legislation</p>				510		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>The Localism Act received Royal Assent on 15 November 2011 – The Bill reformed the planning system to give local people new rights to shape the development of the communities in which they live.</p> <p>3) EDDC Non Compliance The District Councils proposals published on 17th January 2012 are very different from the 2010 plans and were prepared at district level without involvement or consultation with the democratically elected West Parley Parish Council. This is contrary to The Localism Act 2011.</p> <p>4) Only 100 houses I agree with the Parish Council's view which reflects the verdict of over 80% of the residents (Parish Plan Survey) that West Parley could find room for about another 100 houses. On top of our present housing stock this would be a sustainable addition. Any new houses should be built in small to mid sized closes in the several open clearings along the B3073 Christchurch Road to the east and west of Parley Cross. Such ribbon development has the merit of being traditional, broadly acceptable and in accord with DES 8. West Parley's infrastructure (most particularly the roads) is barely adequate at present and would be overwhelmed by large housing estates. The proposal for another supermarket adjacent to Parley Cross junction is beyond belief. Sufficient supermarkets already exist in the near vicinity and 2 Tesco Express shops exist in West Parley.</p> <p>5) Green Belt I strongly oppose large scale housing in the green belt (Government Policy, which is to protect) that provides 'natural drainage' and is a 'key gap' to prevent urban sprawl between Bournemouth and West Parley.</p> <p>6) Loss of Village Status 520 more houses in West Parley is a 32% increase in the village's housing stock, this figure together with the high density build is not acceptable. It would mean the identity of the village being lost for ever.</p> <p>7) Entitlement to 'Have a Say'. The uniqueness of West Parley village must at all costs be retained. I urge you to reconsider your proposals and to start talking to the people in West Parley whose rights are enshrined in The Localisation Act 2011.</p>						
656209	Mrs Y Tiley		CSPS2196	Policy FWP7							<p>I cannot understand why anyone would think it OK to increase the number of houses in West Parley by over 1/3 and on green belt land too. I understand that green belt is supposed to prevent urban sprawl. To loose the green belt in this area it would just be a continuation of Bournemouth. Apart from the 520 proposed houses in West Parley there are other pockets of land which are being built on. Already the air around West Parley is very polluted. More houses, more traffic, more pollution. Space, on the plans, shows an allotment area. Who needs an allotment with so much pollution?</p>				510		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>A question was being asked on the Radio last week. Do you live in a good environment? They came back with answer that it should be yes!</p> <p>The proposed Supermarket will also bring more traffic to the area. As will the proposed development about ½ mile along the road. More houses, an Hotel and a rest home etc. What is going to happen with all the traffic then? Schools? Playground? Water? Gas? Electricity? Etc. Not to mention Employment.</p> <p>I was under the impression that residents were going to have more say in matters concerning their area?</p> <p>This certainly doesn't seem to be happening. Residents do not want to many houses on their door step. If this project goes through I will have many of the proposed houses looking down into my back garden and some will look directly into my bedroom!</p> <p>As well known, rats are unable to live in over-crowded conditions and as we all well know the over-crowded situations cause many problems in many areas where people are living on top of one another.</p> <p>More thought should be given to this project and people who live and know the area should have the final say.</p>						
656216	Mrs Jacqui Rainsbury		CSPS2198	Policy FWP7							<p>I wish to object to the building of 220 houses on the FWP 7 and 300 on FWP6 sites for the following reasons.</p> <p>The New Road and Dudsbury heights fields are not any old green belt sites they are "KEY GAPS" with Bournemouth. These gaps were to prevent urban sprawl, and the main reason for having a green belt in the first place.</p> <p>The proposed link road will go right through the middle of 300 houses in FWP6 which will be very dangerous for young children.</p> <p>The new roads will not be started until half the houses are built so Parley Cross will have to cope with hundreds more cars a day. It is already over capacity and is dangerous at peak times.</p> <p>Will their construction (eg foundations) be adequate to a predicted rising flood plain ? and the new road planned near the river stour will be liable to flooding. If this road is raised to avoid flooding the displaced water would have an effect on surrounding residential dwellings.</p> <p>The proposed development is close to a site of special scientific interest and the increase in cats & dogs would have an impact on natural wildlife.</p> <p>Another Supermarket is not needed in the area and will only bring chaos to the already crowded roads of the area.</p> <p>I urge you to reconsider these proposals and find more appropriate locations for this level of residential accommodation</p>				510		
656223	M Williams		CSPS2202	Policy FWP7							<p>We are writing to express are grave concerns over the plans to build 520 new houses at West Parley. We see this as a massive increase in the number of houses within the village and consider it will overload the already limited resources within the area.</p> <p>The road system at Parley Cross is presently severely</p>				510		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
											<p>congested and is a nightmare during the rush hour. The proposal to put in link roads we consider will not alleviate this problem. In fact the extra houses will create even more traffic. On top of this there are only limited Doctors, Dentists and Schooling facilities within the area.</p> <p>We cannot understand why the Green Belt is being built on in such a small area with so many houses. This excessive building is much more than proposed for Corfe Mullen, Ferndown, Wimborne or Verwood. In putting forward the proposals, the District Council has ignored the wishes of the West Parley residents embodied in the West Parley Parish Plan.</p> <p>In summary, we feel the District Council is pushing forward with plans without the consideration of West Parley residents.</p>							
656253	Mr N Marvin		CSPS2211	Policy FWP7							<p>I am writing to express my complete and total opposition to the proposed "development" of new houses, roads and shops at West Parley.</p> <p>As I understand it, the two new link roads are not expected to be built until the houses are built, or half the houses are built – this alone is utter madness, as Parley Cross junction is already the busiest junction in Dorset.</p> <p>The proposed link road from Christchurch Road to New road will pass right through the middle of 300 houses according to policy FWP6. This is potentially dangerous for young families. And New Road & Dudsbury Heights fields are KEY GAPS – originally there to PREVENT urban sprawl.</p> <p>The bottom line is that I, along with all the other local residents I have talked to, DO NOT want this development. I have set up home here and have no plans to move, I am opposed to this completely and will fight it at every turn.</p>				510			
360082	Mr and Mrs K Healy		CSPS2501	Policy FWP7	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	<p>In Background Paper 2, para 2.78, East Dorset District chooses to follow the following principles in upholding the Green Belt:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To prevent neighboring towns from merging into one another and • To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas (or in the words of East Dorset, to maintain an area of open land around the conurbation). <p>We feel that in proposing to develop a large area of the hill at Dudsbury, East Dorset District planners are undermining their own principles.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This space helps to create the openness as you leave the built up area of Bournemouth and enter East Dorset District. It separates the settlements. • The proposed 'rat run' between Christchurch Road and New Road across the hill, we find quite incomprehensible. A highly visible and important rural aspect will be lost as it becomes a solid mass of traffic in busy times, and coupled with the adjacent new housing, would destroy the area's historic natural setting. It would be interesting to know what type of junction is proposed at either end. • The proposed housing will enclose the Stour Valley Way. • It will also encroach on the Scheduled Ancient Monument, Dudsbury Rings. Paragraph 132 of the NPPF: 'When 	<p>We would like to see the proposed development on this hill to be deleted from the Core Strategy.</p>	<p>No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination</p>	510				

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>considering the impact of proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation.' It continues by saying it can be harmed or lost through development within its setting.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Surface water run-off and a natural spring line will cause problems and will require SUDS to control the additional flow of water onto the Stour flood plain. This will cost the developers so the number of proposed affordable homes may be threatened. • The reasons given for considering the development east of New Road harmful to the settlement of West Parley, will also apply to this site. These 200 homes on the hill at Dudsbury, in combination with the 320 proposed on the other site, are just too many. The number of new homes must be considerably reduced to protect the settlement from a schism between new and existing residents. A 33% increase in size is too much to be absorbed by a community that has existed over a number of decades. From a sustainability point of view, it has no primary school, the nearest one is too far away to walk to. NPPF paragraph 69 promoting healthy communities. It mentions encouraging social interaction, if there are too many new residents this will not happen. • We feel that the dismissal of all the objections to this site in the Issues and Options indicates that this decision was already taken subject to the Sustainability Appraisal and ecological surveys. <p>For a more detailed and statistical response, please see Issues and Options, December 2010, submitted by Janet Healy, Paul Timberlake and Kevin Healy, policy FWP3 land to the south of Christchurch Road</p>						
489582	Mr John Swift		CSPS2338	Policy FWP7							<p>I wish to register my strong objection to the proposal for more housing than the number already rejected, for the reasons listed below.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposal is to build in the 'green belt' area that we have left. Even the Government has back-pedalled on this and insists on Councils doing their utmost to find 'brown field sites'. Building in any green belt area is a slippery slope towards having a complete disregard for the term. If, indeed, it really doesn't mean anything then we should do away with calling it green belt which at least would be a lot more honest. 2. West Parley residents had already completed a survey, re. Housing proposals in the area, with the overwhelming majority objecting to the number of houses then proposed. Completely ignoring that survey Councillors then issued these new proposals which include a huge increase in the number of houses over that already rejected. This is very confusing and I am sure a lot of people find it difficult to understand the reasoning involved. Maybe this is by design. 3. So far in this plan all I have seen is, more houses, more people, more roads, more cars, more Supermarkets. Where are the Doctors, Dentists, Fire Stations, Clinics, Police etc. to cope with this? Penny's Hill Practice (Doctors Surgery) is already quite appalling in the time it takes to see your Doctor 				510		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
											(quite often two weeks). Glenmoor Road Surgery is currently doing all it can to dissuade new patients from joining as it does not wish to end up like Penny's Hill, which it is fast doing. 4. Please, please do not say that you are including 'affordable housing'. In the current climate, along with the comparatively low wage level in this area, 'affordable housing' would have to be property selling for under £100,000. Even then most people would be unlikely to obtain a mortgage. If I am wrong in this then please publish the number and cost of these 'affordable houses' along with the mortgage providers that are willing to provide mortgages to the young first time buyers you say you are trying to attract 5. Finally, please do not, just for political reasons, keep toeing the 'Official Government Line'. Of course there is an argument for more housing, more roads, more infrastructure etc. But there always will be. Unless someone, somewhere takes a stand. We cannot keep on building and expanding indefinitely as, by definition, the whole of the country would eventually be concreted over. We need a change of Policy. Please help by rejecting this latest build, build, build Government dictate by respecting the wishes of the people that a) you have been elected to represent and b) live in the area concerned.							
489898	Mrs Elizabeth Daw		CSPS2396	Policy FWP7							I have lived in West Parley for 32 years and found it a very pleasant place to live. I would like to make a few observations about the proposed changes to the area. Parley required more houses to accommodate a growing population. Young people require places to live and the area requires a mix of young people with families as well as the elderly population we have at present, Unfortunately in recent years West Parley has become a community of NIMBY's. I would be against vast housing estates with high density housing and would not want any encroachment on our precious green belt. Infrastructure will be required – roads etc. before any houses are contemplated. The two new relief roads proposed will certainly be needed to relieve pressure on Parley Cross traffic. We need shops that people can go into and a supermarket would bring convenience and trade to the area. We do not need any more take-aways, kitchen & bathroom showrooms, hairdressers and beauty shops. People should appreciate the convenience of living so near to our International Airport yet w have constant complaints about aircraft noise. We need to get rid of the NIMBY attitude – the “new brooms” who want to change things – spending large amounts of ratepayers money on “improvement projects” and allow West Parley to be the peaceful place it used to be. The historic church is the only church in the area with any character but unfortunately the population has moved away from it over the years. A new cemetery would, however, be worthwhile so that local people can be laid to rest where they have lived instead of being interred in another town with which they have no connection.				510			

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
490866	Mr and Mrs D Wright		CSPS2389	Policy FWP7							<p>I am writing this letter rather than the form you issued as I do not understand the jargon you use. It would be helpful if you used everyday language as other professions now do and doubtless as you would wish your doctor, dentist or solicitor to speak to you.</p> <p>Frankly I am disgusted by the lack of notice taken of the wishes of local residents in this very extensive scheme which amounts to top down planning. These schemes FWP6 & 7 will, if passed, completely alter the nature of the village in which we now live and I have lived in for decades. This area is a key gap between Bournemouth and West Parley designed to prevent urban sprawl. We were assured that the green belt was inviolate but now our present councillors seem to feel free to impose their own arrogant ambitions regardless of the community's wishes they pretend to represent. Is it any wonder that so few vote at elections?</p> <p>My objections are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The infrastructure is insufficient to support such a vast housing increase (schools, approach roads etc.). • We do not need another supermarket or church. What planet do these planners live on? • These schemes are out of proportion with what is proposed for other areas. • I do not trust the authorities to stop with these schemes; we were told the road diversion at the west of the airport was only for safety and not to extend the runway for larger plans. The authorities lied over this so why not again? <p>I do hope the views of the local population will be respected; by this I do not mean the wider East Dorset region who remain unaffected by the plans. With my lack of trust in the integrity of the planners I suspect that a survey of the wider area will be cited to falsify the claims that the schemes are supported by 90% of the population.</p> <p>I can only hope that local authorities are not in a close relationship with large developers who stand to gain so much from the schemes. I am not opposed to any new residential building however, such as at the former Coppins Nursery or Dormy Hotel sites. The latter did seem to have a very good plan which for some reason was turned down.</p>				510		
491252	Mrs Margaret Wareham		CSPS2504	Policy FWP7							<p>Regarding the proposals for West Parley it would lose its identity and be come just another small part of a very large conurbation.as both proposed building sites are on green belt which provides the break between Bournemouth and Ferndown boundaries.</p> <p>This land brings the countryside into the village and we have many protected species of animals. This improves the quality of life for all residents who regularly use the the fields and official footpaths.</p> <p>The new roads will not ease the traffic jams it will just be moved down the road and we do not have the infrastructure for more houses.</p> <p>Dudsbury rings is an important heritage site and needs to be protected.</p> <p>In winter and when there is heavy rain the slopes in the field</p>				510		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description		
											cause water to rundown hill to flood the unmade road the Ridgeway the road surface is severely eroded and floods which makes it very unpleasant. With so much more concrete laid on the fields flooding would be even worst. So I urge you to reconsider the proposals for West Parley.								
491272	Mr and Mrs D Steel		CSPS2315	Policy FWP7							<p>I am writing in response to the Core Strategy Pre-submission Consultation. I refer to the three policies identified above and would like to express my concerns that these policies are neither effective nor sound.</p> <p>FWP6 and FWP7</p> <p>The number of houses identified as being built appears to increase the village size by more than 30%. This does not sound like a balanced increase, or in keeping with national requirements. The needs of any proposed residents (with the exception of more large scale retail) are not identified, such as schooling. This does not seem to have been considered in the planning, and I assume that, if it is required as an afterthought, may then be built on a further green field space!</p> <p>The proposed building areas are on current agricultural and green belt areas that provide a break with the Bournemouth conurbation. To remove these areas for housing erodes a resource that can never be recovered.</p> <p>Travel</p> <p>As for travel considerations on page 109 of the Core Strategy Pre-Submission April 2012 Christchurch and East Dorset, section 10.13 identifies that there are “severe problems” with Ferndown Town Centre with the sheer volume of through traffic, and section 10.14 highlights from the Census 2001 statistics that 85% of local commuters were car drivers or passengers. These 2 factors would indicate a heavy burden on the local road infrastructure. They do refer to a “regular and frequent bus service”, however, since living in West Parley since 2001 and working in Christchurch, there has never been a bus service to provide an alternative to car transport based on scheduling and cost.</p> <p>In section 10.10 it identifies that residents make use of Bournemouth and Poole Hospitals but again there is no suitable bus routes from Ferndown to Bournemouth Hospital without travelling into Bournemouth and back out which is not suitable for patients. I appreciate that the local planning authorities cannot mandate bus routes, but they have to consider the impacts of no routes, or where routes are remove. At the moment the bus routes are ideal for those wishing to commute to Bournemouth and Poole town centres which therefore implies that West Parley is a being sucked into the town of Bournemouth.</p> <p>The two identified relief roads to remove congestion at Parley Cross will make no difference to the commute times and when problems occur on the A338 Spur road cause tailbacks stretching to the northern boundary of the village.</p> <p>Policy FWP5</p> <p>The provision of a large retail complex to rejuvenate the West Parley village will be as successful as that within the central Ferndown. Currently the centre of Ferndown is dominated by</p>						510		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
											Estate Agents and banks, and is not an ideal shopping experience. Tesco has reduced the viability of other retail opportunities. There is no specific identification of what shops and services are to be provided or their viability. Has analysis been made as to how they will compete against those provided by Castle Point which is further along the road (but only accessible by car)? I provide the concerns above to be included in your consultation phase of the Core Strategy Consultation phase.							
497944	Mrs G Salway		CSPS2403	Policy FWP7							I wish to express the following points regarding the FWP6 and FWP7 relating to the proposal to build 520 houses in West Parley. We were not consulted regarding these new plans and the whole inference is that everything is planned and ready to go, with Council Officials openly saying when all these houses are built and not if they are built. Personally I have written and completed forms at least three times objecting to similar proposals and I feel that no notice is being taken of our views and our rights to be listened to without prejudice have been totally ignored. I am writing yet again to express my concern about the number of houses proposed for West Parley and to say again that we would accept about 100 new houses being built, as I do appreciate the need for more housing locally, but not to an increase of 520 houses (with no doubt more later) which would be an increase of 325 OF THE West Parley housing stock. Please stop and think what this means. I wish to object to the proposals outlined in FWP6 and FWP7 on the following grounds:- 1) The Green Belt land would be lost forever. The fields are the "Key Gaps" between Bournemouth and West Parley and Ferndown; they are the only factor which stops the wholesale spread of Bournemouth, and without the fields West Parley and Ferndown would be joined to Bournemouth and the rights and benefits of being under Dorset County Council would disappear forever. 2) The fact that no new road system will be introduced or even considered until half the proposed houses have been built would mean that 260 houses will have been built before any action can be taken to alleviate the traffic problems which will inevitably have increased by then. Presumably if the houses are not selling, - with the present economic problems the whole future is very uncertain, - the developers will cut back on their building and the infrastructure will never be built; presumably this will also be true for the remainder of the proposed infrastructure – Surgery, Clinic etc. 3) The proposed road through the middle of FWP6 would run close to or through areas with young children, which would be extremely dangerous. Similarly the proposal to build a road from Christchurch Road to New road through, or adjacent to, the development in FWP7 is full of danger. 4) The land in FWP7 is on a hill (which is why it was chosen for the Dudsbury Ironage fort) and as such has several				510			

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
											springs which run down the hillside in wet weather, and the proposed developments would encourage subsidence and the possibility of flooding which would be detrimental to the whole of West Parley, particularly to the area around Ridgeway and behind the present shops. West Parley was mentioned in the Doomsday Book, it has a character and rural atmosphere that would be ruined forever by the proposed developments. We do care what happens to West Parley. Please review and reconsider the current proposals and take the wishes of the current residents into consideration before it is too late.							
498008	Mr John Salway		CSPS2405	Policy FWP7							It is noticeable that there is now a huge increase, 32%, in the proposed housing development in the West Parley area. Interestingly housing proposal policy FWP6 omits the additional future houses that were first shown on the East Dorset District Council's initial submission. No doubt these will be driven through by the councils officials once housing in FWP7 and FWP6 is processed with the old dishonest planning comment, "We are only infilling". FWP7 the proposed housing (220) on the Dudsbury fields will over-shadow West Parley and effectively wipes out this green belt area. Springs run under the Dudsbury fields and without adequate drainage systems for this, subsidence in properties below this new projected FWP7 housing will occur. FWP6 current proposed houses (300) and supermarket, and obvious future additional houses, effectively removes this green belt area. FWP6 and FWP7 green belts, formed a Key Gap with Bournemouth, and maintained West Parley's historic village status. Why destroy a designated green belt area and make West Parley village part of a large conurbation? West Parley's roads are already congested and these proposals, a large increase in housing and population, can only make a bad situation worse. The two proposed link roads shown in FWP7 and FWP6, when they are built, "part way through this development"?, will do nothing to ease this. Link main roads running through housing estates are very dangerous for young families. My wife and myself have had to register in Kinson for a Doctor and West Moors for a Dentist. Where is the proposed increase in facilities for these new residents (Doctors, Dentists, Clinics etc.)? I am supposed to live in a democracy and this has once again proved to me not to be the case. The East Dorset District Councils officials have virtually ignored the West Parley's residents wishes, and they have also virtually ignored the West Parley's Parish Councillors' Parish Plan. They have shown by their consultation formats that they are determined to drive policies FWP7 and FWP6 through by whatever means possible. Once proposals FWP7 and FWP6 are being carried out the Green Belt is effectively lost and West Parley adjoins Bournemouth and should come under its control. As part of a large conurbation there is no need to duplicate paid council posts and cost savings can be made. As the East Dorset District Council officials have virtually ignored the West					510		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>Parley's Parish councillors Plan, why waste council tax on these district Council posts and administration? These proposals by the paid District Council officials, have I believe, been made as unfriendly and as difficult as possible for the West Parley residents to respond, as follows:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. West Parley Residents Association held a written Poll of residents and they overwhelmingly opposed the proposals in FWP7 and FWP6m but agreed to a limited number of infill new houses This was submitted to the East Dorset Councils officials and ignored. 2. First official consultation document 4-10-2010 to 24-12-2010. Deliberately used unfriendly. Each objection to be submitted on a separate form by only one person. Finally I obtained these forms, but it proved necessary to have an aggressive argument with a council official before these were reluctantly supplied. The East Dorset District Council exhibition at the West Parley Memorial hall then supplied a more condensed consultation form, but none of the original official ones. The published official results were interesting when compared to the original Parley Residents Association figures. I wonder how these two official Consultation documents were interpreted? 3. Second official consultation document, "noticeable how Ferndown residents were now included". They outnumber West Parley residents by two to one, but these proposals would have little effect on them apart from traffic congestion. 4. We have now yet another "so called used friendly consultation Document". We have been informed by our Parish Councillors that the East Dorset District Council have agreed that ordinary written letters are acceptable instead of the official forms and format. After consultation procedures details in points 1, 2, and 3 above I now await to see how acceptable a written letter will be, and these results will be interpreted? 						
500570	Mr J.D Head		CSPS2310	Policy FWP7				No	No	No	<p>I wish to comment on the plans that the District Council have put forward for the development in West Parley POLICY FWP7</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ⊞ Not justified, no credible evidence has been produced to show that this increase in housing is required to be made in West Parley on green belt land ⊞ Against national planning policy. Dudsbury heights is green belt. Under the new planning policy this land can be used for development unless there is a proven local needs. As I have said above no local need exists in West Parley. ⊞ The green belt in FWP7 & FWP6 form part of the important "key gap" with Bournemouth, this is why they were green belt in the first place. Removing them and then just adding a few bits here and there to compensate does not comply with the rules regarding this matter. ⊞ Dudsbury Heights fields are an undulating area visible from around the area, to build 220 homes here will have a detrimental impact to views with in the area. The street lighting will cause light pollution and will be able to be seen from the Isle of Wight. Major earth work will be required to 				510		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>make this land suitable for building and the new road will travel across part of the flood plain. The extra houses both here and Policy FWP6 will cause extra run off at times of heavy rainfall. Instead on soaking into the ground it will cause flash floods both in existing properties below Dudsbury Heights and along the lower reaches of the Stour</p> <p>⊞ If the developer has to build 50% affordable homes and hand them over at cost price, plus build roads, and pay all the other contributions expected of him this development as it stands is not viable. It is clear to me in view of this and the size of the supermarket proposed the real number of houses will be need to be much higher. This has all the appearance of a chance to breach the "green belt" by the District Council on behalf of the developers, so once it has been allowed they will just keep on cramming properties in until they can do no more. Double, treble or even more than the 500 that is being suggested now</p> <p>This means as it stands the policy is not effective ie not deliverable & not able to be monitored</p> <p>⊞ The road layout proposed I think has to be a joke! It will not make one jot of difference to the total journey times going north, south east or west. The proposed road in FWP7 goes alongside the new estate. This will be highly dangerous for all the young families in the affordable housing. A series of junctions are proposed, these will cause the traffic to speed up and slow down creating more pollution and increasing the fuel consumption of the vehicles involved, especially HGV's using this road. The extra junctions on New Rd South will just add to the congestion south of Parley Cross not ease it. The congestion at the firs station traffic lights in Ferndown will increase, the length of wait is already longer than at Parley Cross, so a major alteration involving demolition of surrounding buildings will be needed here at some point to ease the traffic flow. The 500 extra houses will create a minimum of 1000 extra car movements per day (one car per household going in and out once a day). These new roads were described to my by the Council Officer at the public display that was held in Parley as "not a rat run". If they are not a "rat run" what is it?</p> <p>This extra traffic will create the need for not only junction improvements at the north of New Road, but at the south and at both ends of Christchurch Rd.</p> <p>It will also mean local traffic trying to access the existing parade of shops will have to travel ½ a mile to go 100 yards due to the banning of left and right turns at Parley Cross.</p> <p>⊞ above all else the residents and Parish Council have been totally ignored in this matter. The Parish Plan contributed to by the majority of the residents said that Parley could take about 100 extra home scattered around in small groups and as infill development. There was no asking for a supermarket or for that matter a Plymouth Brethren chapel. Road improvements were asked for but what is proposed will not be road improvements as I have outlined above. As 50% of the houses can be built before the new roads are built congestion will only get worse before it gets better if at all. No one not</p>						

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>even the local district councillors knew about these plans until they were published. This is “top down” planning which is against government policy.</p> <p>⊞ The affordable housing will by its nature contain large numbers of young families. The children as they start to grow will become bored with little to do locally and start to create problems in the area for other residents. Many of these families will not be here by choice and will not want to be in or have any interest in the rural nature of the area (or what will be left of it!) Anti social behaviour will increase despite bland promises from officialdom this is the common pattern elsewhere and there is no reason for it to be different here. West Parley and its residents (many of whom have worked very hard to have their properties and work very hard to maintain the appearance of the community) should not be the victims of some sort of social experiment by the District Council.</p> <p>⊞ The proposed increase in the housing stock is over 32%. This is far more than any other community in East Dorset is being asked to take. It will change West Parley forever for the worst. It is environmentally damaging, will have no benefit to the existing community. The proposals are against government policy and national planning regulations and are being forced on the local people by a district council who is using “spin” and “bully-boy” tactics to get their way. The council officers at the display of the proposals in the Memorial Hall made it very clear that this was going to happen no matter what local people think. The council has also made the assumption that every one has internet access. The official consultation form is difficult to use, especially on the internet. The official pamphlet that has been handed out contains enough spin and proper gander that would have made “New Labour” proud.</p> <p>The governments policy is that local people are fully involved in planning issues such as this. What is happening here is that the local District Council is doing every think it can to prevent objections. This means the consultation is not consistent with national policy.</p> <p>The affordable housing will by its nature contain large numbers of young families. The children as they start to grow will become bored with little to do locally and start to create problems in the area for other residents. Many of these families will not be here by choice and will not want to be in or have any interest in the rural nature of the area (or what will be left of it!) Anti social behaviour will increase despite bland promises from officialdom this is the common pattern elsewhere and there is no reason for it to be different here. West Parley and its residents (many of whom have worked very hard to have their properties and work very hard to maintain the appearance of the community) should not be the victims of some sort of social experiment by the District Council.</p> <p>⊞ The proposed increase in the housing stock is over 32%. This is far more than any other community in East Dorset is</p>						

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description		
											<p>being asked to take. It will change West Parley forever for the worst. It is environmentally damaging, will have no benefit to the existing community. The proposals are against government policy and national planning regulations and are being forced on the local people by a district council who is using "spin" and "bully-boy" tactics to get their way.</p> <p>The council officers at the display of the proposals in the Memorial Hall made it very clear that this was going to happen no matter what local people think. The council has also made the assumption that every one has internet access. The official consultation form is difficult to use, especially on the internet. The official pamphlet that has been handed out contains enough spin and proper gander that would have made "New Labour" proud.</p> <p>The governments policy is that local people are fully involved in planning issues such as this. What is happening here is that the local District Council is doing every think it can to prevent objections.</p> <p>This means the consultation is not consistent with national policy.</p>								
500906	Mr and Mrs Scholes		CSPS2370	Policy FWP7							<p>We are writing to you as we wish to object to the building of the following: FWP 7 220 houses Dudsbury Rings is an important heritage site and building close to it will compromise the safety of it for future generations. Ridgeway gets flooded in winter due to the slope of the proposed site ... Tarmac will only make matters worse. FWP 6 300 houses WE DO NOT NEED ANOTHER SUPERMARKET. We have 4 major supermarkets in a radius of 3 miles plus express outlets.</p> <p>The reasons we are objecting are as follows: We feel the consultation process is not satisfactory</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislation requires full consultation with local communities which has been ignored by EDDC planner • A full and considered consultation with residents produced a parish plan which was sent to EDDC and as resident we clearly told them that we were strongly against any more than a total of 2100 houses in West Parley. This has been ignored. • Reliance on electronic communication is flawed. It has been assumed that most resident in west parley communicate by email and have access to the internet. We have a large elderly population many of whom quite possibly are not connected to the internet. I am sure many of these residents are very concerned by the proposals. • The proposals would mean that there would be no green belt and green space separating us from the urban sprawl of Bournemouth. We moved here to liven in a semi rural more open and green environment. We pay higher council tax for this pleasure ... why should we if we just become an extension of the Bournemouth conurbation. West Parley will lose its identity. WE NEED THE GREEN BELT. PLEASE KEEP THE GREEN BELT. We should be protecting the wildlife as we have protected species in the locality; this is not 					510			

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description					
											<p>only important for the environment but for our quality of life also. WE DO NOT WANT MORE SHOPPING. If you want to build please build us a more modern village hall.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic congestion is already bad enough at peak times. The proposed new roads will not help and extra housing means extra traffic. • A 32% (520) increase in housing which you propose for West Parley is excessive and out of proportion to other parishes. We don't have the infrastructure for such an increase. <p>PLEASE, please, please reconsider. The West Parley community is entitled to their say. Listen to us. We have made out thoughts very clear to the West Parley Parish Council and residents association.</p> <p>DON'T MAKE US AN EXTENSION OF BOURNEMOUTH. KEEP THE GREEN BELT. Honour the land and the wildlife. Please don't sacrifice the wellbeing of current residents.</p>											
501502	Mr Michael Wareham		CSPS2500	Policy FWP7							<p>Regarding the proposals for West Parley it would lose its identity and be come just another small part of a very large conurbation.as both proposed building sites are on green belt which provides the break between Bournemouth and Ferndown boundaries.</p> <p>This land brings the countryside into the village and we have many protected species of animals. This improves the quality of life for all residents who regularly use the the fields and official footpaths.</p> <p>The new roads will not ease the traffic jams it will just be moved down the road and we do not have the infrastructure for more houses.</p> <p>Dudsbury Rings is an important heritage site and needs to be protected.</p> <p>In winter and when there is heavy rain the slopes in the field cause water to rundown hill to flood the unmade road the Ridgeway the road surface is severely eroded and floods which makes it very unpleasant. With so much more concrete laid on the fields flooding would be even worst. As we have heard on the news about floods in many villages due to heavy rain.</p> <p>So I urge you to reconsider the proposals for Dudsbury Rings West Parley.</p>					510						
656254	W A Oldfield		CSPS2231	Policy FWP7							<p>Having attended many meetings regarding the proposed development at West Parley I would like to voice my objection to this development.</p> <p>I object to the fact that green field site which is the last barrier to Bournemouth should be proposed when there are other brown field sites in the area, i.e. St. Leonards hospital area which has been available and far more suitable.</p> <p>The proposal to build new roads which I understand will be from the developers money is not a viable proposition as the return on the number of houses proposed which includes an high level of social housing will not enable them to cover the cost of the road development which in anycase is far from acceptable as the traffic volume is already very congested at times.</p>					510						

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>The increase in population proposed re FWP6 will alter the whole character of the village which does not need another supermarket or shopping centre and is entirely unreasonable to try and increase the population by a third.</p> <p>These proposed houses will not help the local people as in such a desirable area they will be bought up by incomers still not helping the young people of the village and there are enough houses up for sale already in this area.</p> <p>The ground being proposed for development is unsuitable as the water from the surrounding area including springs from Chine Walk which drain down to Parley Cross by stream then underground pipes will be compromised if the ground water from the proposed development at duds bury, which will all be concreted over , will also drain onto this land causing flooding on a very large scale as the flood plain from the Stour reaches the edge of this development.</p> <p>This has all been planned by outside interest with no regard for villagers who will have to put up with all the disruption for years with no relief at the ends of it but finding oneself in the middle of a small town instead of a village with fields, and property prices falling as a result.</p> <p>It seems that all the local areas (Christchurch and Ferndown) are very happy to let building happen as long as it is as far away from them as possible with no regard for the total destruction of the road system which is struggling even now and the lives of people that have chosen to live the village life rather than estate living.</p>						
656255	Mrs Dorothy Bundle		CSPS2253	Policy FWP7							<p>I am writing on behalf of my Husband and myself to say that we are very much against the proposals to build 520 New Homes on Green Belt Land.</p> <p>West Parley already experience serious traffic congestion which creates very long tailback both mornings and early evening, which makes it very difficult for pedestrians to cross the road and for getting out of their properties and to add several hundreds more vehicles to the area will make matters worse.</p> <p>Schools:- As things stand at the moment the local schools haven't enough places for all the children, which means that some of them have to travel to Colehill and West Moors.</p> <p>And the plans for all these New Road means that the whole area will be surrounded by Roads, and all built on Green Belt Land.</p> <p>Please give these comments some thoughts.</p>				510		
656256	Tim Sill		CSPS2260	Policy FWP7							<p>I refer to the recently published building plans for the Green Belt areas of West Parley. I am particularly concerned about the massive increase in traffic that will undoubtedly occur, given the volumes of new dwellings under policies FWP7 and FWP6. Christchurch Road is already a major route for very heavy lorries that often break the 40 mph speed limit. The Linden Road turning is very dangerous when trying to turn left and right into Christchurch Road. More housing is already set to go ahead on the old garden centre site which will only add to the traffic volumes. Parley Cross is an absolute nightmare for travelling in any direction. Traffic will only get worse. The</p>				510		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>planned 520 houses in these two policies is completely excessive for this area of green belt. We need to protect this area and not drag it into the sprawl of Bournemouth. Soon it will be covered and it cannot be retrieved!</p> <p>Why are the people who contributed to the Parish Plan for West Parley being ignored. This is not democratic and smacks of decisions being already made.</p> <p>The amount of airport traffic is only likely to increase further with additional flights, ore businesses using the industrial parkwhich when added to the planned increase in housing will cause traffic chaos between Longham through to the Spur Road. Someone has surely got to see that the current road system cannot sustain existing traffic volumes, let alone what is being planned.</p> <p>Please can someone in an appropriate position arrange for these plans to be thought through again.</p>						
656259	Michael G Woodgate		CSPS2283	Policy FWP7							<p>I am writing to ask you to stop or at least modify the plans for 520 more houses in the West Parley area.</p> <p>Policy FWP6 is, for me, particularly awful with 300 new houses proposed. They will close a Key Gap between Parley Cross and Bournemouth and the amount of extra traffic at peak times on already congested roads will add to the long queues at traffic lights. Remember there can be lane closures on the A338, Bear Cross to Longham and New Road itself. Living here we all know the dreadful traffic jams we experience every few months.</p> <p>Policy FWP7 will also add to the congestion and spoil the lovely area which is Dudsbury Heights, and without all those extra houses we will not, or course, need another supermarket.</p> <p>Please do not allow these plans to go ahead.</p>				510		
656260	Mr and Mrs MP Porto		CSPS2284	Policy FWP7							<p>Re: Policy FWP7 & FWP6 – OBJECTIONS</p> <p>I refer to your above policy for the construction of 220 houses & the new road planned for Dudsbury Heights field near the old fort, along with the policy for the construction of 300 houses supermarket shopping centre & link road planned for the new Road Field</p> <p>The newly proposed link road goes from Christchurch Rd to New Road right through the middle of the 300 houses in FWP6 which is very dangerous for young families.</p> <p>The FWP6 & FWP7 are both very different to the 2010 plans which we have not been included in or consulted over clearly top down planning.</p> <p>Parley Cross is already over capacity the 2 new link roads will not be built until half the houses have been built & therefore the already strained infrastructure will be placed under more pressure – clearly unacceptable.</p> <p>1000 residents contributed to the West Parley Parish plan as encouraged by them however the district council has virtually ignored it, unacceptable.</p> <p>The New Rd & Dudsbury Heights fields are not any old green belt, they are “Key Gaps” with Bournemouth. These “Key Gaps” prevent urban sprawl & were the “TOP” reason for having a green belt in the first place any changes then this</p>				510		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
											would also be unacceptable changes. 520 more houses is a 32% increase – again clearly an unacceptable level for the infrastructure, it is excessive, wrong, damaging and way in excess of what is being imposed on Corfe Mullen, Ferndown, Wimborne & or Verwood. Therefore I object wholly to both proposals of Policy FWP6 & FWP7.							
656261	Mr and Mrs John and Barbara Russell		CSPS2290	Policy FWP7							<p>We wish to register our very strong objections to the proposals to fundamentally change the character of West Parley that will result from the implementation of the Green Belt Plans.</p> <p>West Parley is still an attractive area in which to live despite the increase in traffic during recent years with speeding vehicles using our residential roads as 'rat runs' to avoid the congestion at Parley Cross especially at morning and evening peak times. Any plans to increase the number of vehicles in West Parley will clearly exacerbate this problem leading to a greater risk for residents.</p> <p>However that is just one of our concerns arising from the proposals which are summarised as follows: Housing – The number of homes proposed via Policy FWP6 & FWP7 is quite disproportionate thus reducing the valued 'Green Belt' and adding to the vehicular congestion that already exists on the basis that most households now have two cars. The extra residents will undoubtedly place additional demands upon the already overstretched local services.</p> <p>Rationale – It is accepted that some housing development is necessary that include affordable housing but not to the extent that is proposed.</p> <p>West Parley must retain its character and the density of any 'New Build' must be limited and proportionate.</p> <p>Traffic - The proposal to build a new link road (east of Parley Cross) to join christchurch Road and New Road only confirms our fears that more traffic will use this area. The proposed route encroaches upon the Green Belt and passes through the FWP6 development thereby creating a danger to all residents, young and old alike.</p> <p>The proposal to build a new link road (west of Parley Cross) again encroaching on 'Green Belt Land' will create dangers for the residents of FWP7. This particular development is inappropriate given its proximity to Dudsbury Hill Fort.</p> <p>Rationale – Traffic is a major problem for West Parley</p>				510			

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
											<p>residents for the reasons outlined above. As a priority the existing traffic arrangements in the area should be reviewed focussing upon, speed limits, traffic management & pedestrian safety, especially at Parley Cross, New Road & Christchurch road before any building work is undertaken.</p> <p>Environment – New Build – The proposal in FWP6 to site a ‘New Foodstore of 3,000 sq. m’, presumably a supermarket, will attract additional traffic to an already overburdened area and again encroach upon the Green Belt. Air Pollution – No mention is made in the proposals of the impact that increased traffic in West Parley will have upon the air pollution in that area. Whilst levels are currently within acceptable guidelines consideration must be given to the detrimental impact that any increase will have, including the anticipated increase in aircraft using Bournemouth Airport during the next decade and beyond. Rationale - Redevelopment of the existing shopping area is needed together with the creation of additional shops and services that would support and attract local residents. Central Government has placed much emphasis upon decisions that affect local communities being made at a local level, i.e. ‘bottom up’ not ‘top down’. This is your opportunity to demonstrate to the residents of West Parley that you understand, support and embrace that principle. Please don’t let us down.</p>							
656262	Pauline Vince		CSPS2291	Policy FWP7							<p>We are very much against the proposal for 300 houses, supermarket, shopping centre and link road planned for New Road. 300 new families will put enormous strain on our schools – already full to capacity; medical facilities – already 10 days wait for a doctor’s appointment; employment vacancies in the surrounding area – already in very short supply. We already have a local supermarket and shopping centre – a new superstore will probably put them all out of business – look at the number of empty premises in Christchurch since the increase in out of town supermarkets. New roads will eat up valuable green space and just move congestion along to the next bottle neck. Where is the money coming from for this scheme? Any money available would far better be spent on improving public transport and making it more affordable for families.</p>				510			

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>We understood that Government policy was against building on green belt land and indeed that the New Road and Dudsbury height fields were 'Key Gaps' to prevent urban sprawl.</p> <p>We also understood that development was supposed to be self financing. If the developers are intending to provide all the increased facilities that are required then it is hardly likely to be affordable housing – they will still expect to make their profit.</p> <p>Why has the District Council virtually ignored the West Parley Parish Plan which 1000 residents contributed to? A 32% increase in West Parley housing stock is completely unacceptable, it will turn an historic village into a bland housing estate at best – the worst doesn't bear thinking about.</p>						
656274	Mrs K D Pearce		CSPS2241	Policy FWP7							<p>I write to object to the above named policies for the reasons summarised in my letter:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The proposal to build estates of 300 houses in the field adjacent to us at Parley Cross with a further 200 at Dudsbury would probably spell the end of our treasured Green Belt, or certainly establish a massive "thin end of the wedge". 2) Despite our clear opposition to the destruction of our prized Green Belt, EDDC do not appear to want to consider resident's views, but sit remote in their Furzehill offices dreaming up ways of covering it all in concrete. 3) Over the past decade, the local roads have barely coped with the increasing traffic, yet EDDC propose a third more dwellings concentrated at the worst location. 4) The whole overloaded infra-structure would need extensive modification prior to, rather than following any increase in housing. 5) EDDC have sprung policies FWP6 and FWP7 without consultation, (other than with developers). What happened to the 2010 plans? Why has West Parley's Parish Plan been ignored? 6) We remain uninformed by EDDC of the need of all the housing they propose. Our Green Belt could be preserved by more sensitive in-fill building of houses to match those existing. This would meet real demand rather than the developers speculative greed. 7) During involvement with WPRA we sought the views of pilots flying out of The local international airport, since the Western end of its runway is just 2 km from the proposed FWP6 site. The pilot's committee was opposed to dense housing in such a location. An engine failure following take-off could have devastating results 8) I am bound to conclude that EDDC have agendas widely 				510		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description		
											different from those They purport to represent. I suggest they withdraw and consult much more widely before issuing further edicts. Perhaps they should get out of their office chairs and visit us in West Parley and see what their lack of vision is doing to our local countryside.								
659520	Mrs Julie Ridout		CSPS2218	Policy FWP7							I wish to object to the building of 220 houses on the FWP 7 and 300 on FWP 6 sites for the u/m reasons: (1) The Consultation process is unsatisfactory. (a) Government legislation requires you to consult fully with local communities before setting out proposals. EDDC planners have ignored this legislation. (b) West Parley has produced, after a lengthy consultation with residents, a well publicised Parish Plan, copies of which were sent to EDDC. In this Plan residents are overwhelmingly against having more than about 100 houses built in West Parley. This source of information has been ignored by EDDC planners. (c) EDDC have relied too much on the use of electronic communication to provide information to residents for this consultation and assumed that all residents in West Parley have access to the internet. This is far from the case and most residents are extremely concerned about the proposals but are unable to find the information they need to consider the proposals effectively. (d) To build more than 100 houses in West Parley would create an unbroken Urban sprawl from Bournemouth to Ferndown and beyond. West Parley would lose its identity and become just another small part of a very large conurbation. Both of the proposed building sites constitute much valued green belt land which provides this break between the Bournemouth and Ferndown boundaries. This was the reason for introducing the Green Belt system many years ago. (d) This land brings the countryside into the village and with it many important And protected species of animals. Sightings of badgers, foxes, otters, deer, buzzards are frequently reported. This improves the quality of life of all residents who regularly use these fields through which official footpaths pass. (e) The 2 new roads proposed around the proposed building sites will be dangerous for children living in the new houses and will not ease the already stretched traffic system in West Parley. Traffic jams will be merely moved further down the main roads. 500 extra houses will bring up to 1000 extra cars all trying to get out of and into West Parley which is already ridiculously over crowded. (e) 520 extra houses in West Parley represents an increase in housing of about 32%. This is excessive and is far more than is proposed for the other East Dorset communities. Without the appropriate					510			

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>infrastructure of adequate school places, doctors, dentists, community centres etc there will be unacceptable pressure on existing provision.</p> <p>Site FWP 7</p> <p>(a) Dudsbury Rings is an important heritage site and this field is to closely connected to the site for the security of this important site to be protected.</p> <p>(b) In winter time and in times of heavy rain the slope of the field causes water to run down hill to flood the unmade and private road, Ridgeway, every time. With heavy traffic, servicing the shops at Parley Cross using Ridgeway every day, the road surface is severely eroded and flooded which makes it very unpleasant for residents who are also responsible for the upkeep of the road. With so much more concrete laid on the field due to the proposed buildings flooding would be even worse.</p> <p>Site FWP 6</p> <p>(a) Yet another Supermarket in the area is not needed and will only bring in Much more traffic to bring chaos to the already crowded roads of West Parley. Sufficient supermarkets (Tesco, Asda, Sainsbury 2, Lidl) already exist within 3 mile radius of West Parley and 3 Tesco Express shops exist in a radius of 1 mile of Parley Cross. There is no demand for allotments, orchards etc.</p> <p>West Parley should not be sacrificed by planners' unrealistic dreams and an attempt at social engineering. I urge you to reconsider these proposals and to start talking to the people in West Parley Community who are entitled to have a say in the drawing up of proposals for any increase in housing in their village.</p> <p>Yours faithfully</p>						
659580	J S & P W Torok		CSPS2277	Policy FWP7							<p>I object to the proposed large scale development at Parley Cross and Dudsbury Heights. The reason being that the volume of traffic is overwhelming already without any more. This is a green belt area but how can we protect our environment when this is taken away from us?</p> <p>When we expressed our opinions regarding the plan, The District Council ignored them.</p> <p>I hope our opinion will be considered and you reconsider this large scale building development plan.</p>				510		
503019	Mr David Schofield		CSPS2374	Policy FWP7							<p>We wish to object to the scale and position of the proposed housing development for West Parley, in particular Policy FWP&, the proposal to build 220 or so houses in the Dudsbury Heights green belt and also FWP6 to build 300 houses and a shopping centre in the New Road field. We were not consulted about the changes from the 2010 plan. The village can take some houses but to overload us in this way is just too much. It is essential that we keep opur green belt and key gaps with Bournemouth. The threat to the heathland is of major concern and new open spaces will not distract people away from it.</p>				510		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
											<p>The policies are not sound in that they were adapted in response to initial concerns about the infrastructure being able to cope. The answer to which appears to be to change the proposal without proper consultation and propose building more houses to pay for the infrastructure, twisted logic to say the least.</p> <p>We do not believe it is consistent with National Policy which prevents building on the green belt except in exceptional circumstances. We believe this is not the case.</p> <p>We would accept 100 houses or so as ribbon development along main roads.</p>							
503040	Mrs Kathleen Schofield		CSPS2381	Policy FWP7							<p>We wish to object to the scale and position of the proposed housing development for West Parley, in particular Policy FWP&, the proposal to build 220 or so houses in the Dudsbury Heights green belt and also FWP6 to build 300 houses and a shopping centre in the New Road field. We were not consulted about the changes from the 2010 plan. The village can take some houses but to overload us in this way is just too much. It is essential that we keep our green belt and key gaps with Bournemouth. The threat to the heathland is of major concern and new open spaces will not distract people away from it.</p> <p>The policies are not sound in that they were adapted in response to initial concerns about the infrastructure being able to cope. The answer to which appears to be to change the proposal without proper consultation and propose building more houses to pay for the infrastructure, twisted logic to say the least.</p> <p>We do not believe it is consistent with National Policy which prevents building on the green belt except in exceptional circumstances. We believe this is not the case.</p>				510			
503395	Mr Ian Davis		CSPS2318	Policy FWP7	No		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	<p>Policy FWP7 – West of New Road, West Parley. This plan is considered Unsound, in that it is not Consistent with National Policy, Justified, Effective, or Deliverable. N.P.P.F. 155 Please refer to the previous text between the asterisks.</p> <p>Building on this area of green belt, (which is a key gap and has a high landscape and community value), is not justified by the evidence produced for the claimed housing need. (See comment on policy KS4)</p> <p>This field known as “The Down”, meets all the requirements in NPPF 77 for a Local Green Space Designation. It is adjacent to the Dudsbury Iron Age Hill Fort. First fortified approx. 150BC. Yes, older than Jesus Christ.</p> <p>At the highest point of this field, it is possible to view the Isle of Wight, some 17 miles to the south east, the white chalk cliffs above Totland and Alum Bay. Due east another elevated view of Bournemouth International Airport, amazing views for the annual air show. Still viewing the scenery to the south/east, we see St Catherines Hill in Christchurch, and the elevated areas around Holmsley Inclosure and Brownhill Inclosure and the railway gap in the tree line for the Bournemouth to London Waterloo line.</p> <p>Due south, we can see the balloon in the Bournemouth</p>				510			

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>Pleasure Gardens, and to the left a little, the old life guard buildings on Hengistbury Head, standing alone on the horizon.</p> <p>On Bonfire night, the sight of all the surrounding fireworks are amazing.</p> <p>These fields, the woods and the adjoining gardens are home or feeding places to over 60 species of birds, including a resurgence of House Sparrows and Song Thrust. Wild animals include deer, stoats, weasels, badgers, foxes rabbits, squirrels and hedgehogs. Several species of bats can be seen at twilight. Frogs and Roads frequent the fields, lanes and gardens.</p> <p>Local residents, ramblers, brownies, girl guides, young volunteers working with the livery businesses, walkers on the Stour Valley Way, couples and families walking to the local pub/restaurants, dog walkers from far and wide, they all stop for a while to admire these beautiful views, the birds, and the wild life.</p> <p>The effect of flooding on FWP7 has been overlooked in the core strategy. Not surprisingly the Hill Fort was built on an area with plentiful natural springs. After heavy rain there are mini streams in Ridgeway and Christchurch Road West. Concreting and tarmacking over much of the field known as "The Down" would have considerable effects and it is such a concern that only amateur desktop studies on this have been carried out.</p> <p>The proposed link road, again not studied in any depth, could also find itself impacted in construction, maintenance and extremely high costs by seasonal floods.</p> <p>Photographs on the Environment Agency website shows floods right up to the Southern part of the proposed link road junction onto New Road.</p> <p>Coincidentally, in the last few years, I have been monitoring a 1/1.5 metre wide x 150/200 metres long, section of the western side of New Road from the bridge. This large area of road seems to be slowly subsiding, I believe that the tidal floods that occur more frequently these days, are perhaps slowly eroding the base materials that were originally used to form the causeway decades ago.</p> <p>In summary, the FWP7 site is a specially prized elevated landscape, community asset and valuable green belt key gap separating Bournemouth from West Parley, it is full with both bird and wild life activity.</p> <p>This should be the very last place to be considered for house building and link roads.</p>						
503763	KS Turner		CSPS2489	Policy FWP7							<p>THIS IS GREEN BELT THE ROADS ARE OVERCROWDED FWP6 HIGH DENSITY HOUSING, BUILT ON A FLIGHT PATH. NOISE AND POPULATION FROM ASCENDING AND DESCENDING PLANES, LIVE LIKE THAT FOR A SHORT TIME.</p> <p>AND JUST FOR GOOD MEASURE PUT A ROAD THROUGH THE MIDDLE TO CARRY TO MUCH TRAFFIC. IDEAL FOR FAMILIES.. TRAFFIC.</p>				510		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description				
											FOR AIRPORT FACTORIES, OFFICES, OTHER THAN AIRPORT. LARGE LORRIES FOR SAND AND GRAVEL EXTRACTION FOR WASTE DISPOSAL, BUSES COACHES, ETC. TO AND FROM BOURNEMOUTH BY PASS. TO CHRISTCHURCH TO RINGWOOD TO BOURNEMOUTH HOSPITAL IF ANYTHING HAPPENS ON EITHER THE A338 OR A31 WHICH IS FREQUENTLY NEW RD COMES TO A STAND STILL. INFRASTRUCTURE. SEWAGE, FLOODING, SCHOOLS, HEALTH CARE ETC. MAY BE 50 HOUSES BECAUSE PEOPLE MATTER BUT NOT A NEW TOWN IN A FIELD. PLEASE COME AND LIVE HERE FOR 6 MONTH BEFORE YOU PUSH THIS THROUGH. HOW ABOUT USING THE DORMY SITE WITH SENSIBLE PLANNING.										
508605	Miss Janet Ames		CSPS2574	Policy FWP7							(1) I note you wish to build on the Stour Valley Flood plain. Please note that properties built on the river edge have increased the water flow & washed away sand and gravel near the black house on Mudeford Sandbank. That area in front and near the black house was a place where Fishermen pulled up their nets before W.WarII – I am a witness! There are now boulders put there to prevent some erosion. I suggest you consult the oceanography dept at Soton University before increasing the river flow. (60% of building land will be covered by hoses, roads etc & water has to go somewhere). If Mudeford sandbank is washed away, then a large part of historic Christchurch will go too. (2) The picture of Parley shops shows that very little parking will be available – so no-one will be able to shop there. (3) A seat outside the Chip shop will have a lovely outlook of busy traffic (a lot goes to Hurn) not exactly the spot for anyone to enjoy except intoxicated youngsters!					510					
508852	Mrs L.A. Chesshire		CSPS2513	Policy FWP7							I wish to advise you of my strong objections to the proposals to erect 220 houses on the FWP 7 site together with a further 300 on the FWP 6 site. The extent of the proposed building is not only excessive for this area but, in my view, also ill conceived. Consultation: I understand that current Government legislation requires you to consult fully with the local communities involved and yet patently this has NOT happened to date. In fact, it would appear that the views of these communities are actually being steadfastly overlooked. I, therefore, feel that the ongoing process is far from satisfactory and have even to question its legality. In the absence of any of this direct consultation required by law, West Parley went ahead and conducted its own survey of residents' views and produced a comprehensive Parish Plan, copies of which were duly forwarded to EDDC. Despite the fact that it categorically showed West Parley 'en masse' to be opposed to the erection					510					

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>of any total exceeding 100 houses, this valuable information gathered straight from the people on site, i.e. the residents themselves, has so far apparently been ignored by EDDC planners.</p> <p>Construction knock-on effects: I have attended a variety of meetings locally on the subject of the proposals – meetings which have compounded my concerns even further rather than allaying fears. The intended erection of 520 additional houses in the village of West Parley represents a massive 32% increase in housing and is a vast, totally out of proportion increase for a small community and greater by far than those increases put forward for other East Dorset area. Without considerable financial investment (and where would that come from in these straitened times?) West Parley is currently lacking in much of the appropriate infrastructure that this increase in population would require – school places, doctors, dentists, community centres etc – with the result that existing services will be unable to meet all the needs. The inevitable erosion of the Green Belt caused by the advent of this quantity of new homes would signal the death knell of West Parley, which would be submerged inexorably into an urban sprawl extending from Bournemouth in the south towards Ferndown and even beyond. Our village would cease to exist. The Green Belt was introduced many years ago to prevent exactly this scenario, i.e. the absorption of the countryside into conurbations. Both sites proposed for the new construction are at present part of this much treasured Green Belt land, which is home to so many animals, birds, flora and fauna and all of which improve the quality of life for one and all. SOf course, the building of vast quantities of houses will also result in a correspondingly large increase in the number of cars on our already overloaded local roads, which are even at the this time acknowledged to be at bursting point. The two new roads planned will do little to ease congestion – they will merely move the traffic jams further along. Plus it seems they and their traffic will be directed through the two new ‘estates’ with their medium and high density housing and resulting children. Is that not an idea born of madness? – or just desperation?!</p> <p>Site FWP 7 – individual issues: 1) It’s acknowledged that heritage site of Dudsbury Rings is one of the considerable importance and the field in question is far too close for its retention and safe protection. 2) The field itself slopes considerably and as a result heavy rainfall at any time of the year cascades downhill flooding Ridgeway – an unmade and private road, which already suffers adverse effects from the heavy traffic using daily it as an exit onto Christchurch Road after servicing the shops at Parley Cross. The road surface is severely eroded and flooded which makes it very unpleasant for residents who are also responsible for its upkeep. Once the field is built upon, there will be far less open ground to absorb rain and flooding would inevitably become even more of a problem.</p> <p>Site FWP 6 – individual issues: (1) To be truthful, West Parley has little requirement for yet</p>						

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>another supermarket. A Tesco's Express is already available to us on the parade at the crossroads plus there are two more of these sited within 1 mile. Even within a 3 mile radius we are well served by a variety of the larger main outlets, i.e. 2 Tesco's, 2 Sainsburys, Asda and Lidl – more than enough to cater for everyone's needs. The construction of a further supermarket will only add yet again to the traffic and bring ever more chaos to the already crowded roads of West Parley.</p> <p>(2) Currently allotments and orchards etc are not a major need in the area.</p> <p>Conclusion: I beg you to reconsider your proposals and take into account at long last the views and wishes of the residents of West Parley. You MUST NOT dismiss this small community out of hand, simply to 'meet quotas' and 'tick boxes'. We are people who genuinely love where we have chosen to live and we only have the welfare of our area at heart. We, not you, are the ones who stand to lose most in this matter. Please talk to us. Please listen to us. Remember that throughout this country we are rightly proud of our democracy and have exercised our electoral right to choose those who govern us both nationally and locally. Those people now need to take OUR wishes into consideration – not ride roughshod over us. WeS are entitled to have our say. An acknowledgement to confirm, receipt, reading and understanding of this letter would be much appreciated.</p>						
508966	Mrs Mansell		CSPS2573	Policy FWP7							<p>I wish to object to the building of 220 houses on the FWP7 and 300 on FWP6 sites at West Parley for the following reasons.</p> <p>In my opinion 32% increase in houses in the village is in excess and more than in any other location in East Dorset communities. Added to these there are 30 houses proposed at Coppins and 110 at Holmwood both in the area. A small amount of houses eg. 100 would be acceptable although I am against building on Green Belt. We do not want to create urban sprawl. The Green Belt is also home to protected species of animals The field next to the river is a flood plain which could be of concern in building a new road.</p> <p>Secondly the construction of 2 new roads would not solve the traffic problems – it would just move the traffic to the new junctions. The roads through the new estates would be dangerous 'rat runs' for the residents. As the roads are not to be built until half the houses are finished what happens to the extra traffic until then?</p> <p>Thirdly where would the extra residents go to school – dentists – doctors etc. these are already full to capacity. Is another supermarket necessary – we have many in our area and another on FWP6 would only add to the congestion on the roads. The proposal of a High Street also seems unnecessary as we are a village not a town. Another point is the restrictions to turning right and left at the crossroads, this would divert airport traffic through the estates causing more traffic problems. I was under the impression the field where</p>				510		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											300 houses are proposed is a safety net for the airport. To end I believe the consultation process is unsatisfactory and I feel the residents of Parley village are entitled to have a say in the drawing up of proposals for development of their village.						
509811	Mrs J Waugh		CSPS2564	Policy FWP7							I attended the West Parley Meeting to explain what was planned for West Parley in the future. I found very little which we residents had voted for in our Parish Plan. This was completely ignored. West Parley seem to have taken the brunt of the plans by using our precious Green Belt. This is totally in excess of Corfe Mullen, Ferndown and Wimborne. Apparently the Green Belt was designed to stop the urban sprawl of Kinson and Bournemouth from reaching this very different area. We have all bought bungalows because we like the area and they will be almost worthless should this all come about. Although I can certainly hear the traffic at peak times from our junction, the busyist in Dorset apparently, most of the time we have a very quiet little road of bungalows. The road at the top is unmade and not good to drive a small car over most of the time and it has no through road which has been blocked off. I hope that this new road from Christchurch Road to New Road which is planned with not come along here. 220 houses are planned for Dudsbury Heights also which would be completely devastating. (FWP7) As far as the Green Belt is concerned the other side of New Road where Tesco has already put in their bid and which will no doubt be a very profitable source for them and for the Developer who will have the benefit of the 300 houses. I am not against young people being able to buy houses reasonably but I am if they are to be occupied by immigrants with no knowledge of English and no jobs. (Policy FWP6) As you see I do not completely advocate your plans although I realise it is necessary to have some building space but not to the inconvenience of the present residents.				510		
509843	Mr and Mrs Brian and Dorothy Adams		CSPS2592	Policy FWP7							WEST PARLEY HOUSING Fair shares – Ferndown contribution from far afield. Without these ‘remote centres’ the Ferndown commitment would be zero. Meanwhile look at the possibility of West Parley being overwhelmed. The rural nature of the village would be destroyed and those we trusted to look after our interests would be held forever responsible for this. Act now and stop this madness – a few more houses maybe, but this! West Parley is a quiet village and the prospect of swamping the area with new builds with its consequent traffic and noise fills me with horror. A lot of the houses will be beneath the fly path which I would think could be a problem especially with the noise and any accidents which could happen especially the Christchurch Road and New Road areas. Our roads also are extremely busy with cars queuing regularly.				510		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											I do not think that so many houses should be built in this area and we want to keep WP as a village and not joined up with Bournemouth.						
509897	Mrs Rachel Harding		CSPS2555	Policy FWP7							<p>I am writing to object to the large and unwelcome plans for our green belt in West Parley.</p> <p>I refer to policy FWP6 which is for 300 houses, supermarket, shopping centre and link road which is planned for the New Road Field.</p> <p>This proposal is very different to the 2010 plans and we feel the roads and infrastructure around this area would be totally inadequate to cope with this. Christchurch Road and West Parley traffic lights junction are already exceptionally busy, how would this road cope with all the extra traffic, it is over capacity already.</p> <p>I understand that the proposal for the new link road will not be started until half the new houses have been built. This link road will go through the middle of the 300 new homes. Do you think that this is acceptable for these families and their children.</p> <p>520 more houses are proposed to be built at West Parley and Dudsbury Heights, this is a 32% increase to our housing stock, this is excessive and unacceptable and way in excess of what is being imposed in Corfe Mullen, Ferndown, Wimborne or Verwood.</p> <p>The West Parley Parish plan was encouraged by the District Council, but the Council have virtually ignored it.</p>				510		
512459	Sandra Davis		CSPS2358	Policy FWP7	No		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	<p>Policy FWP7 – West of New Road, West Parley.</p> <p>This plan is considered Unsound, in that it is not Consistent with National Policy, Justified, Effective, or Deliverable.</p> <p>N.P.P.F. 155 Please refer to the previous text between the asterisks.</p> <p>Building on this area of green belt, (which is a key gap and has a high landscape and community value), is not justified by the evidence produced for the claimed housing need. (See comment on policy KS4)</p> <p>This field known as “The Down”, meets all the requirements in NPPF 77 for a Local Green Space Designation. It is adjacent to the Dudsbury Iron Age Hill Fort. First fortified approx. 150BC. Yes, older than Jesus Christ.</p> <p>At the highest point of this field, it is possible to view the Isle of Wight, some 17 miles to the south east, the white chalk cliffs above Totland and Alum Bay. Due east another elevated view of Bournemouth International Airport, amazing views for the annual air show. Still viewing the scenery to the south/east, we see St Catherines Hill in Christchurch, and the elevated areas around Holmsley Inclosure and Brownhill Inclosure and the railway gap in the tree line for the Bournemouth to London Waterloo line.</p> <p>Due south, we can see the balloon in the Bournemouth Pleasure Gardens, and to the left a little, the old life guard buildings on Hengistbury Head, standing alone on the horizon.</p> <p>On Bonfire night, the sight of all the surrounding fireworks are amazing.</p>				510		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>These fields, the woods and the adjoining gardens are home or feeding places to over 60 species of birds, including a resurgence of House Sparrows and Song Thrust. Wild animals include deer, stoats, weasels, badgers, foxes rabbits, squirrels and hedgehogs. Several species of bats can be seen at twilight. Frogs and Roads frequent the fields, lanes and gardens.</p> <p>Local residents, ramblers, brownies, girl guides, young volunteers working with the livery businesses, walkers on the Stour Valley Way, couples and families walking to the local pub/restaurants, dog walkers from far and wide, they all stop for a while to admire these beautiful views, the birds, and the wild life.</p> <p>The effect of flooding on FWP7 has been overlooked in the core strategy. Not surprisingly the Hill Fort was built on an area with plentiful natural springs. After heavy rain there are mini streams in Ridgeway and Christchurch Road West. Concreting and tarmacking over much of the field known as "The Down" would have considerable effects and it is such a concern that only amateur desktop studies on this have been carried out.</p> <p>The proposed link road, again not studied in any depth, could also find itself impacted in construction, maintenance and extremely high costs by seasonal floods.</p> <p>Photographs on the Environment Agency website shows floods right up to the Southern part of the proposed link road junction onto New Road.</p> <p>Coincidentally, in the last few years, I have been monitoring a 1/1.5 metre wide x 150/200 metres long, section of the western side of New Road from the bridge. This large area of road seems to be slowly subsiding, I believe that the tidal floods that occur more frequently these days, are perhaps slowly eroding the base materials that were originally used to form the causeway decades ago.</p> <p>In summary, the FWP7 site is a specially prized elevated landscape, community asset and valuable green belt key gap separating Bournemouth from West Parley, it is full with both bird and wild life activity.</p> <p>This should be the very last place to be considered for house building and link roads.</p>						
514156	Mr J Breeze		CSPS2620	Policy FWP7	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	<p>TRANSPORT AND ACCESS: diverting traffic from the village centre will not alleviate the existing very severe traffic congestion in Christchurch Road for traffic E – W / W – E just merely move the congestion 400 yds further up the road to the proposed new junction in Christchurch Road.</p> <p>The effect of giving access at that point to traffic from a further estimated 200 new homes solution. It is noted the "Highways Agency" is not included in the Core Strategy Document "Key Stakeholders" a fact that speaks for itself.</p> <p>From the above: The "Transport and Access of FWP7 has not been properly prepared or thought out.</p> <p>From the above: It cannot be considered effective or justified. It can only be considered consistent with National Policy, if that policy is to Congest roads and slow the economic growth</p>	<p>Layout and Design FWP 7</p> <p>The Core Strategy document states that the FWP7 area is of a higher landscape value than the main development at FWP6. It is a fact that within FWP7 itself, that sector west of the of the proposed link road (Dudsbury Monument area adjacent) is of a</p>	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		510		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
											<p>of the area GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE - FWP7 Para 10.39 (Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace for Public Access) SANG To replace the Green Belt areas currently required for development FWP7, as shown on Map 10.10, the area of "Potential SANG" is currently and in the foreseeable future, undeliverable, both to the Development, its occupants and the wider public. Of the 100% "Potential SANG" area Some 25% Adjacent to the River Stour, is on a flood plain, often under water and unusable for long periods of time. Some 5% is bog/waterlogged land for much of the year. Some 8% is steep cliffs/valley rides up to 20mts or more. (All the above areas are currently fenced off, specifically preventing access and the associated dangers, particularly to children) Some 15% is an existing, working Public House, beer garden and pub car park, which although an excellent facility, is not a suitable area to claim as "potential SANG". Some 30% is currently a private house, garden and grounds in private ownership, and not either owned by the developers or within the development area. Why this "Dudsbury Manor" estate has been included in the potential SANG area is inexplicable and an explanation should be given. Of the some 17% of the "potential SANG" remaining that is the only SANG for FWP7 that is currently or for the foreseeable future, actually available or deliverable on the grounds of Land Suitability, Availability, or (Safety for Public use under Policy HE2) Implementing Policy D. To remedy this SANG shortfall a significant sector of the development should remain open space. The area abutting the Ancient Monument may be considered, providing a improved 'setting zone' and protecting the better habitat found west of the link road in FWP7. No development on FWP7 should be permitted until equivalent area to that shown on Map 10.10 can be allocated to actually usable SANG by all ages of the public, all year around. Policy HE4 Local Play and Sports The development area of FWP7 located to the west of the proposed link road is designated as a "Sports Field" on numerous local maps. Compilers of the Core Strategy may consider this area to supplement SANG, given its previous use. For the above reasons, 1) Positively Prepared: I do not believe the presented plan meets the objectives and needs of the area. 2) Justified The actual SANGs portion needs greater clarity and justification. 3) Effective: the plan is not deliverable in respect of "potential SANG" areas shown, and Policy HE2 public safety. 4) Would not be consistent with National Policy in providing unusable and unsafe SANGs set off.</p>	<p>far higher order of natural beauty again. Council Policy HE3 applies and, particularly with any removal of Green Belt protection, should give protection to the quality and diversity of the landscape in this special sector of FWP7. This is not mentioned in the Core Strategy. It should be. The present Green Belt policy has afforded significant protection to the ancient hedgerows lying in the proposed area west of the link road, that are recognised as providing a major protected habitat for numerous bird, animal and insect species, including butterflies not widely found. The Ancient Hedgerows contain dense thicket of a wide variety of indigenous shrubs and wild plants, interspersed with Mature Oak trees and within the Development site, immediately adjacent to proposed housing places these at severe risk. They should be specifically protected in their entirety. Policy ME1 Protection of designated areas of Nature Conservation interest/Protected Habitat. If the Greenbelt status is removed then ME1 should be actioned for this area. The "right of way" from Christchurch Road (Adjacent to and</p>						

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
												<p>behind the Owl's Nest Restaurant) running to the rear of "Dudsbury Manor" runs alongside the western Hedgerow and is a footpath for most of its length. It is not used for Vehicular access. This hedgerow would be at risk, being within the development, should developers require to widen the current access to provide either access to the development, during building or to provide a permanent main vehicular access to Dudsbury Manor, which may be required by virtue of the new development.</p> <p>The Council should meet with English Nature/CPRE/RSPB/ and local Parish Council to determine a future protection for these ancient hedgerows and the flora and fauna therein.</p> <p>Policy ME1 should provide a minimum future safeguard and distance between the sensitive habitat and housing increased.</p> <p>The final document should note that if the Inspector removes green belt status from this area west of the link road, nature will be so protected.</p> <p>Policy HE1 (safeguarding the historic heritage of the Country)</p> <p>The FWP7 development area west of the link road, and adjacent to the Hill Fort Ancient</p>					

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
												<p>Monument is significant in historical and archiological terms, to this area of Dorset/West Parley District. Previous maps show archiological finds that are consistant with the monument and access to it. The public gallows, was located next to the development, and it is highly likely, as was usual that burial of the victims was actioned very nearby.</p> <p>The first maps of this area indicate habitation of two cottages adjacent to the development (possibly dating back to 1500's or earlier) at a time when no other habitation was found locally, it is behind.</p> <p>For all the above reasons, and the HE1 policy, the Council (EDDC) should action a full archiological survey of this area of development, west of the proposed link road, It should involve English Heritage/Dorset County Architects Dept, CRRE, and Local Universities. This survey should be actioned and discussed results before this area is included in any permitted development.</p> <p>As drawn, map 10.10 in the Core Strategy, shows the proposed affordable housing, west of the link road, within just 75 mrs of the Ancient Monument</p>						

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
												<p>Hill Fort, just a 15 second cycle ride away. It is difficult to equate this fact with the opening Statement in para 10.39 of the Core Strategy "The Hill Fort is an ancient monument, so development must be kept clear from it and open space used to maintain its integrity" (A 15 second bike ride to a "ready made" playground/BMX track, or under a 50 odd seconds walk, is that adequate protection?) 75mts is not an adequate buffer zone for the public visiting it or the monument itself. It will put the monument under stress and the buildings that close will ruin the existing picturesque "setting zone" in which the monument currently sits and which visitors see on arrival, with attractive hedgerows and established countryside along its access via the "StourWay" national footpath.</p> <p>It is noted that the Statutory body responsible for the Ancient Monument, "English Heritage", is not listed as a Key Stakeholder in the Core Strategy Document for FWP7 although lesser bodies are. This is clearly a serious omission, and it seems unlikely that English Heritage would give Statutory Approval for such an</p>					

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
												<p>immediate distance as 75 mtrs, given the present ideal situation and the detrimental impact both visually, and practically that such a distance will bring to the Ancient Hill Fort.</p> <p>In the present proposal, intense use of the Monument Site for all manner of activities by estate residents is highlighted, by the fact that of the "potential SANG" area (Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace for Public Recreation) in FWP7 on Map 10.10, only some 17% of it is usable to the Public of all ages on a year round basis. A fact that will not be lost on the Statutory body (EH) who would undoubtedly seek a greater distance from such a large scale development.</p> <p>The Hill Fort site incorporates land owned by the Girl Guides Association and main guide camps for Dorset facility within it. It is important for the safety of the hundreds of children guides, using the site annually, and despite the levels of supervision, to ensure security. A good level of security is currently provided by the isolation and distance away from any housing.</p> <p>Development so close to the monument will eventually put</p>					

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
												<p>unneded pressure on the Guides facility, which has been a wonderful retreat for parent and children alike, and its interests require safeguarding. For all the above reasons:</p> <p>1) Positively Prepared: I do not believe the present plan meets the objectives and meets the objectives and needs of the area.</p> <p>2) Justified: The plan is not the most appropriate strategy given the constraints of the particular area of FWP7.</p> <p>3) Effective: The plan is not deliverable in respect of HE3, ME1, the li limited actual usable SANG and the distance from/effect on the ancient monument.</p> <p>4) Would not be consistent with National Policy for the protection of ancient monuments and the Flora and Fauna of the specific area west of the link road in FWP7.</p>						
535574	Mr and Mrs Ralph Williams		CSPS2305	Policy FWP7							<p>I write to registry my formal objection to the building of 200 houses on the FWP 7, 320 houses and 33,000 sq.ft Foodstore on FWP 6 and to Major Enhancements to the West Parley Village Centre FWP 5 sites for the following under mentioned reasons, some of the points below also apply to Coppins Nursery FWP 6 (corrected to FWP4 by F.P. officer) which is more suited to an elderly care facility. The points raised below are by no means extensive and having read the councils proposals and accompanying documents which are contradicting and lack robust evidence as a result The Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy Plan is therefore Unsound and Non-Compliant.</p> <p>The Consultation process is unsatisfactory.</p> <p>The Planning system is there to enable Sustainable Development to ensure the right development takes place in the right locations. It is there to protect Green Belt Land and ensure homes are provided on the right sites to meet the needs of both the established community and the people who</p>				510			

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>are likely to live in the proposed new homes. Local Plans must take account of local concerns and wishes of the local population as required by the new Localism legislation. No account has been taken to current Government legislation that requires any L.A. to consult fully with local communities before setting out proposals. EDDC planners have ignored this legislation and failed to consult.</p> <p>West Parley P.C. has produced, following a lengthy consultation with residents, a well publicised Parish Plan, copies of which were sent to EDDC. In this Plan residents are overwhelmingly against having no more than about 100 houses built in West Parley. This information, contrary to new legislation, has been ignored by EDDC planners and the results have not been represented in any of the draft reports. To build more than 100 houses in the Village of West Parley would create an unbroken urban sprawl from Bournemouth to Ferndown with West Parley losing its unique identity and become just another small part of a very large conurbation.</p> <p>Green Belt Considerations. These proposals are in direct conflict with current green belt national planning policy CSIDE1, indeed the L.A. has itself successfully used that policy at planning appeals which has been upheld the planning inspectorate, if challenge is the L.A. expecting that given past decisions the planning inspectorate will change this view on green belt policy. Certainly it will be a major consideration if these proposals are called in by the Secretary of State.</p> <p>No tree survey has been carried out particularly in relation to FWP7 or considerations given to the habitat of many protected species of animals which inhabit this site that has established trees, hedge rows and stream that have remained unaltered for 100 of years. Also this area contains public footpaths with associated rights of way. English Nature do not appear to have been consulted in regard to this site nor it would seem have the Rivers Authority. Dudsbury Rings is an important heritage site and this proposed development is too close to this monument not for it to have an impact on protected heritage site. There is no evidence that English Heritage has been consulted in this regard.</p> <p>Sustainability Sustainability should be the mainstay of any planning policy and on FWP5, FWP6, FWP7 and FWP4 the proposals fails to demonstrate that any of these sites are sustainable. To include a un-needed 3300 sp ft supermarket in the plans for FWP6 will not make this site appropriate for housing. It will add considerably to traffic congestion.</p> <p>Lack of consideration for families that will live in these proposed house and their children’s education needs are not address, Parley First School has little or no capacity is over 1.5 miles from these sites and no mention is made of middle or upper schools both in Ferndown and over 2.5 miles away with little or no public transport, putting aside the danger of the number of main roads to be negotiated the increase in car usage will again add to traffic congestion.</p> <p>Transport</p>						

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>Transport seems largely to be ignored and no full traffic survey has been conducted to support or refute these plans. The B3073 crossing New Road from the Airport to Longham at peak times is already operating way beyond its capacity as is New Road. No amount of improvements to Parley Cross will improve the situation. To add 560 new Homes to these roads plus a super market with 22 car space when also adding the proposed increase in traffic at the airport the potential to add in the region of 1000 new cars to this junction is totally un- sustainable and unpractical for both the existing and the would be residents of these proposed developments. The 2 new roads proposed around the proposed building sites will only move congestion from one point to another and do not address the underlying problems of the current over capacity of New Road and the B3073. The industrial estate at the Airport supports over 2000 workers the majority of which in the main commute by car, most with single occupancy and this number is set to increase. This already causes major congestion at peck times The two proposed new roads will not alleviate the problem.</p> <p>With regard to the proposed road too the West from New Road and part of FWP7 this appears to cut across an existing Flood Plain and this issue has not been addressed by way of a Flood Risk Assessment, discussions with the Rivers Authority or an Environmental Report. This site is know to flood in winger and with the changes in climate the situation is unlikely to improve. No evidence that the Environmental Agency has been consulted on this matter. Covering more of this land with a large scale development will only compound the situation.</p> <p>Infrastructure. No evidence is supplied to support on how Surface and Foul Drainage will be accommodated or Gas, Water and Electricity and if the existing local infrastructure can support this addition 560 homes and a new Food Store.</p> <p>Site FWP 6 Another Supermarket in the area is not needed and will only bring in as mentioned much more traffic and delivers to the already overcrowded roads of West Parley. Sufficient supermarkets already exist within 3 mile radius of West Parley and 3 Tesco Express shops exist in a radius of 1 mile of Parley Cross. Also there appears no demand for allotments or orchards. Adequate public open space is already available in the village.</p> <p>Environmental Issues No consideration appears of have been given to the impact that noise will have on these proposed sites due to the location in relation to the flight path to and from Bournemouth Airport. There is no evidence that any sound test have been carried or other environmental issues have been addressed in having large developments close to an expanding airport. Needs Survey and consideration for alternative Brownfield sites There seems little or no evidence that these number of homes are needed in this location and no supporting evidence to</p>						

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description		
											justify 50% affordable. Many undeveloped sites are available in the Ferndown area much closer to schools and local amenities some are Brownfield sites these have the potential to deliver hundreds of homes and that is without the windfall sites that will certainly occur. No consideration has been given to alternatives sites. All the sites above in there present form are totally Unsustainable please I would urge both the elected members and the officers of the council not to dismiss the local residents of the Village of West Parley and deny us our democratic right to have a say in plans that will have a impact massively on the environment in which we live.								
535965	Mr & Mrs Harry Ford		CSPS2401	Policy FWP7							<p>Policies FWP6 and FWP7</p> <p>Firstly, we would like to say that this whole process has been made so complex that it is clearly not written with residents in mind. The official consultation response form is not user friendly and very few will be able to complete this as requested on line. For this reason we have written this letter instead.</p> <p>As residents of West Parley we object to the above mentioned proposals. To lose much of our valuable Green Belt is unacceptable. It is not just green belt they are Key Gaps with Bournemouth. The proposed plans will completely change West Parley's identity and it will lose its village appeal. This was one of the reasons that we moved here in the first place. The proposals are totally inappropriate and improper to West Parley which already has some of the most congested traffic routes in the area. We understand that the link roads will not be constructed until half the houses have been constructed thereby adding further to the problems that the proposed plans will bring. We are quite prepared to accept our share of the housing needs but the proposed 520 new homes is completely out of proportion to the size of West Parley (+32%) and far more than the number proposed for other sites in the surrounding area.</p> <p>Such a development would place pressure on medical services and schools. Our local schools are already oversubscribed. We have children from West Parley being refused entry to all 3 local primary schools (Parley first, Hampreston and Ferndown First) and Ferndown Middle school is also turning away our local children. Having a young daughter, this is of great importance to us.</p> <p>No more commercial outlets are required in this area, especially as future retail trends indicate increased shopping on the internet, out of town supermarkets and retail centres.</p> <p>We are very lucky to have the shops that we already have including: post office, pharmacy, hairdressers, barbers, boutique, Tesco supermarket, beauty salon, veterinary services, kitchen, tiles, bathroom outlets, sewing shop, chiropody and traditional fish and chips, etc.</p> <p>It would appear that the 'West Parley Parish Plan' that was contributed to by 1000 residents has been virtually ignored by the District Council. We do hope that you will now take ours and other local residents views into account.</p>					510			

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
610626	Mr and Mrs Hamilton		CSPS2399	Policy FWP7							Please put a stop to the over development, pollution and traffic nightmares in the West Parley area.				510		
656264	J A Newell		CSPS2330	Policy FWP7							<p>I wish to object to planning proposals FWP6 (300 new homes) and FWP7 (220 new homes)</p> <p>I have included some background information as an introduction to my opposition to the new housing proposals</p> <p>A public meeting was held in 2010 and the West Parley Steering Group was formed from West Parley Parish Council and West Parley Residents Association. A survey was designed for residents to give their views on all aspects of the community over the next 5 – 10 years of which 1,000 residents replied. From this information the West Parley Parish Plan was published with funding contributions from East Dorset District Council, Dorset Community Action, West Parley Parish Council and various local open days. The main points of the plan were -</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Residents like to live in the village, they are not transient and would like to keep its rural open nature. 2. A maximum of 100 new houses are acceptable. Large scale housing development is strongly opposed as the green belt is highly valued. 3. Other topics were mentioned such as roads, traffic, parking and sports and health facilities. <p>In November 2011 the Parish Plan was distributed to all houses in West Parley including EDDC. A meeting was held in West Parley Memorial Hall on 2-12-11 to discuss the Parish Plan. This was when the first piece of information was released to us giving details of perhaps 100 new houses at New Road and 260 at Dudsbury Heights, all on green belt land, by the Parish and District Councillors. The residents were encouraged to write to EDDC councillors stating their objections to large housing developments, general lack of consultation about decisions being made on lack of infrastructure and roads, etc. which is totally unsatisfactory. EDDC planners have ignored government legislation to consult fully with local communities before setting out proposals. EDDC planners have ignored the information in the Parish Plan which sets out residents requirements, all this is unsatisfactory.</p> <p>IN February 2012 we were again urged to e-mail EDDC councillors because the number of houses proposed to be built was approx. 500 at 4 sites at West Parley, a substantial increase to the last estimate of 360. Again all the residents requirements have been ignored. Also it was revealed that the councillors would abstain from voting against the proposal, why, they could have voted for the proposal so that the residents objections could be used to modify the plans. I was also later informed that all points of objection were ignored and that further plans would go ahead on 16th April 2012. I was informed that EDDC would hold an exhibition at West Parley Memorial Hall on 24th April, 2012 and that their planners would attend and explain new plans for building on green belt at New Road. Arrangements around Parley Cross and shopping centre.</p>				510		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>This was the moment that the residents saw the enormity of the proposed new plans FWP6 and FWP7 for West Parley new Housing Development. These plans were detailed proposals setting out new roads, high, medium and low density housing with a total of 520 houses.</p> <p>Building more than 100 homes would destroy West Parley as a village and change its character as it would become part of the Bournemouth urban sprawl. This development once accepted would encourage EDDC and other developers to add even more housing to suit their needs and the loss of the valued green belt would be lost forever.</p> <p>West Parley is in the countryside and has many species of animals and birds which the residents can see from their gardens and official footpaths marked in the surrounding fields, all this would be at risk. The two new main roads which are going through the two developments will channel all existing heavy goods lorries and more in the future to satisfy the increase in demand from shops and services to suit the 520 new homes. It is not going to be an ideal start for children in terms of safety with the possibility of 1,000 cars to join existing heavy goods lorries. As both of the new developments are south of Parley Cross they will be very close to the airport noise envelope of aircraft and increase pollution from aircraft, cars and lorries is not desirable when buying a new dwelling. Parts of both developments are prone to flooding sometimes during the year and will become worse as there will be less surface to soak up rainwater as houses and roads are built. As the commercial side of the airport has been given permission to expand, Parley Cross will be even busier with all types of vehicles.</p> <p>If a hundred homes were built, EDDC would have to supply and pay for roads and services but I understand developments over five hundred the developers are responsible for funding all access roads, so it is easy to see why 520 homes are to be preferred by the EDDC. If this is correct, when asked if an environmental survey had been carried out and agreed with all interested parties, the answer was no that would come later. I thought this a bit odd with a development of this size because, if unsatisfactory, this could be expensive to rectify.</p> <p>Since this last meeting, I have been told that English Heritage has concerns about houses far too near the ancient monument Dudsbury Hill Fort and has concerns that the environmental impact has not yet been considered and are very interested.</p> <p>The timescale for the development was approximately 14 years starting in 2014 but other work could start outside the major development and the two new link roads will not be started until half of the houses are built so Parley Cross would be even busier for a number of years before they are completed and the development completed. Therefore, I ask that there should be more consultation to discuss and consider these plans.</p> <p>West Parley is served with its own infrastructure and has use of Ferndown, Northbourne and Longham for back up but,</p>						

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											although not ideal, is liveable and with future small modifications could be improved. EDDC and local and national policy makers should take into consideration the wishes of West Parley residents and satisfy The Parish Plan also local and government MPs and Ministers are supposed to represent out interests.						
656267	Mr and Mrs Mitchell		CSPS2347	Policy FWP7							Regarding the building plans for West Parley green belt, we refer to policy FWP6. The potential effect of the roads which you intend to build, will have a detrimental impact on New Rd and the roundabout going toward Wimborne Rd and Castle land during peak times. In regards to policy FWP7 it is already difficult to exit Elm Tree Walk during morning and evening rush hour. We have to go up to Chine Walk to be able to get in the right land. The cross roads are well known for it's congestion. How will the roads cope with all the extra cars these houses will bring? No schools or doctor, Tesco, we rest our case.				510		
656268	Lynne and Paul Clayton		CSPS2383	Policy FWP7							We are writing to formally object to the proposed building of 220 houses on the FWP 7 and 300 houses on the FWP6 sites. We believe the consultation process has been unsatisfactory for the following reasons: 1. Government legislation requires full consultation with local communities prior to setting out proposals; this legislation has been ignored by the EDDC planners. 2. The proposed building of 520 houses in West Parley constitutes an increase in the housing stock of around 32%. We feel this is disproportionate and far exceeds what is proposed in other East Dorset localities. 3. The detailed West Parley Parish Plan [2011] was produced following significant consultation with residents. The vast majority of residents are against having any more than 100 houses built in the West Parley area. The plan was well published and copies were forwarded to EDDC who appear to have ignored the opinion of the community. 4. The elected UK Government policy is to protect the green belt. Locally the green belt areas are boundaries which form an integral part of the West Parley identity and act as key gaps between us and the Bournemouth and Ferndown sprawl. 5. As members of the RSPB and the Woodland Trust we are extremely concerned regarding the effect of the proposals will have upon the West Parley environment. Our quality of life is enriched by living adjacent to and having access to open countryside with the associated sighting of birds and wildlife. 6. The local infrastructure, particularly the roads, throughout the parish is currently inadequate and would be overwhelmed by the addition of the proposed two new roads. 7. Too much reliance has been placed by EDDC on communication via electronic means, a presumption appears to have been made that all residents have internet access. This is not the case and has both disadvantaged and caused stress to those unable to access the necessary information in order to make an informed response.				510		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
											The proposal for a supermarket on Site FWP6 is not warranted. The West Parley area is already well served by the major retailers Sainsburys, Tesco and Lidl within three miles plus two Tesco express branches in West Parley itself. The ensuing increase in traffic will add to the already overloaded West Parley traffic lights site and environs. Dudsbury Rings is a significant local heritage site; the proposed building on site FWP 7 is too close to guarantee the protection of Dudsbury Rings. We strongly urge you to reconsider the proposals.							
656272	Mr Ronald Daw		CSPS2394	Policy FWP7							The proposed two new roads would considerably relieve crossroads congestion and make it much easier to cross New Road as a pedestrian in the vicinity of the shops. I have concerns that it is possible for a great deal of development to take place without these new roads being built. I consider the high density of housing proposed is totally out of keeping with the character of the area. It is likely to rapidly become a slum enclave with a lack of car parking affecting the surrounding area. Reason: Small cars are getting smaller and cheaper and the trend is for every person to own such car in addition to a larger car for families. Small cars will probably be battery electric and collision avoidance systems will enable a wider ownership than today (e.g. younger and older people etc.) We can expect considerable changes over the next 20 years. If self-driving cars become acceptable, things could be very different, one car serving many people rather like a taxi and it could be sent away to part and summoned by telephone. The development of this area took place in 1960's and the then planners, in their wisdom, left green belt areas they considered appropriate. I see no reason to justify overturning their decisions.				510			
656276	A R Pearce		CSPS2480	Policy FWP7							I wish to object to the building of 300 houses on the FWP6 and 220 houses on the FWP7 sites. 1) My wife and I moved here in late 1998 as West Parley appeared a location which enjoyed a nice balance of rural and urban facilities. We have found that our neighbours, of all age groups, were of the same opinion. We also found that they were prepared to enhance and jealously protect the area against inappropriate development. The West Parley Residents Association was the outcome of this regard as was the subsequent election of its members to the local parish council. Over the years by dint of meetings and all manner of communication we have made our views clear to the EDDC. It now appears that those whom we have elected have continued to conspire against us, and by stealth and cunning would undo all that we have worked for. 2) Since we have been here, I have yet to meet a so called "NIMBY" in our midst! Most residents are aware that reasonable changes are inevitable and that an increase in housing can be accepted within the Green Belt without destroying its very intent. The increase in housing proposed in policies FWP6 and FWP7 are beyond belief! An increase of				510			

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
											<p>over a third in our housing stock is the rationale of the asylum. Any sane plan would first ensure the adequacy of an infrastructure capable of accepting such a change. It should be the primary consideration rather than following the ravages of greedy speculative development. Even a cursory visit to the vicinity would conclude that it was already overloaded and priorities were in need of careful consideration.</p> <p>3) Local residents have had no input to policies FWP6 and FWP7, it is a dictat, conceived in the secrecy of EDDC's comfortable offices.</p> <p>Why have EDDC departed from what was agreed in the 2010 plans?</p> <p>What consideration was given to our own Parish Plan?</p> <p>Why were we not fully involved or consulted as promised by the national government?</p> <p>What evidence have EDDC got that there is a current demand for the number of dwellings proposed? What type of dwellings are envisaged; are they all to be "affordable" or varied to match the locality?</p> <p>Will their construction (e.g. foundations) be adequate to a predicted rising flood plain?</p> <p>4) In view of the above, I suggest that these proposals are carefully reconsidered and that the West Parley community is shown the courtesy of having it's views heard.</p> <p>P.S. During a recent T.V. news item depicting the Olympic Stadium's opening centre-piece; namely England's Green and Pleasant Land; I was relieved to note that it was entirely rural in content. Not a hint of an ill conceived development!</p>							
656330	Ms Eileen Mussell		CSPS2498	Policy FWP7							<p>I object to the loss of any West Parley green belt. The West Parley green belt is a precious and integral part of the parish. An open space designed in part to control urban sprawl; it seems ironic that our District Council proposes to destroy this bulwark with the very thing it was meant to prevent.</p> <p>The proposals for this development have been pushed through without consultation; and completely ignores the West Parley Parish Plan supported by over a thousand residents. The development will profoundly alter the unique character of West Parley forever; and yet the residents are obliged to respond with detailed objections on the District Council's terms, as though it were a backland development of a few spare fields.</p> <p>Policy FWP6 and Policy FWP7 will smother the green belt land with five hundred and twenty houses; a supermarket and other sundry infrastructure. This open ended project will entail major road alterations; cause massive disruption, and create long-term congestion at Parley Cross, which is already a congested nightmare.</p> <p>The District Council's casual disregard of a West Parley Plan comes as no surprise; A Residents Association telling them what they want; whatever next. Their apparent contempt for the democratic process sets a new low in their relationship with West Parley rate-paying residents.</p>					510		
656335	Mr and Mrs		CSPS2536	Policy							We strongly oppose the proposition to build more houses on				510			

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description		
	Downward			FWP7							Green Belt in New Road & Dudsbury Heights field. These are Key Gaps. Not only this, but we travel into Bournemouth every day to work and already there are considerable holdups at Parley Cross & Kinson roundabout – the bridge over the river between Bournemouth & West Parley – the thought of 520 more families – a potential of 1000 more cars on that road is unthinkable. It is time that you listened to those of us who live here. We do not want to lose our green fields								
656342	Peter Rees		CSPS2522	Policy FWP7							I am writing to express my deep concern at the plan to increase West Parley Housing stock by 520 houses, a 32% increase. The attraction of West Parley as a place to live is the surrounding green fields which separate us from the Bournemouth conurbation. This green belt, it seems is to be desecrated by the massive building plans which are being considered, especially the plans designated FWP6 and FWP7. Parley cross roads already seems to be at the limit of traffic capacity at certain times, so yet more traffic, possibly hundreds more cars per day will make it intolerable. I understand that 2 new link roads are to be built, but only after half the houses have been built and that may mean many years of traffic congestion. I was one of a 1000 residents who contributed to the West Parley Parish Plan, but it appears the District Council has virtually ignored it. Are our wishes actually being represented or is the democratic principal dead? Please consider and respect the wishes of the existing residents.					510			
656350	D A Cook and J.B Randall		CSPS2526	Policy FWP7							We are absolutely against the above proposals which would appear to have been compiled by people who know nothing about West Parley. West Parley has already grown extensively from the village it was, but it has retained its “cosy” feel with green belt areas which are so important in this country as a whole. We do not want a continuous town/city running all the way along the south. We MUST keep our green “Key Gaps”. The traffic in New Road and Christchurch Road is already horrendous. 520 more houses, as proposed, will add in excess of 500 more cars. Even social and “affordable” housing generates at least 1 car per household and, in many cases, there will be 2. The effect of all these extra vehicles will be widespread. The road past the Airport is already a nightmare and not only at commuter times. We travel that road frequently, at different times of day and it is almost always really busy. Parley Cross will have long queues of traffic and pedestrians trying to cross the road will find it near impossible. Holiday traffic will make things even worse. How are public services and schools going to cope with this huge influx of people? Utility services are already overloaded, schools are fully subscribed, Doctors and Dentists, too, will be strained beyond the limit. Please reconsider the whole situation. We none of us mind a small number of new houses, maybe infilling of large plots, but not greenbelt. Greenbelt areas were provided to prevent					510			

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
											building of large estates and for the benefit of the people who chose to buy their homes in a semi-rural setting.							
656353	Mrs Mary Morrish		CSPS2527	Policy FWP7							With reference to the Housing Plans for West Parley, could I point out that to build on the Dudsbury Heights field – FWP7 – would upset the water table quite dramatically. There are at least 6 springs that start in that area. Also, to take a road from New road through where the horses are at present, would be going through a flood plain at the recent rains and flooded area proved. The water table is naturally high in these areas and to cover it with, yet more, concrete & tarmac doesn't seem very sensible!				510			
656361	Mrs E Hutchings-Clarke		CSPS2530	Policy FWP7							To The Policy Planning Consultation. Im not sure where to start, so I will begin with a little family background. We live at the top of Dudsbury Hill opposite the Dudsbury Pub entrance. Our house was built in 1930 &* my grandparents owned the property from new. Two years later my father was born in our house & grew up here. Over the years weve heard some fantastic stories about his childhood & adventures he & his friends have had in the surrounding areas & especially over the river. He has certainly seen some changes. Being a builder he built his own bungalow two doors away from his parents home on a piece of land they owned. As time went by he married my mum. His father sadly passed away but his mother stayed & worked in the house & area. As children my sister & I spent most weekends at the house with my Grandmother. We can remember looking out of the top front room bedroom over looking Christchurch road & counting the cars coming up from Parley cross (as it was then called) we would count maybe 10 in half an hour. We counted more rabbits in the field opposite than cars on the road. When my Grandmother died in the house my father kept the house, it was empty for 13 years until we moved in. While I realize things must changed my point is that area has changed considerably already. West Parley was some farms & a church at the end of Church lane. Parley Cross was the crossroads where the shops are & We don't know why Dudsbury lost its name, this is the area going up the hill from the Crossroads to the boundary with Longham. We were very upset when a sign saying Welcome to West Parley was erected as we feel Dudsbury is now lost & swallowed up into West Parley. When we asked the council about the sign they just said "There's not enough room for too many signs". We really feel West Parley is going to be swallowed up & become a suburb of Bournemouth, this would be a great shame as West Parley & Dudsbury are very historical places. Referring to policy FWP7 the 220 houses & the new road planned for the Dudsbury Heights field near the hill fort. I am very concerned about the houses here as they are going to be built opposite us. The road at the moment cant cope, some days its taken me at least 5 mins to get out of my drive & onto Christchurch road. About 500 more cars would be trying to				510			

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
											<p>use the same road & this would be mayhem! You may say put traffic lights in or some other traffic calming system but then you loose the village feel we all love & want to live in. Also I have to ask what about our house prices? Surely this will de-value them? The new road that is proposed to come out onto Christchurch Road near us will cause more hold ups & be even more chaotic.</p> <p>Referring to policy FWP6 300 houses, shopping centre & new road.</p> <p>Our road systems cant cope at the moment so why make a congested area even more congested? There will be at least 600 more cars. We will need more schools, Doctors, Dentists etc. While this will mean more jobs it will also mean more chaos & a less village feel.</p> <p>Summing up we will have nearly 1000 more cars on the roads in this area alone. . Its just the Parley area but the whole area including Ferndown, North borne, Longham & Canford Bottom. More houses mean more cars & people.</p> <p>I need to ask two questions</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Do the people proposing this building & expansion live in the area? If not would they be so willing to have a town built around their village? 2. Why hasn't the Dormy site been built on? <p>Also If we build on Green belt land that was there in the first place to stop Urban Sprawl we cant get this land back! Once its gone.</p>							
656363	Mrs Gwen Wells		CSPS2534	Policy FWP7							<p>I was horrified to read how you are proposing to solve the "problems" of Parley X roads, and this without any consultation with the local people which is against the Government's new policy. (We all have a say in how our local environment is handled). This just came out of the blue which just is not on. Parley as everybody knows is a green belt dividing area between Ferndown & Bournemouth. To destroy this would not only destroy for ever the semi-rural character of Parley & Dudsbury – just in one fell swoop – It is a busy X Roads but not any worse than other Junctions around here (I have lived here all my life). It is one of those things if you live in East Dorset. You would do away with everything that keeps it a pleasant semi-rural to live in. Do away with the fields, Hedges, trees and even verges, build more shops, 300 houses new Rds and you have another town. A few small steps of green here and there do not make an area a pleasant division between large areas of town. It takes the green belt and that is what has saved Parley & Dudsbury. We have had lovely shops at Parley X but they have had to close because of lack of support. Most people do their shopping in the large super markets and there are plenty around & shopping outlets everywhere. The only way to create a division between Ferndown & Bournemouth would be to leave Parley alone & I'm sure people would rather wait a few minutes at the lights than see the whole are ruined. There is no alternative and if the local people & Council had been consulted (as is their right) then this would have been obvious. We live around here because we like it as it is. These schemes to make traffic</p>					510		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
											move faster is no answer and would call for more problems than they solve.							
656366	Mr & Mrs B Brunsdon		CSPS2541	Policy FWP7							<p>Once again the Residents of West Parley have been put into a very poor position regarding the proposed building on the Green Belt.</p> <p>Have the powers to be really thought out all the points which the residents are constantly putting forward.</p> <p>We all appreciate we shall have to have some building in the area but surely not the level proposed.</p> <p>The policies FWP6 and FWP7 are what the District Council thinks are food for us. So different from what we were originally consulted on.</p> <p>We read link roads will not be started until some of the houses are built. How come? Lorries etc. will be using already congested roads. Very dangerous.</p> <p>The New Road and Dudsbury heights fields are at the best Key Gaps between linking Bournemouth and West Parley. It looks to us in the future it will be lone gigantic building area with us joining directly onto the outskirts of Bournemouth.</p> <p>An increase of 32 per cent in housing stock in West Parley seems we consider to be very excessive.</p> <p>How can the area support this. Do we get more Doctors, Dentists etc. for all the new residents and how about schooling.</p> <p>We really feel there needs to be a lot more consultations and notice taken from the residents before any of the proposed plans can go a head.</p>				510			
656372	Mrs M C Rees		CSPS2557	Policy FWP7							<p>Please register my objections to the Core Strategy Pre-Submission. I am particularly concerned with the two planning proposals known as FWP6 and FWP7. These two proposals would lead to a massive and unsustainable increase in the size of West Parley. They are ill thought out and have been developed without the support or even the consultation of the local community. They bear little resemblance to the proposals originally consulted upon. West Parley Parish Council have been ignored, as have the wishes of the West Parley residents.</p> <p>These proposals would destroy whole tracts of the Green Belt. Such unforgivable vandalism would diminish Dorset and would also choke West Parley cross roads with even more traffic. West Parley's status as an independent village, separate and distinct from Bournemouth would be seriously compromised. The proposed population increase would amount to 32% increase in the size of the village in a relatively short period. Such an increase would be wholly unsustainable and would seriously damage if not destroy the village.</p> <p>The Green Belt should only be encroached upon under exceptional circumstances. It most certainly should not be discarded because the local council find it an inconvenience. The Green belt areas you plan to destroy are Key Gaps separating West Parley from Bournemouth. They must remain sacrosanct.</p> <p>West Parley is a small village that already has to contend with</p>				510			

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description		
											the notorious West Parley cross roads. According to these two proposals, new link roads will not even be started until half of this proposed new build on Green Belt land has been completed. Yet Parley Cross roads are already over capacity. Please rethink these divisive and environmentally damaging proposals.								
656376	Mr and Mrs W D Pyke		CSPS2570	Policy FWP7							<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We consider that the 220 houses planned for Dudsbury heights to be extremely detrimental to the well-being of existing residents in that it will considerably add to traffic congestion & rob the area of its distinctive feature of providing a "green space" between Bournemouth and Ferndown. Many of the residents of West Parley (including ourselves) will have been drawn to this area by the existence of this green space (and will have considered it to be reasonably protected by being a "Key Gap") We therefore wish to register our objection to Policy FWP7. We consider Policy FWP6 to be ill considered to give scant consideration to the impact of traffic on the already congested New Road. We are concerned that you appear to have taken little heed of West Parley's Parish plan and treat this area, already robbed of open recreational space by the building on Poor Common, is being asked to bear a disproportionate burden to that being imposed on other areas of East Dorset. 					510			
656382	Mr & Mrs D G Moody		CSPS2578	Policy FWP7							<p>SUBJECT: The desecration of West Parley</p> <p>To whom it may concern,</p> <p>As long term residents of West Parley we are appalled at the proposal to build 520 houses in the village.</p> <p>Our property fronts onto New Road, and over the last 52 years we have lived here the traffic has increased by 10,0005</p> <p>At times it is life threatening to get in or out of our own property.</p> <p>To build 300 houses and shops on the Green Belt directly under the flight path of a greatly expanding airport defies credibility and the extra traffic joining New Road is a recipe for chaos.</p> <p>If the thought of ever increasing council tax revenues drives the District Council, think again, big brother Bournemouth and over the past century every village and parish adjoining the old boundary has been swallowed up, including Kinson when that expanded.</p> <p>Overrule documents PPSD, the core strategy and all the other documents!</p> <p>Listen to the concerns of West Parley residents and their Parish Council, and do your best for them.</p> <p>After all we love living here and are well aware of the pitfalls the proposed development will cause.</p> <p>Concerned West Parley residents</p>						510		
656390	Mrs Karen Brittain		CSPS2543	Policy FWP7	No					Yes	We moved to this area of West Parley just over two years ago to live among quiet like minded mature people, without too many children running around. Now, we find that suddenly the District Council propose to build three hundred & twenty houses East of New road, West Parley, plus a further two					510			

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
											<p>hundred homes West of New Road, with a minimum of 50% being affordable, which is a whopping 32% increase for West Parley. This is totally unacceptable to us, particularly as over half of the new properties would be affordable. If we had wanted to live near a Council Estate, we would have moved to West Howe, not West Parley.</p> <p>Where is the proof that these houses are actually needed. This land is green belt Land, which are "key gaps" between West Parley & Bournemouth, to prevent "urban sprawl" which is the very thing that you are now proposing, without, may I add, even the decency to consult us until this late stage. You cannot just "move" green belt land to where it suits you. The land is used as agricultural land at the moment, & it is against national policy to build on such land. A 32% increase in housing also brings problems with traffic, schools, employment & health. Where are these people coming from to fill five hundred & twenty houses? That is over one thousand people plus children. Most councils are demolishing such estates, not building them. Putting main roads through a housing estate is utter madness, & very dangerous for children.</p> <p>The District Council has totally ignored the wishes of local residents, & in fact, held meetings, & made decisions where residents were not even allowed to speak. This, alone, makes the proposals unsound, & undemocratic. One thousand residents responded to the West Parley Parish plan which was totally ignored.</p> <p>I submit to you that these proposals are unsound, unproven against National Policy, & certainly against the wishes of the local community.</p>							
656402	Mrs Jean Williams		CSPS2566	Policy FWP7							<p>I am writing with my views on the building and drastic changes you are suggesting for West Parley. Firstly though I would say how under hand and undemocratic you have been. You seem to fo ignored The west parley residents and then only given us 12 weeks to respond. The plans that you have put forward are completely different from anything you put forward in your 2010 plans and have not involved the residents or the parish council.</p> <p>I do realise that there may have to be a small amount of building in the area (although I do not want any, I think West Parley is a big enough village0. To help the economy, create work and homes but I feel 520 houses an increase of 32% in one small village is way too much. Plus another 30 dwellings at Coppins and 110 at Holmwood which is just over a mile up the road.</p> <p>Where are all the services to accommodate 660 dwellings. The schools in Ferndown are full. There is a waiting list at Parley First School. I have to wait a week for a doctors appointment now, and there is no dentist and there is no mention from you at all of increasing these services.</p> <p>We do not need a new HIGH Street this is a village not a town. Shops are empty everywhere. Before Tesco took on the shop at the cross it was empty for 2 years and that was before the recession. No one wanted it.</p>				510			

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
											<p>You have not said what there is going to be for all the children moving into the area, are they just going to hang around the streets? Another recipe for disaster.</p> <p>This whole area is important to wild life and you are taking 6,6% of our green belt in West Parley alone which is a huge amount..</p> <p>The fields near the bridge is a flood plain which regularly floods plus the water runs down the Ridgeway from the top fields.</p> <p>The fields in West Parley and Dudsbury Heights are key gaps to separate us from Bournemouth and prevent urban sprawl, without this we will just become part of Bournemouth.</p> <p>The new link roads will just become (rat runs) going through housing estates which will be a big danger to all that live there. Also you say about the new shops, the link roads will be taking the traffic away from the shops and there will be no trade. People will just not bother with it. You have not said any thing about car parking either.</p> <p>What happened to the gyratory in your last set of plans??????????</p> <p>If the new roads are not going to be built until half the houses are built how is West Parley going to copy with all the traffic that 660 houses will bring.</p> <p>32% increase in houses in West Parley is way more than is being imposed on Corfe Mullen, Ferndown, Wimborne or Verwood. Maybe you could explain to me why.</p> <p>West Parley is on the flight path for the airport and I always thought that that fields in this area were a safety net for the airport. A prime example last year was the Red Arrow crash. If this all goes ahead.</p> <p>Where are the children going to go to school.? Will I be dead before I can get a doctors appointment? The green belt was put in place to safeguard our countryside and you are taking it away. What happens in 10-20-30 years time. Will you take more. What will happen to our green and pleasant land and the green English countryside ???</p>							
656425	Mrs M H Marsh		CSPS2601	Policy FWP7							<p>As a resident in the part of Dorset I feel I must add my concern to others about the proposed building etc. that is being planned.</p> <p>I am old & may not see what happens, but I am very sad to think how utterly ruined this part of the world will be, by more Houses, New roads, thousands of cars etc. Danger to all children & the elderly & disastrous to protected species of animals.</p> <p>We would need more shops, where? And the traffic through here would be just unbearable</p> <p>Bournemouth is already joined up with Poole & Christchurch & we really don't need to get rid of the small bit of countryside we now enjoy.</p> <p>The proposed amount of extra houses in West Parley represents an enormous increase, I'm told about 32%. There would not be adequate Schools, Doctors, Dentists etc. Where would we go to cope with these shortages? And where would we park to do our shopping?</p>				510			

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											It is all a nightmare, please think again.						
656434	Mr D Ware		CSPS2672	Policy FWP7							<p>Having been a resident in the area for more than 30 years I am very unhappy with the proposed buildings and additional houses planned for West Parley.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The detrimental affect on appearance and the adverse affect on recreational activities such as Jogging and walking. 2. 2. The extra traffic will be dangerous & the additional cars will make travelling more difficult & time consuming. 3. Facilities will be inadequate, and I name (?) medical services as an example. Where it will become more difficult to make an appointment or to receive the necessary service. I hope further time and thought will be given to this project. 				510		
656444	Mrs Eileen Walters		CSPS2587	Policy FWP7							<p>I have attended meetings held in West Parley Memorial Hall where I have studied detailed planning maps and listened to all the arguments and discussions from the floor which confirmed my reasons for writing to you.</p> <p>West Parley is a delight to live in, and I cannot condone the turmoil which all these plans will cause. Traffic is sure to cause unbelievable chaos – 500 (at least) more cars – buses to take children to school – delivery vans and yet more shops – more buses to provide the elderly. I really don't need to go on listing all the ideas the District Council has seemed to think we need, without any consultation with West Parley Parich Council and residents. How high handed of you to assume we will allow such a carve up without a word. I hope you will accept very seriously the fact that we know best those, that live here, that your plans are not even Viable and would destroy this beautiful area, We cannot educate hundreds more children – we haven't enough schooling to Accommodate then – I doubt If any of my thoughts as a resident have even green sensibly considered – please consider them now.</p>				510		
656453	M Smith		CSPS2589	Policy FWP7							<p>I am writing at your request because I don't think West Parley can take all these proposed changes.</p> <p>First I object to the building of 220 houses at Dudsbury Heights. This is a beautiful area of countryside and all these houses will generate so much traffic it will be too much for Christchurch Road to cope with, especially with the houses to be built at Coppins.</p> <p>I also think the houses supermarket etc proposed for Parley Cross is really not going to be of any be of any benefit without a school NHS facilities etc.</p> <p>It would take a great deal of infrastructure to sort out traffic, its just ridiculous.</p> <p>I may say I have lived here for 40 years now and brought up three daughters who all went to local schools and I appreciate that if people had objected to the building of this estate I would not be living here now but I still think the current proposals are too much for this area, so I would like to see some compromises.</p> <p>Good luck with the consultation</p>				510		
656475	Mrs M		CSPS2593	Policy FWP7							I am completely & utterly opposed to both Policy FWP7 &				510		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description		
	Hovell										FWP6. I was born in ?? was country – Farnham Common, Bucks but spent all my working life in a suburb of London, so it was a joy to retire to West Parley, where I could spend my remaining years in a very pleasant location. The thought of all those houses being built in Dudsbury Heights FWP7 and another load under FWP6 is appalling & it would turn West Parley into a horrible urban sprawl. Keep West Parley as it is & do not turn it into a horrid little town.								
656481	J Church		CSPS2598	Policy FWP7							NO MORE HOUSES FOR DUDSBURY HEIGHTS FIELD NEAR OLD HILL FORT FWP6 NO TO 300 HOUSES AND SUPERMARKET SHOPPING CENTRE NO TO THE NEW LINK ROAD NO MORE CARS WANTED IN THIS AREA.				510				
656489	Mrs Barbara MacFarlane		CSPS2600	Policy FWP7	No					No	I have lived in West Parley since 1948 when my parents moved into New Road when I was 2 yrs old. There have been many changes in all those years. The shops at Parley Cross, with 2 large Blue Cedars outside of Mrs ??? sweet shop, taken down replaced the removed - natural progress, But the Green Belt areas were always sacrosanct and the serious consideration of putting 300 houses onto such a site (FWP6) is reprehensible – when these areas of Green Belt are ploughed away forever West Parley will be a lot worse for it – not only that precious site, but the Dudsbury Heights field near the Old Hill fort which is an area of great interest and Beauty to all who are familiar with it. These “proposed” sites will not only cause even worse congestion to Christchurch Rd and New Rd during months, if not years of the development of these sites, causing unbearable Rush Hour congestion which is certainly dreadful at present. What about our Parish Plan encouraged by the District Council? Why are they choosing to ignore the wishes of more than 1000 residents and our excellent Parish Council – who are these handful of (paid) people who take over our neighborhoods making decisions which don’t affect them – where are the Link Rds? They can’t possibly decrease the traffic that filters onto the Christchurch Rd – New Rd, so perhaps even more of our precious Green Belt land will be taken to satisfy even more traffic. This cannot be justified under any circumstances. Im sure that being “ consistent with National Policy” in West Parleys case is unsound and eventually ineffective, as such developments with presumably houses that will have at least four people in residence possibly 1 – 4 cars in each. Children who have to be scooled, medical services - fire brigade, ambulances etc etc. No wonder a new Supermarket & shopping centre are also thrown into the mix (as if we don’t have enough of those already!) bringing even more traffic into West Parley and beyond. I do hope that these comments will be at least taken into account when making decisions that affect so many people,				510				

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											who really care about the area in which we've chosen to live and in which our children and Grandchildren have been blessed to enjoy the woods, fields and Commonland as their playground.						
656499	Mr R J Leaper		CSPS2614	Policy FWP7							<p>Consultation to the Green Belt Plans</p> <p>Not so long ago, the river Stour was straightened, houses were demolished and services were put in place, to take a new road across from Redhill Avenue direct to Hurn. A brilliant traffic relieving development at the time, and would be even more so today to relieve us of the problems at Parley Cross.</p> <p>Why are you not pushing for this now? It is logical solution to the problems that are being proposed for the area. A huge percentage of the traffic coming to Parley Cross go to Hurn. A huge percentage of that traffic could use that new road, if it was there. Why can't you see this? Why are you not doing some about it? It doesn't take a wise may to see the logic of it.</p> <p>As for the housing proposed it would be a crime to allow it to happen. To destroy Parley as we know it just to satisfy Politicians needs for extra housing, to house a rising population who are not even true British, and you know what I am saying, even if our Politicians are too afraid to say it. Keep Parley as it is, don't let people in London who haven't got a clue about us, ruin Parley for ever for us, who love it for the way it is.</p>				510		
656503	Mrs O Knowelden		CSPS2616	Policy FWP7							<p>Thank you for giving us the opportunity to give our views on the Green Belt Plan.</p> <p>There won't be a "Green Belt" with all the plans that are being put forward.</p> <p>I have lived in West Parley since 1954 – my husband died in 2006. I am 85yrs old! Now I have seen this area grow since then from a lovely small village to the part of a bigger town of Ferndown. Now there will be no space between us and North Bournemouth.</p> <p>I hate to think of more roads at Parley Cross to make it difficult to cross to get to more shops. We certainly need more shops at Parley as the 1st Parade was, but after TESCO & SAINSBURY came, they all went (well, nearly). No more of these, thank you!!</p> <p>My son & family now live here & they don't need more traffic & NOISE it is bad enough with traffic, sirens & aircraft!!</p> <p>Please keep the GREEN BELT in this lovely area.</p>				510		
656520	Joyce Woolnough		CSPS2546	Policy FWP7							<p>As residents of West Parley, we would like to draw your attention to our comments regarding some of the Policies under consultation:</p> <p>Ref: Policy FWP6 (Plans for 300 houses, supermarket and shopping centre & link road)</p> <p>Ref: Policy FWP7 (Plans for 220 houses and the new Road)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The New Road and Dudsbury heights fields are not just green belt; they are "Key Gaps" with Bournemouth, there to 				510		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>prevent urban sprawl. We want to remain as West Parley – the policies above will join our conurbations and create urban sprawl a contradiction in terms.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why are we having a 32% increase in our housing stock? Our Parish Plan clearly outlined our aspirations, a plan encouraged by the District Council; it appears that as residents we have been ridiculed, as these have not been considered at all. We are meant to live in a democratic society – we have not been consulted during the preparation of these new plans at all! • Both link roads will cause more congestion, during construction of the properties and more so after completion once occupied. We live on the main Christchurch Road, and have seen an increase in traffic since we moved here 4 years ago. • More noise, pollution and more industrial vehicles on this road already in 4 years, surely this is will increase the problems we already have a) with the ignorance of speed restrictions by drivers, b) no crossings midway for the pedestrians and horse riders c) more cyclists on our service road more hazards to create accidents d) more airport traffic. • No regard for our wildlife and any endangered species that will be affected. • What's it going to be like at Parley Cross, more congestion on all main roads backing up causing more delays at many more times of the day. • All with the added problem of a new shopping parade and the parking, entry and exit dilemmas associated with these amenities, in an area already over its capacity. • How will it affect local businesses already in situ at Parley Cross • As for link roads passing through urban areas, surely this has not been thought through from a safety aspect for residents particularly for young children or the elderly. • Where are the children from families taking residence in these new homes going to school are their enough places in our existing local education facilities? • What plans have been thought for welfare, medical and dentistry requirements & local transport? <p>On 14th February we sent a e-mail to 35 Councillors, we received replies from Cllr J Wilson, Cllr S Lugg, Cllr B Manuel and Spencer Flower, only 4, that's only 11%. Its obvious where the other 31 votes are"! You're definitely not listening to us residents, is this because it does not effect each of you personally where you live? Please consider our views we really do care about where we live in West Parley.</p>						
359478	Mr Rohan Torkildsen	English Heritage	CSPS2745	Policy FWP7	No						<p>NPPF Section 12 – Conserving and Enhancing the HE. Paragraph 129. Q1. Has the Plan assessed the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal (including by development affecting the setting of a heritage asset) taking account of the available evidence and any necessary expertise.</p>	It is our expert opinion that this proposal lies too close the Scheduled Monument of Dudsbury Camp and that if implemented it will have a negative			510		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
											<p>NPPF Section 12 – Conserving and Enhancing the HE. Paragraph 129.</p> <p>Q2. Has the significance of the heritage asset been taken into account when considering the impact of a proposal on it, to avoid or minimise conflict between the heritage asset’s conservation and any aspect of the proposal?</p> <p>NPPF Section 12 – Conserving and Enhancing the HE. Paragraph 132.</p> <p>Q3. Has the impact of any proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset and their setting been given to the asset’s conservation?</p> <p>NPPF – Plan making. Paragraph 152.</p> <p>Q4. Are there any significant adverse impacts on the protection of the HE and have alternative options which reduce or eliminate such impacts should be pursued?</p> <p>Please also refer to English Heritage letter to ED&C dated 1 June 2012 which provides a more detailed response to this proposal.(Set out below)</p> <p>A. There is a lack of available evidence by the necessary expertise to demonstrate an appreciation of the particular significance of Dudsbury Hillfort and its setting.</p> <p>A. There appears to be a lack of understanding of the significance of the hillfort’s setting in light of the proposed 75 metre buffer. The basis/justification for the figure is unclear.</p> <p>A. We consider this is not the case.</p> <p>A. There are significant adverse affects and the proposed mitigation (75 m buffer) is insufficient to overcome substantial harm.</p> <p>Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy Land to the West of New Road at Ridgeway, West Parley I refer to the current consultation.</p> <p>In advance of a comprehensive reply to the draft Core Strategy please find a specific response to the proposal at West Parley. I hope it can help inform your discussions at the public meeting on 11 June.</p> <p>The proposed new neighbourhood lies immediately east of Dudsbury Camp, a prehistoric hillfort and designated Scheduled Monument (reference 1003583).</p> <p>The hillfort’s setting is affected by housing development to the north and golf course to the west, whilst this proposal will result in development to the east.</p> <p>The hillfort clearly contributes to the areas identity, its local distinctiveness and is an important part of the areas cultural heritage – its history.</p> <p>As a nationally significant heritage asset the hillfort and its setting are protected by the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979 and the National Planning Policy Framework, March 2012 (NPPF). The PPS5 Historic Environment Planning Practice Guide, March 2010 (still extant) and The Setting of Heritage Assets, English Heritage October 2011 are also particularly relevant in relation to this case.</p> <p>Unfortunately the Core Strategy and evidence base only make fleeting reference to the hillfort by stating that, for example, development is to be kept at least 75 metres away</p>	<p>impact on its setting.</p> <p>The north-western part of the development is of particular concern although the western edge is also likely to have an impact and consideration should be given to pulling this back. This accords with paragraph 129 of the NPPF.</p> <p>As it stands we do not feel that paragraph 10.39* of the Core Strategy has been met. The LPA should also be reminded that significant archaeological remains may survive beyond the boundary of the Scheduled Monument and that these will need to be properly assessed. Paragraph 139 of the NPPF states 'Non-designated heritage assets of archaeological interest that are demonstrably of equivalent significance to scheduled monuments, should be considered subject to the policies for designated heritage assets'.</p> <p>We strongly recommend the extent and form of this proposal is reconsidered. As it stands English Heritage consider the proposal is contrary to the NPPF and the Plan as a consequence is UNSOUND.</p> <p>Note, the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be attached to its conservation.</p>						

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
											<p>and open space used to maintain its integrity. There is no specific evidence to demonstrate an understanding of the significance of the Iron Age hillfort has informed the principal of development in this location nor is it explained how such an assessment has informed the proposed mitigation and design response to it e.g. the 75m buffer.</p> <p>In addition to the impact of the development on the setting and integrity of the hillfort, consideration must be given to the future implications of an increased public use of the scheduled monument that is likely to occur as a result of the development. How can this be managed positively? How can the development contribute to the upkeep, appreciation and enjoyment of this historic landmark? What condition is it in? The particular characteristics that contribute to the monument's significance must be defined. This understanding must in turn be used to assess whether the significance will be conserved. I refer to NPPF paragraph 169, 129 and 132 for example. This requirement was clearly set out in formal English Heritage correspondence to you in May 2008 and in particular January 2011.</p> <p>"To ensure the national significance of Dudsbury camp is conserved (protected and enhanced), its values must first be fully appreciated. The immediate and wider significance of the historic landscape must also be understood. Specific detailed evidence must therefore be gathered to inform consideration of the areas suitability, the proximity and the form of any future potential development".</p> <p>Furthermore when this scheme was first mooted as part of the Regional Spatial Strategy in 2006 English Heritage expressed major reservations and offered to explain the constraints presented by the monument and the work necessary to assess the scope for development, if any, at this location. This offer was never taken up and, in the absence of further information, our position remains unchanged.</p> <p>To deliver sustainable development in accordance with the NPPF there is an expectation that such irreplaceable heritage assets are conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance so that they can be enjoyed by future generations. At present it is unclear this will be the case and a consequence this proposal is not in accordance with national policy and the Plan as a whole is therefore unsound. I therefore strongly recommended specialist advice is commissioned as soon as possible to address the above matters and that the aforementioned national policy and guidance is applied.</p> <p>In light of these comments you may also consider whether the same concerns apply to other sites promoted in the Core Strategy as these too will be expected to have been assessed and informed by explicit historic environment evidence. You may wish to consider a single district wide piece of work. The Historic Environment assessment prepared for Wiltshire Council by LUC consultants is a recent local example which may provide a useful reference.</p>	<p>Scheduled monuments are considered to be of the highest significance along with World Heritage Sites and similar.</p>						

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
360116	Mr A G King		CSPS2577	Policy FWP7							<p>I wish to place my concerns about the planning proposals for West Parley on record. In writing I am mindful of pages 220 of the Core Strategy Document and 57 of the National Policy Framework Document, plus the now superseded Government Document PPS12.</p> <p>I am a resident of Church Lane, West Parley and was attracted to the area due to its separate identity from Bournemouth and to a lesser extent the remainder of Ferndown. This separation is achieved by the open spaces that exist between West Parley and the rest of the conurbation. If building is allowed on these vital open spaces West Parley will lose its character and the conurbation will become yet more dense and overbuilt. There are presently a number of these Green Lungs in the West Parley area and they all appear to be under threat. A green belt has been in force in this area for many years but it now seems that at the very time its protection is needed it is being treated as a mere inconvenience.</p> <p>The planning proposals for West Parley would increase the population of the area by nearly a third which is a disproportionate part of the burden expected of the conurbation fringe. Increases in housing equals increases in traffic and the capacity of New Road is already near its maximum. The development on Dudsbury Heights (FWP7) has the advantage of being hidden from general view however 220 houses seems an enormous development whilst 300 houses on the New Road site (FWP6) will just turn the place into a town.</p> <p>I am mindful that there has been considerable "consultation" on this matter but it is becoming apparent that this is no more than window dressing. Proposal FWP6 and FWP7 are far more extensive than previously indicated and appear to have been foisted upon the area by local government with scant regard for local feeling. The Parish Council has genuinely consulted residents and the Parish Plan is a worthy document which I urgently ask the East Dorset District Council to fully respect when making decisions which will affect this community.</p>					510		
360190	Mr John Cullen	Barrack Road (West Parley) Residents Association	CSPS2686	Policy FWP7		No	Yes	Yes			<p>Significant increase in housing proposed well in excess of Parish Plan suggestions for sustained expansion. Housing Strategy document do not suggest specific numbers of houses needed in East Dorset and numbers proposed for this area are put forward as enough to pay for cost of road improvements / SANGs and affordable housing that has been acknowledged is likely to be elsewhere anyway.</p> <p>Large HGVs would need to use link road and sample drawings of likely layout around housing do not look realistic. Spreads effect of heavy traffic even more around the village. Superstore, community space and church have been proposed as they are the only types of development allowed within the 400m heathland housing exclusion area. Significant amount of green belt lost. Close to flight path for Bournemouth Airport.</p> <p>Looks like a plan to ruin a 2000year old village to overcome</p>					510		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											current public funding shortages for social housing and road.						
360910	Mrs Fiona Baker		CSPS2635	Policy FWP7	No		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	<p>In response to the East Dorset and Christchurch Pre-submission Consultation, I would like to make the following observations that are specifically relevant to policies FWP5, FWP6 Fwp7 and the related maps. In their current format, these policies are inter-related and will not work independently, therefore my comments will apply to these three policies.</p> <p>With regard to the new road layout, I consider the proposals to be unsound, ineffective and unjustified due to the lack of detail within the plans and the consultation document. Specifically, the scheme cannot be justified, as the proposal is based on reducing the impact of traffic at Parley Cross, reducing the three lanes on the New Road South side of the junction to one. This is predicated on a new link road from New Road to Christchurch Road. The current road layout utilises three lanes in the northbound direction, yet the consultation does not address how the traffic using these lanes will be pushed back further along New Road towards Northbourne.</p> <p>The consultation does not propose new slip lanes to turn left into the new road, that will as the existing road layout confirms, is necessary to aid the movement of traffic. I believe that a slip road will be necessary, back toward the iron bridge but this will be necessary infrastructure if this plan is to go ahead. However this would be extremely expensive and have a high impact on the environment. This is a flood plain area supplied by watercourses draining from the fields and springs in the nearby field.</p> <p>The pre-submission document makes it clear that the proposals should be in line with national planning policy. The document does not state whether the plans are in line with Planning Policy Statement 25 – Flood management through spatial strategy. As stated above, the proposed road will be crossing the flood plain (which floods frequently and is well known to local residents). However, at the open evenings held at Parley Memorial Hall, the planning team denied the road would be going across the flood plain. Having lived at the above address for more than twelve years, I have seen the fields flood on many occasions, that affect the fields up to the current bridle way and has once flooded New Road itself, resulting in road closure.</p> <p>I have attached photograph, taken in April and May 2012 that provide evidence of the extent of the flooding on these fields and the drainage ditches that would be affected by the building of any slip road on the proposed site. One of these photographs was taken from my window, and importantly for my family, indicates how close this new road will be to our property. The link road will provide an unnecessary impact on the area and the case for the road is unjustified, therefore the consultation is in effective</p> <p>Policy FWP76 identifies a requirement for 200 new homes, but in my view the consultation has not justified the requirements for these homes or the number of homes</p>		Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	I am happy to take part as a resident.	510	2256149_0_1.pdf	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>identified. FWP6 identifies a requirement for 320 new homes my view the consultation has not justified the requirements for these homes or the number of homes identified. This policy also identifies a new food store and the provision for focal buildings, but with very little or no detail to justify the need, and have not provided details for other key community services, in particular, the provision of increased local school places. The link road on this side of the development will have an unnecessary intrusion and the details for the plan have not been justified.</p> <p>The areas affected by these policies are currently green belt, all be it for agricultural use. The policies for these areas proposed suitable alternative green space, but the green spaces proposed are currently green spaces. How can the proposals be considered sound when the alternatives are currently green.</p> <p>It is noted that Dorset County Council, as the Transport Authority has requested a larger scheme in order to justify a major transportation solution. How can the proposals be considered sound when the scale of the development is based on the road layout and not a justified need for the number of houses?</p> <p>On a personal level, I object to the plans produced on the basis that my home will be directly and substantially affected by the impact of the new road layout. Access to our property is already difficult with traffic on New Road, but based on the plan proposals presented and discussed with your consultants at the open evening, we will be squeezed between two additional sets of traffic controls on New Road (between the 2 proposed link roads) that will be less than ¼ mile apart and only ½ mile from Parley Cross lights, that will undoubtedly further hinder access to our property. This will, in my view substantially affect the value of our property as well as the views our property enjoys and impact our quality of life through additional traffic flow, noise and airborne pollution.</p> <p>Finally, I would like to register objection to the consultation feedback form and process. The language in the plan feedback form is intimidating, requesting residents respond on whether the proposals are 1) legal and 2) sound. One would assume that the Council would have put the proposals through a thorough legal view before presenting this to the public. For the definition of sound, I was referred to the Council's web site, where there was a huge number of documents and thousands of pages, which to object to 'soundness' properly, requires you to review all the surveys and findings and understand 'soundness' from a planning professional perspective – like most Parley residents, I am neither a lawyer or a planning professional, so felt immediately baffled on what grounds I could raise my objections. Furthermore, many Parley residents are elderly and do not have access to or experience of a computer, but online is recommended at the 'easiest' way to make representation. Residents are required to complete a separate sheet for each policy representation (Parley Residents are impacted by a minimum of 3 policies). This</p>						

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description		
											process has clearly not been designed to make it easy or to encourage feedback. Thankfully, letters of objection will now be allowed and I hope the Council will this time now listen and acknowledge residents concerns.								
361011	Ms Mary Mogg		CSPS2582	Policy FWP7							I am writing with my views which strongly oppose the proposed housing at West Parley, the reasons for this are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The green belt fields separate Bournemouth from East Dorset and should be retained to prevent urban sprawl; • The field where houses are proposed under policy FWP7 at Dudsbury heights is not suitable due to the slope of the field which is bound to result in flooding at the lower levels; • Policy FWP6 where 300 houses and a shopping centre is proposed is totally unsuitable with such a large number of houses, and moreover high numbers of social housing; • Finally, the residents of West Parley gave their views on previous housing proposals are were unanimously against such large numbers of houses. Why ask us again if you are going to ignore our views. Small numbers of houses are acceptable on brown field sites but to build on lovely green fields is sacrilege. West Parley should not be swamped with such large numbers of houses.					510			
475517	Mrs Sarah Collins		CSPS2626	Policy FWP7		No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	According to the BBC on 27 March 2012, the government said policies such as those protecting the Green Belt, sites of special scientific interest, national parks and other areas could not "be overridden by the presumption". Local Plans should meet objectively assessed needs, according to para 14 of the NPPF. The development of your strategy has not been carried out in proper cooperation with residents, whose views have been sought, but then largely ignored, or skewed. For example, there were about 3 comments on allotments, yet they have been included in the strategy. For a further example, during the Issues and Options Consultation 2010/11, residents said, as quoted in the council's own leaflet. 'We will need additional medical facilities and schools for the influx of new residents.' On this basis, the proposals are neither justified, nor consistent with National Policy. Nor is the document effective because it will not be deliverable if there are insufficient school places for the children. Residents asked for 'food shops that people can go into as it used to be 25/30 years ago – a butcher, baker, greengrocer etc. The provision of a superstore in FWP6 rides roughshod over this evidence and is therefore not justified because it is not founded on a robust and credible evidence base. Again according to para 14 of the NPPF, permission should not be granted if any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole. The paragraphs from 79 onwards concerning protecting the green belt show that development should be restricted, that 'As with previous Green Belt policy, inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances.'					510			

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>These circumstances are not ‘very special’ and have not taken into consideration reasonable alternatives. The strategy is thus inflexible and not effective.</p> <p>Paragraph 72 of NPPF states: The Government attaches great importance to ensuring that a sufficient choice of school places is available to meet the needs of existing and new communities. Local planning authorities should take a proactive, positive and collaborative approach to meeting this requirement, and to development that will widen choice in education. They should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Give great weight to the need to create, expand or alter schools; and • Work with schools promoters to identify and resolve key planning issues before applications are submitted. <p>None of this has been planned for and goes against national planning policy and is not deliverable, therefore not effective. Furthermore, during the Issues and Options Consultation 2010/11, residents said, as quoted in the council’s own leaflet, ‘We will need additional medical facilities and schools for the influx of new residents.’ On this basis, the proposals are neither justified, nor consistent with National Policy.</p> <p>Paragraph 75 states that planning policies should protect and enhance public rights of way and access. Local authorities should seek opportunities to provide better facilities for users, for example by adding links to existing rights of way networks including National Trails.</p> <p>The proposed link road crosses the Stour Valley Walk, far from protecting and enhancing access and facilities to this trail. Again, your strategy is not consistent with national policy. Concerning the green belt, your strategies are inconsistent with National Policy.</p> <p>According to Paragraph 79. The Government attaches great importance to Green Belts. The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence.</p> <p>Paragraph 87. As with previous Green Belt policy, inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances.</p> <p>88. When considering any planning application, local planning authorities would ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt. ‘Very special circumstances’ will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.</p> <p>There is no consideration in the strategy that clearly outweighs the potential harm to the Green Belt. Your strategy is thus not consistent with national policy, it is not founded on a robust and credible evidence base, because you have ignored the evidence which said, quoted in your consultation document ‘We should try at all costs to preserve the Green Belt’ and nor have other more appropriate strategies been put forward, such as developing the brown field site previously occupied by the Dormy hotel</p>						

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description		
											Quoting the figure that 99.5% of East Dorset's green belt will be protected is meaningless when you plan to encroach on West Parley's Green Belt by adding a huge 32% increase in our housing stock. New Road and Dudsbury Heights fields are Key Gaps with Bournemouth. Environmental impact includes removal of oak trees with TPOs on them, destruction of grade 2 agricultural land, the destruction of a bat reserve in the area of the proposed new link road. All going against national policy, all harmful to the green belt and all should be preserved. We should not be prepared to sacrifice these for a strategy that is not necessary, not justified, not effective and not consistent with national policy and that has ignored findings from the survey of local residents, rendering it undemocratic.								
475526	Mr Geoffrey Dark		CSPS2612	Policy FWP7	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	<p>Not Justified because there is no evidence that the views of the local community and others who may have a stake in the area have been taken into account. Moreover, the need for 520 houses, 260 of which are to be social housing in our local area has not been proved. The planners may consider the work 'local' to cover East Dorset as a whole but this is not made clear and where is the evidence? 520 houses in West Parley would increase the present housing stock by 32% which is completely unacceptable. Have alternative sites been realistically researched rather than taking the easy option of excessive building in West Parley? Where is the evidence for this research? If and when did negotiations take place with local people? Meetings with Councillors, KWPG and Planning Officers are quoted in the document but these were advisory rather than encouraging meaningful debate.</p> <p>Not Effective because the plans are not deliverable as currently shown. They are uneconomic as 50% of the housing will have to be 'social', meaning they have to be sold to a Housing Association at cost price and, with the many levies that will have to be imposed to cover infrastructure such as new link roads and Heathland Mitigation the sums are not viable.</p> <p>Not consistent with national policy because the document shows no evidence of Environmental Impact Studies which are necessary before a new through road adjacent to the historically sensitive Dudsbury Heights could be constructed. Moreover, the Plan is contrary to Core Planning as set out in NPPF, which states that a plan should be genuinely "plan-led, empowering local people to shape their surroundings with succinct local and neighbourhood plans, setting out a positive vision for the future". Moreover, the need has not been proved which would allow valuable Green Belt land, which serves the purpose of stopping urban sprawl, to be rolled back to allow housing. Finally, it is unlikely that there are enough First and Middle School places for the children of the new homes but the document ignores this issue for West Parley – if there could be a need to build a new school, details of its possible location should have been included in the document.</p> <p>Questions 6 & 7 Policy FWP7 is a proposal to build 200 homes (minimum of</p>	On the above grounds, I strongly object to the proposals described in FWP7.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		510				

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>50% affordable) and a new link road to join Christchurch Road and New Road through the development. It is proposed to build these houses on green belt land but it is important to preserve this land for the benefit of wild life. Currently, the land is used for grazing horses but it is a wild life habitat and I have seen many rabbits, foxes and deer on the land and there is also a badger sett near the west end of Ridgeway, with a badger run along Ridgeway and through a garden at the end of Longfield Drive then into a garden in Elm Tree Walk. I believe such habitats should be preserved, otherwise the area would simply become an urban sprawl.</p> <p>The land also offers a buffer between the very important and historical site of Dudsbury Fort and Rings and the built up area of West Parley. The plan shows a SANG, a so-called "Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space" beyond the green belt land that is shown for development but the lower part of this land beside New Road is completely flooded every time the River Stour rises following rainfall. Moreover, the green belt land on which the development is shown has very poor drainage and water frequently runs off the land into Ridgeway and also across Ridgeway and down the north side of Longfield Drive, resulting in a constant flow of water along the north side of Longfield Drive until it reaches the drain and often this first drain is unable to accept all the water flow, so it runs on to the second drain.</p> <p>All the traffic from these houses shown in FWP7 would be directed along the new link road which runs between a dangerous bend in Christchurch Road and an equally dangerous bend in New Road and, furthermore, at the New Road end it runs across a field which floods every time the River Stour overflows its banks after heavy rain. A right turn out of this road onto New Road would be very dangerous due to the limited visibility with a bend a few metres to the left. Moreover, since this link road would carry a great deal of traffic, it would be very dangerous for young families. I also understand that this link road will not be started until half the houses are built which may take many years to until then, the only exit will be via the very busy Christchurch Road which will result in Parley Cross having to take hundreds more cars each day, although it is already over capacity.</p> <p>It is also extremely important to make the point that West Parley recently published its Parish Plan, following encouragement to do so by the District council. Over 1000 residents, a large percentage of the total population of West Parley, contributed to this plan and their overriding decision was that no more than 100 houses could be built in West Parley without damaging the character of the village and that these should, in general, be built on brown belt land. It appears that the District Council has virtually ignored the Parish Plan and the views of so many households.</p> <p>The policies FWP6 and FWP7 have been formulated by the District Council without any involvement or consultation in their preparation with the West Parley Parish Council or the residents of West Parley. Such action, is in my opinion, undemocratic and takes no account of the opinions of</p>						

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
											residents who have expressed themselves to strongly in rejecting the District Council's plan for building of a total of 520 houses, representing an additional 32% increase in West Parley's housing stock, which would be excessive, damaging and far greater than the increases being suggested for neighbouring towns and parishes including Corfe Mullen, Wimborne, Ferndown and Verwood.							
476561	Mr Kevin Horton		CSPS2560	Policy FWP7	No			No		No	(NOTE: Please see the attachment to this text for the correct formatting of this response) Appeal Against Proposed "Draft Core Strategy Pre-submission Report" 1 Introduction Since West Parley is my neighbourhood, most of my comments are directed at the plans for that area. In October 2010 the East Dorset District Council (EDDC) issued a range of future planning "Options" in their "Core Strategy Options" document. Most would consider that an "Option" meant that there was a choice and that not all options would necessarily remain. In early 2012 the "Draft Core Strategy Pre-submission Report" was issued and accepted on the 5th March at a public meeting where the public could not make any verbal representation. In this new report, all "Options" numbers have been replaced with "Policy" numbers and a decision to apply every option has been taken. I believe that the Draft Core Strategy Pre-submission Report (hereafter called "the Report") has many serious faults and should not have even gone out to consultation in its present form. Our local EDDC councillors seem reluctant to challenge the planning officers because they consider the officers should be the "experts" on what is best and practicable. This view seems to prevail even when they are aware that their local constituents are very much against the proposals. The report itself is not well written with inadequate references to any of the evidential material. I would expect a 192 page document to contain many references to specific areas in supporting documents, but there are none. To thoroughly check all the deductions that have no specific references for validity would constitute a full time job which would take possibly longer than the public consultation time available. Consequently the public, like the Councillors, are expected to take much of the facts presented on trust. To what extent is there an urgent requirement for housing? How is this need expected to grow over the next 15 years? These facts are left for us to guess. Where are the full results of environmental impact surveys for these proposed plans, particularly building on Dudsbury Heights (FWP7)? Clearly the Parley Cross junction does need improving, but this should not be achieved by vastly increasing the local population along with their associated vehicles and hoping the developers will pay for extra roads. Increasing the number of houses around Parley Cross will greatly increase the traffic and congestion in Christchurch Road between Haskins roundabout and Dudsbury which will not be eased by any					510	2250795_0_1.pdf	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>extra roads planned around Parley Cross.</p> <p>2 Is the Report Consistent with National Policy?</p> <p>2.1 Bottom Up Planning & Localism</p> <p>The government have made it clear that their vision for future planning involves requests from Local communities that will be passed up the local government hierarchy to be finally adopted into the Council's Local Plan (see RIBA1 at end of letter). This is not the case with this Report and few in the local community have been consulted. The Report says on the first page, paragraph 1.15</p> <p>"The Core Strategy has been in preparation for a number of years. This has involved considerable community consultation, the collection of evidence and working with partners, including other Local Planning Authorities, service providers, town and parish councils, community groups, the Local Strategic Partnerships, businesses, government organisations and developers/agents."</p> <p>However the West Parley Parish Council have been totally sidelined and their Parish Plan that outlined the local people's ideas for the future of their neighbourhood totally neglected – there are no mentions of any Parish Plans anywhere in the Report (nothing in section 1.17 Evidence Base – Parish Plans are clearly not important to the EDDC).</p> <p>2.2 The Green Belt and its Protection</p> <p>The Green Belt has been established in England to protect against urban sprawl. Much of the land was set aside many years ago, with the intention that it should not be changed, removed or even increased, but in many places this report says "the Green Belt boundary will be amended" As if it's an appropriate thing to do. One councillor said at a public meeting "Rest assured we shall never build on the Green Belt – we shall just change its boundaries!"</p> <p>When discussing changing boundaries with my local MP Christopher Chope, he made it clear that in his words "the Green Belt was Sacrosanct". You can't go rolling it back, cut a bit off here, add a bit back there just to suit the whims of the local council. So even adding to the Green Belt (see section 11.27) is against government policy. If Councils are allowed to take small bits of Green Belt for housing whenever they think fit where will this end? Clearly, eventually there will be no green belt left or a belt so thin that it is of little use.</p> <p>I should like to refer to these paragraphs in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF 27-March 2012)</p> <p>Para 83: "Once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances"</p> <p>Para 87: "As with previous Green Belt policy, inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances"</p> <p>So what are these exceptional circumstances?</p> <p>Paragraph 89 of NPPF lists these special circumstances, showing the inappropriateness of excessive building in the West Parley area. I have put my comments in bold text.</p> <p>Para 89:</p>						

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
											<p>A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt. Exceptions to this are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Buildings for agriculture and forestry; (Not applicable) • Provision of appropriate facilities for outdoor sport, outdoor recreation and for cemeteries, as long as it preserves the openness of the Green Belt and does not conflict with the purposes of including land within it; (Not applicable) • The extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building; (Not applicable). • The replacement of a building, provided the new building is in the same use and not materially larger than the one it replaces; (Not applicable) • Limited infilling in villages, and limited affordable housing for local community needs under policies set out in the Local Plan; (Not applicable because of the large extent of proposed housing) or • Limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed sited (brownfield land), whether redundant or in continuing use (excluding temporary buildings) which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development (Not applicable) <p>So none of these exclusion criteria pass, therefore the construction of these houses in the Green Belt area around West Parley are inappropriate according to the Government's NPPF.</p> <p>However, the EDDC say in the Report in section 3 Objective 1:</p> <p>"The Green Belt will be retained and protected, except for strategic release of land to provide new housing, and for employment development in East Dorset and at Bournemouth Airport". That "except for" effectively cancels the first part of the sentence. So if it is strategic (important to an overall plan), involves building new houses or buildings for employment – the greenbelt will not be retained and protected. That means that the EDDC will give lip-service to protecting the Green Belt, but in practice, if they want to build houses or industrial estates anywhere, they will – if this Report is approved they have already granted themselves that permission.</p> <p>3 Is the Report Justified?</p> <p>The Report cannot be justified even by the Council's own advisors.</p> <p>In 2010, the suggestion involving developing all the available land south east o Parley Cross was referred to as the "Non Preferred Option FWP 5". The reasons for this were given by the EDDC:</p> <p>"Developing the whole area would result in a large number of homes. The consultants undertaking the Habitats Regulations Assessment have concerns over the impact of such a large population living so close to Parley Common Special Protected Area (SPA) which could not be mitigated. Parley Cross is a very busy traffic dominated junction. Possible improvements to this junction could result in a pedestrian</p>							

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>unfriendly environment and not one around which a new community should be based.” (Page 19 of Ferndown and West Parley Housing and Town Centre Options)</p> <p>Are these reasons no longer valid? If so what has changed? I suggest the opinions of the previous consultants are still very valid and this points to the inadequate consideration of the environmental impact of these now ‘policies’ contained in the Report.</p> <p>4 Is the Report Positively Prepared?</p> <p>Around 30 years ago, it was suggested that a Super Store (I am told it was ASDA) should be built at Parley Cross. This was quite sensibly turned down. The existing grocery store at Parley Cross has seen many owners – Spar, Circle K, Coop, and finally Tesco. Tesco seem to be holding on, maybe because they are a massive nation-wide company, but all the previous stores struggled hard to make a living. If a new supermarket is built opposite, it is goodbye to the local shops - they might as well pack up and go, completely changing the rural character of our area.</p> <p>The Report refers to what I call the beautiful fields to the east of New Road which give the area such an open and rural feel as “This is a flat featureless area ...” (10.36) as if it were worthless and building on it would be doing us all a favour; yet much of our best protected heath land is also “flat and featureless” but very valuable environmentally.</p> <p>Those living in the housing estate planned for east of New Road will be living in the centre of a huge gyratory system with busy traffic rushing by on all sides. The traffic flow will be impeded by no less than 5 consecutive roundabouts on the FWP6 link road. Children wishing to cross to the “Potential SANGS” or the Memorial Hall playground would take their lives in their hands – it is a recipe for accidents and to provide adequate crossings / traffic lights would cause even more congestion to traffic than we experience already.</p> <p>The Report says in 10.32 “West Parley Village Centre is presently compromised by a poor urban environment, dominated by roads and hardstanding”. Most locals I have spoken to do not want West Parley made more “urban” and dominated by houses as well as roads!</p> <p>The proposed houses in the Parley Cross area are in the direct flight path from Bournemouth International Airport whose air traffic is set to increase. Although the potential for an air accident is very remote, currently much of the land under the flight path is non-inhabited Green Belt with the flight path continuing over the River Stour. It does not make sense to knowingly add houses directly under this flight path which may one day be a subject of a catastrophe.</p> <p>Finally, I have reason to believe that the fields opposite the shops at West Parley are Grade 1 Agricultural land and therefore should not be built on. A bill has recently been presented to Parliament by Laura Sandys (South Thanet, Conservative) which seeks to protect Grade 1 agricultural land. The bill “Planning (Grade 1 Agricultural Land Protection)”, although not yet law, shows the direction that responsible Councils should be looking to satisfy future</p>						

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
											<p>requirements.</p> <p>5 Summary</p> <p>In conclusion, I urge you to reject the “Draft Core Strategy Pre-submission Report” plan in its present form as unsound and not fit for purpose. The main cause of these inadequacies is the lack of consultation with those that really matter – the residents that have to live and work in the creation that the EDDC intend to make. Property developers and Councillors living remote to the area may agree with this Report but the majority of the locals do not see it that way. When there are public meetings concerning West Parley, the halls are packed. People take this matter seriously and don’t want their environment spoilt for themselves and future generations. Most local people have a car and are quite happy to travel to the main supermarkets at Ferndown. Many young people who like the buzz of a city are happy to live in Bournemouth and would not want extra housing in West Parley. Too much of the EDDC decisions are made behind closed doors. We need true democracy here, and the local people’s view must be considered by the EDDC so that a report may be produced that will truly reflect the wishes of the local residents.</p>							
491139	Mr & Mrs SJ Dixon-Gough		CSPS2581	Policy FWP7		No				No	<p>We refer to your core Strategy Pre-submission Consultation document regarding the planning for the future of West Parley Village and can say from the outset that, we believe, not a lot of thought has gone into the document and absolutely no consideration has been given to the current residents of West Parley. The whole issue including the proposed construction of two housing estates and a road system, which borders on the nonsensical and dangerous, has prompted us to respond. We have lived at the above address since 2007 and moved into the area to be closer to the countryside and a bit more peaceful than our previous address in Bournemouth. We have both worked hard over numerous years to realise this position and intend to spend our semi and permanent retirements with “like minded” people.</p> <p>We knew from the outset that in order to turn right out of Parley Close onto Christchurch Road and towards Parley Cross was a minor irritation, due to traffic flow but were prepared to put up with this as it seemed that the main times for major tailbacks were during the “rush-hours” in the morning and in the evening. At other times driver inconsideration is aggravating but it is acceptable.</p> <p>We are now threatened with new housing estates being built at West Parley and Dudsbury. The obvious worry is the increase of traffic flow to the area. We are aware that the junction at Parley Cross is reputed to be the busiest in the County and looking at the proposed road scheme for the new estates this will make, not only the junction but, the whole area the busiest and possibly the most dangerous traffic area in the County.</p> <p>We are completely bemused by the proposals of preventing vehicles from turning left from Christchurch Road (East) into New Road (South), and from turning right, from New Road (South) into Christchurch Road (East). This will push all</p>				510			

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>vehicles wanting to travel these routes through a housing estate. This will include heavy goods vehicles from the waste sites, the gravel extraction site, the airport and miscellaneous other articulated lorries, heavy articulated lorries, heavy goods vehicles, coaches and local traffic. Creating a great deal of unnecessary pollution for proposed residents as well as a greater risk of accidents and damage. A similar danger will be at Dudsbury. This is totally unacceptable and completely ridiculous. It would appear that you intend to speed up traffic going straight ahead at the traffic lights in all directions only to create three further "bottle-necks" less than half a mile from the lights. This I suggest will cause far more problems than it solves. (Especially from a personal point of view in trying to leave and gain entrance to Parley Close as it is a recorded fact that to turn right from a main road onto a side road is one, if not the most hazardous traffic manoeuvre in the highway code) Has anyone bothered to monitor the traffic flow through this junction throughout a whole day and then try to predict the impact that the proposed scheme will have on the area for the whole community?</p> <p>The proposed housing estate at New Road/Christchurch Road causes problems of its' own. As we understand the situation, West Parley does not have a housing problem so can we ask where the occupants, to inhabit these proposed developments, are coming from? We attended a "road show" at Parley Memorial Hall where these proposals were discussed. We were told that on this proposed housing estate, there would be 50% social housing ie:- houses that are rented by the Council and/or various housing associations. Why has this number got to be so high? Research in other areas have found – and this was recently featured on a television documentary – that it is a mistake to put so many houses/people of that bracket all together on one estate. The occupants do not feel part of the community or the neighbourhood. The documentary even showed people from these type of estates, around the country, saying that they didn't want to live in these areas as they can turn into "No go" areas and living there can form a stigma and an absolute nightmare for a majority of residents. Youngsters do not want to live in the countryside, they want to be closer to settled towns with all their amenities, there is no employment here for them. All around the country these types of estates are being demolished so why is this Council proposing to build one in West Parley and Dudsbury? At another meeting we were told that in order to get so many houses on this land and make it profitable for the developers, the houses will have to be smaller then what is being shown. This the developer openly said at the meeting to a packed audience, This in itself will cause problems. You are proposing to increase the population of West Parley by 32% It may have escaped your notice that a vast majority of properties in this area are bungalows and you intend to build two storey properties. Looking at the plan for West Parley Village and especially at the above mentioned site you have plans for another supermarket in the Village. WHY? The location of it is on a</p>						

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>junction. SHY? There is already a supermarket in the village and there are bigger supermarkets in the area if required. Can you tell us when deliveries will be made and where the delivery point is? (a further traffic hazard and more pollution for the proposed estate we suggest). You have mentioned on the map a feature "Potential SANG". I again have to ask WHY, when there is already an area in existence, which you intend to cover in concrete. This area is a possible floodplain and a flight path to the airport. Where is your thinking? What is a local centre? Could it be a building or area to attract the ASBO collectors, graffiti artists and alcohol abusers (it is next to a proposed supermarket and a ready supply of alcohol and litter) You are intending to degrade a very nice and peaceful area..</p> <p>Can you tell me where the residents of these proposed developments will receive medical and dental care? Where will their employment be? Where are their traffic links with the bigger centres? And can you enlighten us on the involvement of the Plymouth Bretheren who, we understand, have already purchased land on this proposed site?</p> <p>You requested a West Parley Parish Plan, which was completed by about 1000 residents. From your latest communications you have paid not one jot of recognition to this. Where are the environmental studies, feasibility studies and historical studies into the area? Where are these results published, if indeed you have any?</p> <p>According to Central Government, green belt land should be for life (you obviously think differently) There are brown sites throughout this and national areas to solve the so called housing crisis without removing green belt land.</p> <p>In conclusion, we have to say that your proposals are NOT PROVEN, UNSOUND and toally against National policy and the wishes and rights of the local community</p>						
491163	Mr Butterfield		CSPS2569	Policy FWP7							<p>I wish to express my views on the building of 520 new houses in West Parley. I am totally against building on green belt – I thought this was introduced to prevent the spread of urban sprawl. This land is home to important and protected species of animals. It is enjoyed by residents who walk these fields by official footpaths. I understand the need for new homes but surely 32% increase is excessive and the losing of 6.6% of green belt from West Parley is unacceptable.</p> <p>With regard to the construction of 2 new roads creating 4 new junctions on extremely busy roads is ridiculous. The traffic problems would not be solved by this proposal. What happened to the idea of a gyratory system at the crossroads? I believe the residents of West Parley are entitled to have their views listened to and should have more input in the development of the village.</p>				510		
491173	Ms G Burningham		CSPS2596	Policy FWP7							<p>I am writing yet again, although I don't think the Council takes any notice, and has already decided what it doing before anyone get to hear it.</p> <p>My points are once again To much Traffic at Parley Cross, we don't need anymore shops as there always seems to be empty ones already.</p>				510		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											To add two more roads will make even more traffic. More people need more, doctors dentists and for the children more schools. I haven't heard anything about that. The Green areas you take can never be replaced.						
494723	Mr D Brittain		CSPS2551	Policy FWP7	No	No	No	No	No	No	<p>We moved to this area of West Parley just over two years ago to live among quiet like minded mature people, without too many children running around. Now, we find that suddenly the District Council propose to build three hundred & twenty houses East of New road, West Parley, plus a further two hundred homes West of New Road, with a minimum of 50% being affordable, which is a whopping 32% increase for West Parley. This is totally unacceptable to us, particularly as over half of the new properties would be affordable. If we had wanted to live near a Council Estate, we would have moved to West Howe, not West Parley.</p> <p>Where is the proof that these houses are actually needed. This land is green belt Land, which are "key gaps" between West Parley & Bournemouth, to prevent "urban sprawl" which is the very thing that you are now proposing, without, may I add, even the decency to consult us until this late stage. You cannot just "move" green belt land to where it suits you. The land is used as agricultural land at the moment, & it is against national policy to build on such land. A 32% increase in housing also brings problems with traffic, schools, employment & health. Where are these people coming from to fill five hundred & twenty houses? That is over one thousand people plus children. Most councils are demolishing such estates, not building them. Putting main roads through a housing estate is utter madness, & very dangerous for children.</p> <p>The District Council has totally ignored the wishes of local residents, & in fact, held meetings, & made decisions where residents were not even allowed to speak. This, alone, makes the proposals unsound, & undemocratic. One thousand residents responded to the West Parley Parish plan which was totally ignored.</p> <p>I submit to you that these proposals are unsound, unproven against National Policy, & certainly against the wishes of the local community.</p>		Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	Yes I wish to participate at the oral examination because the wishes of local residents has been totally ignored.	510		
494736	Mr & Mrs S Cox		CSPS2539	Policy FWP7							<p>Building of 220 houses on the FWP 7 and 300 on FWP 6 sites.</p> <p>I am writing to object strongly to your proposals for the above. Being a resident I already have to tolerate traffic chaos travelling to and fro from any direction to my home, whether on foot or by car. At congestion periods it can take up to an hour to get home from the airport! Your plans to add and alter directions of existing roads would be inadequate to cope with the amount of new home owners vehicles. You are simply adding further chaos and congestion to an already exhausted infrastructure.</p> <p>To destroy Green Belt land for yet another supermarket, concrete complex is totally unacceptable and a waste of money when we have so many within 1-3 mile radius. Doctors</p>					510	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
											Surgery's and schools in the area are full to capacity; could they really cope with a further multi influx of persons? Your proposal is ludicrous and warrants serious reconsideration.							
495680	Mr J M Brown		CSPS2585	Policy FWP7							I view with alarm your proposals for the building of 520 houses on Green belt land in West Parley, which is a massive increase over what the local residents considered was reasonable. I recall that a survey carried out by the Parish Council, concluded that up to 200 would still retain the village nature of this area. I In order to impose this vastly increased number, you propose to infill the essential strips of Green Belt, which had been retained for the express purpose of avoiding urban sprawl from the Bournemouth. . Furthermore, you propose to further carve up this area by a road network to service this urban sprawl, which will destroy for even the essential charm of West Parley as a village on the edge of Ferndown. I would like to know on whose authority you are imposing your plans in this area? Under the present government's policy of the adoption of Localism, plans must be with the support of the residents, and not to alienate them or ride roughshod over them, where there is clearly no support. I can only see this ending up with a full judicial review, in order to place a limit on your grandiose plans for West Parley.				510			
498270	Mr and Mrs P Herrington		CSPS2544	Policy FWP7							As residents of West Parley, we would like to draw your attention to our comments regarding some of the Policies under consultation: Ref: Policy FWP6 (Plans for 300 houses, supermarket and shopping centre & link road) Ref: Policy FWP7 (Plans for 220 houses and the new Road) • The New Road and Dudsbury heights fields are not just green belt; they are "Key Gaps" with Bournemouth, there to prevent urban sprawl. We want to remain as West Parley – the policies above will join our conurbations and create urban sprawl a contradiction in terms. • Why are we having a 32% increase in our housing stock? Our Parish Plan clearly outlined our aspirations, a plan encouraged by the District Council; it appears that as residents we have been ridiculed, as these have not been considered at all. We are meant to live in a democratic society – we have not been consulted during the preparation of these new plans at all! • Both link roads will cause more congestion, during construction of the properties and more so after completion once occupied. We live on the main Christchurch Road, and have seen an increase in traffic since we moved here 4 years ago. • More noise, pollution and more industrial vehicles on this road already in 4 years, surely this is will increase the problems we already have a) with the ignorance of speed restrictions by drivers, b) no crossings midway for the pedestrians and horse riders c) more cyclists on our service				510			

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>road more hazards to create accidents d) more airport traffic.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No regard for our wildlife and any endangered species that will be affected. • What's it going to be like at Parley Cross, more congestion on all main roads backing up causing more delays at many more times of the day. • All with the added problem of a new shopping parade and the parking, entry and exit dilemmas associated with these amenities, in an area already over its capacity. • How will it affect local businesses already in situ at Parley Cross • As for link roads passing through urban areas, surely this has not been thought through from a safety aspect for residents particularly for young children or the elderly. • Where are the children from families taking residence in these new homes going to school are their enough places in our existing local education facilities? • What plans have been thought for welfare, medical and dentistry requirements & local transport? <p>On 14th February we sent a e-mail to 35 Councillors, we received replies from Cllr J Wilson, Cllr S Lugg, Cllr B Manuel and Spencer Flower, only 4, that's only 11%. Its obvious where the other 31 votes are"! You're definitely not listening to us residents, is this because it does not effect each of you personally where you live? Please consider our views we really do care about where we live in West Parley.</p>						
498455	Mrs Rosemary Dark		CSPS2607	Policy FWP7	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	<p>Not Justified because there is no evidence that the views of the local community and others who may have a stake in the area have been taken into account. Moreover, the need for 520 houses, 260 of which are to be social housing in our local area has not been proved. The planners may consider the work 'local' to cover East Dorset as a whole but this is not made clear and where is the evidence? 520 houses in West Parley would increase the present housing stock by 32% which is completely unacceptable. Have alternative sites been realistically researched rather than taking the easy option of excessive building in West Parley? Where is the evidence for this research? If and when did negotiations take place with local people? Meetings with Councillors, KWPG and Planning Officers are quoted in the document but these were advisory rather than encouraging meaningful debate.</p> <p>Not Effective because the plans are not deliverable as currently shown. They are uneconomic as 50% of the housing will have to be 'social', meaning they have to be sold to a Housing Association at cost price and, with the many levies that will have to be imposed to cover infrastructure such as new link roads and Heathland Mitigation the sums are not viable.</p> <p>Not consistent with national policy because the document shows no evidence of Environmental Impact Studies which are necessary before a new through road adjacent to the historically sensitive Dudsbury Heights could be constructed. Moreover, the Plan is contrary to Core Planning as set out in</p>	On the above grounds, I strongly object to the proposals described in FWP7.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		510		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>NPPF, which states that a plan should be genuinely “plan-led, empowering local people to shape their surroundings with succinct local and neighbourhood plans, setting out a positive vision for the future”. Moreover, the need has not been proved which would allow valuable Green Belt land, which serves the purpose of stopping urban sprawl, to be rolled back to allow housing. Finally, it is unlikely that there are enough First and Middle School places for the children of the new homes but the document ignores this issue for West Parley – if there could be a need to build a new school, details of its possible location should have been included in the document.</p> <p>Questions 6 & 7 Policy FWP7 is a proposal to build 200 homes (minimum of 50% affordable) and a new link road to join Christchurch Road and New Road through the development. It is proposed to build these houses on green belt land but it is important to preserve this land for the benefit of wild life. Currently, the land is used for grazing horses but it is a wild life habitat and I have seen many rabbits, foxes and deer on the land and there is also a badger sett near the west end of Ridgeway, with a badger run along Ridgeway and through a garden at the end of Longfield Drive then into a garden in Elm Tree Walk. I believe such habitats should be preserved, otherwise the area would simply become an urban sprawl.</p> <p>The land also offers a buffer between the very important and historical site of Dudsbury Fort and Rings and the built up area of West Parley. The plan shows a SANG, a so-called “Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space” beyond the green belt land that is shown for development but the lower part of this land beside New Road is completely flooded every time the River Stour rises following rainfall. Moreover, the green belt land on which the development is shown has very poor drainage and water frequently runs off the land into Ridgeway and also across Ridgeway and down the north side of Longfield Drive, resulting in a constant flow of water along the north side of Longfield Drive until it reaches the drain and often this first drain is unable to accept all the water flow, so it runs on to the second drain.</p> <p>All the traffic from these houses shown in FWP7 would be directed along the new link road which runs between a dangerous bend in Christchurch Road and an equally dangerous bend in New Road and, furthermore, at the New Road end it runs across a field which floods every time the River Stour overflows its banks after heavy rain. A right turn out of this road onto New Road would be very dangerous due to the limited visibility with a bend a few metres to the left. Moreover, since this link road would carry a great deal of traffic, it would be very dangerous for young families. I also understand that this link road will not be started until half the houses are built which may take many years to until then, the only exit will be via the very busy Christchurch Road which will result in Parley Cross having to take hundreds more cars each day, although it is already over capacity.</p> <p>It is also extremely important to make the point that West Parley recently published its Parish Plan, following</p>						

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
											encouragement to do so by the District council. Over 1000 residents, a large percentage of the total population of West Parley, contributed to this plan and their overriding decision was that no more than 100 houses could be built in West Parley without damaging the character of the village and that these should, in general, be built on brown belt land. It appears that the District Council has virtually ignored the Parish Plan and the views of so many households. The policies FWP6 and FWP7 have been formulated by the District Council without any involvement or consultation in their preparation with the West Parley Parish Council or the residents of West Parley. Such action, is in my opinion, undemocratic and takes no account of the opinions of residents who have expressed themselves to strongly in rejecting the District Council's plan for building of a total of 520 houses, representing an additional 32% increase in West Parley's housing stock, which would be excessive, damaging and far greater than the increases being suggested for neighbouring towns and parishes including Corfe Mullen, Wimborne, Ferndown and Verwood.							
499745	Mr M C Tompkins		CSPS2603	Policy FWP7							My concerns & Objections to the Developments on "Green Belt" land at FWP7 & FWP6 are as follows: Low cost "Affordable Housing Estates" would not be compatible with the 'Non Estate' residential properties at West Parley Village. Problems caused by raising the height of the abnormal high water table levels at West Parley Village and surrounding areas may destroy the workings of water wells at West Parley. The "Green Belt" agricultural land absorbs a large quantity of water before draining into meadow land near FWP7 and FWP6 within the Stour Valley. Any developments will cause un-controlled surface water "Run Off". Expensive to over load the current surface water and sewage systems It is un-necessary to saturate West Parley Village with the proposed 520 houses. A massive increase of 32% to housing stock in the "Green Belt" at West Parley Village. It is bad planning to subject a further 1,500 people to "polluted air" and high noise levels caused by aircraft movements over & close to the areas FWP7 and FWP6 Approximately 80% of West Parley Village residents do not want the East Dorset District Council "Top Down" planning for the "Green Belt" areas FWP7 and FWP6.					510		
500391	Ms Jennifer Mogg		CSPS2583	Policy FWP7		No		Yes			Gradient of the field does not lend itself to mass housing, there will be severe flooding problems at lower levels. Green fields should not be built on anywhere. Try looking harder for brownfield sites.					510		
500818	Mr J Ladd		CSPS2520	Policy FWP7							I want to register my objection to the proposals for a substantial increase in the housing density at West Parley. Policies FWP6 and FWP7 For FWP6, 300 planned houses with roads and shops to be built on present Green Belt land is preposterous. What is the point of the term Green Belt if it is to be ignored? This					510		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>particular area forms the last barrier of fields between Bournemouth and Ferndown/West Parley.</p> <p>The traffic levels at Parley Cross are already high and with an extra estimated 500-1000 cars (with FWP7) using the roads, the situation will only get much worse.</p> <p>For FWP7, 220 planned houses close to an ancient hill fort is also folly. We should protect sites like this, not leave them open to danger from building works.</p> <p>Furthermore a substantial amount of concrete and tarmac at this site will lead to the possibility of flooding on the roads and houses below.</p> <p>West Parley Parish Council has requested residents' opinions about the proposed development and a substantial majority are not in favour of this. Notice should be taken of these views.</p> <p>The development also means almost a third increase on the number of houses: the village cannot tolerate that sort of increase.</p> <p>I urge all members of the Planning Committee to take heed of the points and not just file them to gather dust.</p>						
501234	Dr A Grieve		CSPS2618	Policy FWP7							<p>I write to express my extreme concern about the housing plans for West Parley.</p> <p>An increase of 32% in the local housing stock will place an unsupportable load on infrastructure.</p> <p>West Parley has a current pollution of 3600 and the ?? plans will raise this to around 5000</p> <p>Housing is of course needed and West Parley must make its contribution but not at the expense of spoiling everything that makes it a quiet and attractive place to live.</p> <p>I beg you to reconsider these plans</p>				510		
501826	Mr Gordon Hunt		CSPS2628	Policy FWP7							<p>Please accept my painting as my contribution to the Parley Planning debate.</p> <p>I have lived in the area since 1997 and have been impressed by the activities of Parley parish to maintain the parish by planting flowers and picking up litter etc.</p> <p>Many of the roads in the area are still country lanes and the limited number of river crossings generates traffic chaos In the event of accidents etc. i.e. at the Black water intersection. I ride an electric bike, but many routes are suicidal e.g. riding down the Ringwood Rd to Poole.</p> <p>Parley is a beautiful area and I don't like to see valuable farmland given over to housing.</p> <p>I appreciate that additional housing is required, but I am sure there is plenty non agricultural land. We have to Import 40% of our food!</p> <p>The land is on the flight path to Hurn airport and there have been three air accidents close to the airport while I have lived here. The Dornier twin engine ed aircraft is the biggest offender as it is very noisy and circles at low altitude many days of the week.</p> <p>The proposed link road to Longham crosses an area that floods regularly and is close to an iron age complex at Dudsbury.</p> <p>I trust my comments are helpful and constructive.</p>				510	2257622_0_1.pdf 2257592_0_1.pdf 2257601_0_1.pdf	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
503518	C Skipton		CSPS2552	Policy FWP7							<p>We write to set out our objections to the above, which we trust will be taken notice of:-</p> <p>Policy FWP7 (220 houses on Dudsbury Heights) and FWP6 (300 houses on the fields on the south east of the New Road/Christchurch Road junction).</p> <p>1. This is a proposed increase in the housing stock of 520 dwellings (32%), which is unsustainable and completely out of proportion to the size of West Parley. Further it is very different to the proposals in the 2010 plans upon which no further discussion, to my knowledge, has taken place.</p> <p>2. The proposed link roads will not be built until approx. 50% of the houses have themselves been built. This will cause absolute chaos at the New Road/Christchurch Road junction. If any of you have actually tried to travel through this junction during business hours, let alone the rush hours, you will realise that even now it is far overstretched with queues back to the airport in one direction, Longham mini roundabouts in another, New Road bridge and Glenmoor Road in others. I still do not see the proposed road changes being adequate to handle the additional traffic caused by 520 houses and a shopping development.</p> <p>3. The proposed land to be built on is not any old bit of "green belt" but an essential gap between West Parley and Bournemouth. It is essential that these gaps are maintained to avoid a hideous urban sprawl along this part of the country and to maintain the village atmosphere of West Parley rather than have it subsumed into a huge conurbation.</p> <p>4. The parish plan was put together with contributions from over 1000 residents and this plan has basically been totally ignored by the District Council when putting together this development proposal.</p> <p>5. Finally this proposed increase in housing stock is far in excess of that proposed for other areas of Dorset (ie Verwood, Wimborne, Ferndown and Corfe Mullen). We have spent some considerable time and effort in putting down our feelings towards these proposals in an effort to have our voices heard.</p> <p>You were elected as councillors by the local residents to represent them and their wishes for the area, however, we have to say that, as in all cases of political matters, our views, along with other like-minded residents, will undoubtedly be totally ignored and the councillors/politicians will go ahead and do their own thing as usual.</p>				510		
503689	Mr and Mrs Dunnings		CSPS2561	Policy FWP7							<p>I am writing in connection with the above as I found your questionnaire to be legally biased, and I am not legally trained.</p> <p>First I would like to point out the fact that the development of FWP6 is under the flight path, I cannot see many people wanting to purchase and we do not wish this area to be turned into a slum of the future.</p> <p>Secondly, building generally on green belt I would have thought is illegal, we must reserve our green pastures which are a joy to this country.</p> <p>Thirdly, I have lived in this area for nearly forty years and feel</p>				510		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
											<p>the planners do not know the area very well. The two proposed roads enter New Road and Christchurch Road, both of which are extremely busy and quite often congested. New Road traffic blocks at Northbourne roundabout, the queue passing through West Parley well up to Ferndown. Christchurch Road blocks regularly at Longham roundabouts, traffic attempting to pass through Longham, where there is a very narrow bridge, traffic backs well into Ferndown. Fourthly, the schools are full, doctors surgeries appear to be overflowing, I personally feel that with so very many extra cars from the proposed FWP6 and FWP7 sites, plus more houses planned for a site further up Christchurch Road, the old garden centre, let alone the proposed development on what was the Dormy Hotel in New Road, is asking far too much for a small village to accommodate.</p> <p>I would also make the obvious comment that with all the increased traffic (each new house having at least one or two cars, the emergency services, ambulance, fire and police will encounter great difficulties leading to long delays, with tragic results.</p> <p>I appreciate that our young people need homes, but with the lack of work in the area, many blocks of flats are now available having replaced large houses plus smaller properties.</p>							
503869	Mrs Jean Khan		CSPS2524	Policy FWP7		No		Yes			<p>I wish to stress the following points regarding the Core Strategy plans for Policy FWP6 and Policy FWP7. As to why I think these plans are impractical and unjustified.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Movement of Green Belt to suit development plans. This is contrary to legislation and maintenance of Green Belt land. This reduces the gap between Northbourne and West Parley Village. The New Road and Dudsbury Heights fields Are Key Gaps with Bournemouth to prevent urban sprawl. 2. The EDDC have ignored the views of the Parish Council and the residents of West Parley who contributed to the Parish Plan. 520 new houses is a 32% increase in West Parley's housing stock. This is excessive compared to other areas in Dorset. 3. WE DO NOT HAVE ADEQUATE SCHOOLS AND MEDICAL FACILITIES TO COPE WITH THIS. West Parley school is already overflowing and the Pennys Hill Practice in Ferndown is already pushed to its limit. 4. 520 new homes mean another 1000 cars in the vicinity, West Parley Cross Roads already one of the most congested local areas. This can only cause more chaos. 5. Affordable housing means houses with no garages. Cars parked anywhere I must presume. 6. In the 1980's Tesco applied to build a Supermarket on the Green Belt area. The application was turned down. Now Policy FWP6 suggests 300 houses and a supermarket and shops. Yet an application for flats on the opposite side of the road was rejected on grounds of accessibility. The EDDC appears to have one law for itself and one law for everyone else. 7. The newly proposed link road from Christchurch Road New 				510			

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description		
											Road goes straight through of the middle of the new High Density housing estate, this will surely be dangerous for young families living there, and what about the noise? 8. The two new link roads will not be started until half the houses are built, this means the roads at West Parley Cross will be taking hundreds of more cars a day. How can we copy with this? I respectfully submit what I hope are valid points regarding the FWP6 and FWP7 CORE STRATEGY PLANS, AND AS TO WHY THEY SHOULD NOT PROCEED. I HOPE SOME GOOD SENSE WILL PREVAIL SOMEWHERE!!								
509543	Mrs Beryl MacDonald		CSPS2702	Policy FWP7							I wish to object to the building of 220 houses on the FWP 7 and 300 on FWP6 sites for the u/m reasons: (1) The Consultation process is unsatisfactory. (a) Government legislation requires you to consult fully with local communities before setting out proposals. EDDC planners ignored this legislation. (b) West Parley has produced, after a lengthy consultation with residents, a well publicised Parish Plan, copies of which were sent to EDDC. In this Plan residents are overwhelmingly against having more than about 100 houses built in West Parley. This source of information has been ignored by EDDC planners. (c) EDDC have relied too much on the use of electronic communication to provide information to residents for this consultation and assumed that all residents in West Parley have access to the internet. This is far from the case and most residents are extremely concerned about the proposals but are unable to find the information they need to consider the proposals effectively. (d) To build more than 100 houses in West Parley would create an unbroken urban sprawl from Bournemouth to Ferndown and beyond. West Parley would lose its identity and become just another small part of a very large conurbation. Both of the proposed building sites constitute much valued green belt land which provides this break between the Bournemouth and Ferndown boundaries. This was the reason for introducing the Green Belt system many years ago. This land brings the countryside into the village and with it many important land protected species of animals. Sightings of badgers, foxes, otters, deer, buzzards are frequently reported. This improves the quality of life of all residents who regularly use these fields through which official footpaths pass. (e) The 2 new roads proposed around the proposed building sites will be dangerous for children living in the new houses and will not ease the already stretched traffic system in West Parley. Traffic jams will be merely moved further down the main roads. 500 extra houses will bring up to 1000 extra cars all trying to get out of and into West Parley which is already ridiculously over crowded. (e) 520 extra houses in West Parley represents an increase in housing of about 32%. This is excessive and if far more than						510		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>is proposed for the other East Dorset communities. Without the appropriate infrastructure of adequate school places, doctors, dentists, community centres etc there will be unacceptable pressure on existing provision.</p> <p>Site FWP7 (a) Dudsbury Rings is an important heritage site and this field is too closely connected to the site for the security of this important site to be protected. (b) In winter time and in times of heavy rain the slope of the field causes water to run down hill to flood the unmade and private road, Ridgeway, every time. With heavy traffic, servicing the shops at Parley Cross using Ridgway every day, the road surface is severely eroded and flooded which makes it very unpleasant for residents who are also responsible for the upkeep of the road. With so much more concrete laid on the field due to the proposed buildings flooding would be even worse.</p> <p>Site FWP 6 (a) Yet another Supermarket in the area is not needed and will only bring in much more traffic to bring chaos to the already crowded roads of West Parley. Sufficient supermarkets (Tesco, Asda, Sainsbury 2 Lidl) already exist within 3 mile radius of West Parley and 3 Tesco Express shops exist in a radius of 1 mile of Parley Cross. There is no demand for allotments, orchards etc. West Parley should not be sacrificed by planners' unrealistic dreams and an attempt at social engineering. I urge you to reconsider these proposals and to start talking to the people in West Parley Community who are entitled to have a say in the drawing up of proposals for any increase in housing in their village.</p>						
511916	Mr Craig Baker		CSPS2642	Policy FWP7	No		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	<p>In response to the East Dorset and Christchurch Pre-submission Consultation, I would like to make the following observations that are specifically relevant to policies FWP5, FWP6 FWP7 and the related maps. In their current format, these policies are inter-related and will not work independently, therefore my comments will apply to these three policies.</p> <p>With regard to the new road layout, I consider the proposals to be unsound, ineffective and unjustified due to the lack of detail within the plans and the consultation document. Specifically, the scheme cannot be justified, as the proposal is based on reducing the impact of traffic at Parley Cross, reducing the tree lanes on the New Road South side of the junction to one. This is predicated on a new link road from New Road to Christchurch Road. The current road layout utilises three lanes in the northbound direction, yet the consultation does not address how the traffic using these lanes will be pushed back further along New Road towards Northbourne.</p> <p>The consultation does not propose new slip lanes to turn left into the new road, that will as the existing road layout confirms, is necessary to aid the movement of traffic. I believe that a slip road will be necessary, back toward the iron bridge</p>				510	2255991_0_1.pdf 2255992_0_1.pdf	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>but this will be necessary infrastructure if this plan is to go ahead. However this would be extremely expensive and have a high impact on the environment. This is a flood plain area supplied by watercourses draining from the fields and springs in the nearby field.</p> <p>The pre-submission document makes it clear that the proposals should be in line with national planning policy. The document does not state whether the plans are in line with Planning Policy Statement 25 – Flood management through spatial strategy. As stated above, the proposed road will be crossing the flood plain (which floods frequently and is well known to local residents). However, at the open evenings held at Parley Memorial Hall, the planning team denied the road would be going across the flood plain. Having lived at the above address for more than twelve years, I have seen the fields flood on many occasions, that affect the fields up to the current bridle way and has once flooded New Road itself, resulting in road closure.</p> <p>I have attached photograph, taken in April and May 2012 that provide evidence of the extent of the flooding on these fields and the drainage ditches that would be affected by the building of any slip road on the proposed site. One of these photographs was taken from my window, and importantly for my family, indicates how close this new road will be to our property. The link road will provide an unnecessary impact on the area and the case for the road is unjustified, therefore the consultation is in effective.</p> <p>Policy FWP7 identifies a requirement for 200 new homes, but in my view the consultation has not justified the requirements for these homes or the number of homes identified.</p> <p>FWP6 identifies a requirement for 320 homes my view the consultation has not justified the requirements for these homes or the number of homes identified. This policy also identifies a new food store and the provision for focal buildings, but with very little or no detail to justify the need, and have not provided details for other key community services, in particular, the provision of increased local school places. The link road on this side of the development will have an unnecessary intrusion and the details for the plan have not been justified.</p> <p>The areas affected by these policies are currently green belt, all be it for agricultural use. The policies for these areas proposes suitable alternative green space, but the green spaces proposed are currently green spaces. How can the proposals be considered sound when the alternatives are currently green?</p> <p>It is noted that Dorset County Council, as the Transport Authority has requested a larger scheme in order to justify a major transportation solution. How can the proposals be considered sound when the scale of the development is based on the road layout and not a justified need for the number of houses?</p> <p>On a personal level, I object to the plans produced on the basis that my home will be directly and substantially affected by the impact of the new road layout. Access to our property</p>						

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
											is already difficult with traffic on New Road, but based on the plan proposals presented and discussed with your consultants at the open evening, we will be squeezed between two additional sets of traffic controls on New Road (between the 2 proposed link Roads) that will be less than ¼ mile apart and only ½ mile from Parley Cross lights, that will undoubtedly further hinder access to our property. This will, in my view substantially affect the value of our property as well as the views our property enjoys and impact our quality of life through additional traffic flow, noise and airborne pollution.							
512129	Mr J.R Chesshire		CSPS2654	Policy FWP7							I wish to record that I strongly object to the proposals to build 300 houses on the FWP 6 site and 220 houses on the FWP 7 site. Far too many for the area, ill conceived, and the cost to eventually put right the Highway plans will far outweigh the original costs which will create chaos in an admittedly already way overstretched area. I believe the consultation process to be not only unsatisfactory, but I question the legality in as much as Government Legislation requires you to fully consult with local communities. When did this happen? You have transparently appeared to ignore our objections on several occasions and in particular our Parish Plan. The village of West Parley will cease to be with the erosion of Green Belt areas and just become part of the Bournemouth to Ferndown urban sprawl. From meetings I have attended it is obvious that a new supermarket is unnecessary, new filter roads unworkable, with the vast increase in lorry and car traffic the existing problems are moved 'up the road'! Where is the sense in that? FWP 7 site is too near to Dudsbury rings, unsuitable because of the rare and prolific wildlife in the area and the field is a virtual floodplain in wet weather. Recently rainwater has poured into the Ridgeway and Elm Tree Walk. Building and the dreaded concrete even with better drainage will not solve the problem. I urge you to reconsider these proposals and listen to the local community before its to late. Don't dismiss our concerns as the rantings of old pensioners or NIMBY cranks. If you have a pride in your work, rather than just a job, make sure you don't regret your decisions. There is always a higher authority which includes Nature which will show man the error of his ways. An acknowledgement of this letter would be courteous – thank you.					510		
512344	Mr M Wyeth		CSPS2663	Policy FWP7	No		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Not Justified - No evidence to the actual number of houses required – dictated by developer who requires a minimum quantity to make profit. - Informed from previous meeting that affordable quota could increase to 90% if developer is unable to sell the quota for standard housing with the Housing Association purchasing any not sold. - No consideration to Parish Plan - District Council did not listen to residents wishes - 32% increase in housing for West Parley					510		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>- No reasonable alternatives proposed</p> <p>- The proposed New Link Road proposal has been incorrectly planned as no evidence given to traffic flow and vehicle numbers. No consultation given.</p> <p>- No consideration given to how the planners propose to overcome the drainage issues with the Ridgeway site.</p> <p>- This plan can be justified until the major road infrastructure has been completed at Parley Cross. To build additional 200 houses without properly designed road links would result in continuous bottlenecks. Again no consultation and a lack of experience at district council level.</p> <p>Not Effective</p> <p>- Plan not deliverable without major road infrastructure completed efore building commences.</p> <p>- Plan not flexible as no alternatives proposed – again lack of expertise and poor consultation process.</p> <p>- Very difficult to monitor an effective plan that lacks detailed planning on all issues.</p> <p>National Policy</p> <p>- Due to this plan being unjustified and non-effective it is not compliant with National Policy.</p> <p>- Lack of expert planning and consultation goes against the National Policy.</p> <p>- Local member of parliament is in total agreement that the plan is against the National Policy and fully supports the Parish Council Plan.</p> <p>In conclusion we wish to point out that due to all the points raised in this letter, that we strongly opposed to the Core Strategy Proposals for all sites.</p> <p>In addition council members are elected by us the residents and our opinions should be taken into consideration. If not the only redress we have is at the next election.</p>						
512406	Mr and Mrs PE and JA Coward		CSPS2697	Policy FWP7							<p>We wish to raise a number of points relating to the proposed changes to West Parley as per Policies FWP6 and FWP7. Although not politically nor 'NIMBY' motivated, we have been closely following the proposals for the area in which we live. Firstly, we cannot understand why the 'Green Belt Areas' at New Road and Dudsbury Heights have to be taken over for housing and roads. The green areas are the main aspect that differentiates West Parley from the Borough of Bournemouth. With the proposed increase in housing stock and the use of the Greenland for that purpose is a backward step. Checking the proposals, alternatives have been suggested for suitable areas of natural green space[S.A.N.G.] if this is the case, one can envisage that if this present green belt is not sacrosanct, the proposed new areas are likely to be taken over at some future date also.</p> <p>The proposals indicate a new housing stock for West Parley of over 30% to what is already in place and is being unjustly forced upon the area. Compared to proposals for areas such as Corfe Mullen, Wimborne and others, West Parley is being treated as the poor relation.</p> <p>The West Parley Parish Council has been outspoken as to the merits or otherwise of the projected plans for West Parley.</p>				510		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>Many residents consider that the Parish Council are 'spot on' when it comes to the concerns of the general populace. It seems that some from a higher tier of local government appear to think they know better than the West Parley residents and parish councillors. The 2010 proposals/plans are different to the current proposals from the East Dorset and Dorset County Councils and as far as we can tell, the local voices of opposition have not been listened to nor consulted at all.</p> <p>We do understand that new housing is necessary for the area, but the 'Dormy Hotel' site has been empty for years with little progress for a large area of ground that should have been considered first without recourse to the green belt land at New Road proposed in Policy FWP7. In addition, the 'Coppins' site in Christchurch Road has already been earmarked for additional housing.</p> <p>If there has to be new housing in either FWP6 or FWP7, the lesser of the 2 evils would be the houses on Dudsbury Heights field (FWP7). At least the planners and highways departments have considered a link road for that location which could be workable. The proposal for FWP7 shows that the link road to be located at the edge of the proposed new housing stock, which if built, would be the correct location for it to be situated.</p> <p>The proposal for the new link road between New Road and Christchurch Road (FWP6) is a disaster waiting to happen. Plans for this link road indicate that it is to be built directly in the middle of the proposed new housing estate. One can imagine that if constructed in its proposed form, there will be a campaign from the new population asking for a link road around the estate as it will be dangerous for all especially children. The current traffic from New Road to Christchurch Road and the Hurn Industrial estate is very busy with all sorts and sizes of vehicular traffic. This proposal will not be a 'residents only' route and we fear that if this proposal goes ahead, some in high office will have their consciences pricking when the inevitable happens.</p> <p>We also consider that the creation of link roads will cause problems. At a recent road-show, there were conversations with staff from the highways and planning departments. We were told that traffic lights would be installed at both ends of the link roads and coordinated to 'keep the traffic moving' and 'away from the Parley crossroads'. If traffic lights are installed, we believe that the result would be gridlock in a short space of time. One only has to look at Ferndown town centre and Wimborne Road East to West Moors to see that the traffic lights are not coordinated now, so we fear for the village of West Parley.</p> <p>In addition, if the link roads are to be built, it should be guaranteed that they are in place BEFORE any housing construction commences. We do not want West Parley to be an apparent building site for a significant time, where traffic is stalled because alternative routes are not in place. Parley Crossroads may be over capacity, but at least everyone receives a turn at the traffic lighted crossroads and although</p>						

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>slow, the traffic does, in general keep moving, especially when the filters are in operation. We also feel that if restrictions are put into place as to vehicular traffic movements at the centre of Parley Cross then some motorists will endeavour to find alternative routes, which will mean busier traffic in residential areas in and around the outskirts of Parley.</p> <p>Please bear in mind too that the shops at Parley are doing their best in difficult circumstances. Parking there is a concern, particularly as some drivers are using the Bournemouth airport car parks when going on holiday. Restricted time parking [if policed] would assist in creating space for the shop users. It should be borne in mind that drivers already attempt to use this area as a 'rat run' and this type of use will increase if the new proposals FWP6 and FWP7 are accepted and put into place.</p> <p>In summary, we would like to reiterate the main points of our letter: -</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Retain as much of the 'Green Belt' as much as possible. If the 'Green Belt' is used now, alternatives are likely to be taken over in the future too as the precedent will have been made. 2) Plans for FWP6 should not go ahead. 3) If there is to be development, let it be policy FWP7 4) If either or both schemes are to go ahead, build the link roads before any houses are erected. You should ensure that they are positioned at the edge of any development, not in the middle of residential housing. 5) Reconsider the Parley Crossroads through routes. Narrowing the junctions will not be good for the area traffic nor the environment. 6) Listen to the views of the residents of West Parley and bear in mind that those who remain silent are not necessarily in agreement with the current proposals. 						
515878	Mr & Mrs G Ball		CSPS2703	Policy FWP7							<p>We are writing to you to object to both of the above planning proposals. We are very concerned about the proposed 520 homes that could be built in West Parley. As a very small parish we will not be able to accommodate these extra families and as the 2 new link roads will not be started until half the houses are built then that will mean extra build up on our roads. We live on the main Christchurch Road and as it stands at the moment, the traffic in the morning is at a virtual standstill. It takes us approximately 15-20 mins to get to Parley lights. Also, the new proposed link road is going to go through the middle of 300 houses, surely this will be a risk to the young families with young children.</p> <p>We do not want our Green Belt built upon. We moved here to escape the built up town environment, we wanted open green fields around us, somewhere for us to walk our dogs and to see horses grazing. This is going to disappear! Please do not take this away from us; this is the only enjoyment we have. Young families grow up and this constitutes in youngsters hanging around pubs, supermarkets, under age drinking and drugs. We live opposite a pub and we do not want to tolerate</p>				510		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
											any more anit social behaviour, which will also be a strain on our police. Our homes will be 'at risk' and house prices will plummet. We worked hard to move to this affluent area and we do not want social housing here. We pay a lot of council tax and to have people move here on benefits that will not have to pay is unacceptable. I worked in social housing for 14 years and I am fully aware of the problems that housing estates can have if not managed and monitored correctly. West Parley is a close knit community which houses a lot of elderly people. We fear that an influx of young families will take over and we will lose our elderly forever.							
656218	Dr and Mrs G and S Dudding		CSPS2661	Policy FWP7							It has been brought to our notice the recommendations by District Council for developments in East Dorset and in particular the plans for West Parley. One major reason we moved to West Parley ten years ago was the presence of the Green Belt which gave West Parley its own special character. Policies FWP6 and 7 propose to develop Green Belt which would seem unlawful and contrary to National and local opinion. Parley heath, a special conservation area would receive a very negative impact by the increased volume of people using this area. Traffic, at saturation levels already, would not be ameliorated by the proposals – the so called 'link road' would have minimal effect at Parley Cross roads, as any regular used of this stretch of road would be able to tell you. All would agree that traffic has grown exponentially and in addition it should be remembered that Parley is the chosen route of emergency services, fire, police and ambulance – a source of considerable noise pollution with excessive siren use. A programme of increased housing by 520 houses in this area would seem a grossly excessive expansion by any standard – a 32% increase in current housing stock. We do not wish to be connected to Bournemouth by urban sprawl. In terms of the Green Belt policy abuses as planned, I would wholeheartedly support a legal challenge even if I have to pay for it. We all know that there are many other brown field sites available for development but West Parley is chosen for perceived ease of development and no doubt some financial incentive which has yet to be declared.				510			
656394	Dawn Jones		CSPS2682	Policy FWP7							I would like to oppose the plans as follows: POLICY FWP7 To build 220 houses and a new road goes totally against the West Parley Parish Plan which was put together with a 1,000 response from local residents. The Parish Plan has largely been ignored. To build 220 houses with a large proportion affordable would mean young families would be moving in with virtually no infrastructure i.e. schools, doctors, dentist. The road would be heavily used and would therefore be a danger to the people living there. The area is a key gap				510			

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
											<p>between West Parley and Bournemouth which prevents urban sprawl.</p> <p>POLICY FWP6</p> <p>To build 300 houses, supermarket, shopping centre and link road on the New Road field would totally change the village and turn it into a “new town area” because of the nature of the housing “low cost/affordable” attracting people with young families. There is no infrastructure for young families in the area – no schools, doctors, dentist. The new road would be a danger to children. Most families have at least one car - this would mean an increase of at least 520 more vehicles using the already congested roads. This pln has not been thought through – it is almost that you have seen an empty field and thought “that will do” – top down planning at its worst.</p> <p>The two new link roads would not be started until half the houses are built which could be years – until then hundreds more cars will be using the local roads.</p> <p>The total number would be a 32% increase in West Parley’s housing stock. This is planning madness – please re-think your plans – they are wrong.</p>							
656398	E Spitori		CSPS2689	Policy FWP7							<p>I am compelled to write in response to the large and unwelcome building plans for our Green Belt in the beautiful village of West Parley. The policies outlined in FWP6 and FWP7 for a total of 520 houses equates to a massive 32% increase in West Parley’s existing housing stock! This is excessive, damaging, wrong, grossly unfair, disproportional and way in excess of what is being proposed for Corfe Mullen, Ferndown, Wimborne and Verwood.</p> <p>There are good reasons why the existing residents chose to live in West Parley and the main reason that often comes up in conversation as the top reason on their list is the green belt we enjoy which separates us from major conurbations of condensed housing in surrounding areas. The New Road and Dudsbury Heights fields are not any old green belt area. These are KEY GAPS with Bournemouth. These key gaps prevent urban sprawl and indeed were the main reason for having a green belt here in the first place!</p> <p>To continue to ignore the residents’ objections to the plans within FWP6 and FWP7 is at the very least insensitive to the existing residents contributions. These plans will damage the quality of life for all and particularly those residents who have lived in the vicinity and paid council tax, most of whom for a quarter of a century and several others for longer..</p> <p>Christchurch Road is already suffering from high volumes of heavy traffic creating noise pollution and (existing road and housing) construction damage by the existing excessive traffic with the evident congestions. The newly proposed link road from New Road to Christchurch Road, incidentally, going through the middle of the 300 houses in FWP6, is bad planning, very dangerous and compounds the already congested Christchurch Road traffic. Christchurch Road and New Road are overcapacity already and to add 500 to 1000 more vehicles is unsafe and plain madness. Furthermore, the link roads are not planned to be constructed for several years</p>					510		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
											from the commencement of the housing construction. Imagine the traffic build up at Parley Cross as a result! This will directly affect Christchurch Road and its residents by the line of traffic that builds up from the traffic lights. Imagine also the increase in volumes of heavy construction vehicles and heavy plant machinery during the years of construction!! This is not why we, the residents chose to live in West Parley. FWP6 and FWP7 plans are unsound, ineffective and not good for the existing residents. They are also inconsistent with the national policy for green belt areas and with the wishes of the existing residents. We look to the District Council officers to do what is right for its council tax payers and to respect their wishes by rejecting the plans in FWP6 and FWP7.							
656399	Mrs R J Cook		CSPS2699	Policy FWP7							I am writing about the proposed plans – Policy No’s FWP5, FWP6 and FWP7. I think it very sad when you are talking about covering all this green land with Houses etc. I came home to live just because of the green. I could see and also the mild life on it. With the increase in Traffic to the already overloaded roads. No I do not agree with these plans.				510			
656519	Mr Derek Pitts		CSPS2669	Policy FWP7							Plans to build on green belt at West Parley – Policy FWP6 and Policy FWP7 I object to both plans in their entirety. The West Parley green belt must be be preserved. i) It helps define why the area is such a nice place to live in. ii) Protects the parish from urban sprawl; and encroachment from pro-development interests acting against the wishes of the residents. This development will be a bad thing for West Parley. i) It will destroy the unique character of the area. ii) Pushed through without consultation. It completely ignores a West Parley Parish Plan supported by over a thousand residents. iii) The proposal to build over five hundred houses, a supermarket and other as yet other unspecified development, will condemn residents to an open-ended time scale of intrusion and disruption. iv) Major road alterations will cause massive congestion around Parley Cross into the foreseeable future. If the District Council believe their proposals are in the best interests of West Parley’s residents they have an odd way of showing it. They appear to have an agenda of their own with proposals that can only downgrade what is for the present a lovely place to live. Meanwhile major companies like Taylor Wimpey waiting in the wings on land they own adjacent to Poor Common, must be rubbing their hand in glee.				510			
656523	Mr Matthew Rainsbury		CSPS2675	Policy FWP7							I wish to object to the building of 220 houses on the FWP 7 and 300 on FWP6 sites for the following reasons. The New Road and Dudsbury heights fields are “KEY Gaps” with Bournemouth. These gaps were to prevent urban sprawl, and the main reason for having a green belt in the first place. The proposed link road will go right through the middle of 300				510			

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
											houses in FWP6 which will be very dangerous for young children. This land brings the countryside into the village and with it many important and protected species of animals. Sightings of badgers, foxes, otters, deer and buzzards are frequently reported. This improves the quality of life of all residents who regularly use these fields through which official footpaths pass. Government legislation requires you to consult fully with local communities before setting out proposals. EDDC have ignored this legislation. Another Supermarket is not needed in the area and will only bring chaos to the already crowded roads of the area. I urge you to reconsider these proposals and find more appropriate locations for this level of residential accommodation.							
656524	Mr Alan Bishop		CSPS2548	Policy FWP7							As residents of West Parley, we would like to draw your attention to our comments regarding some of the Policies under consultation: Ref: Policy FWP6 (Plans for 300 houses, supermarket and shopping centre & link road) Ref: Policy FWP7 (Plans for 220 houses and the new Road) • The New Road and Dudsbury heights fields are not just green belt; they are "Key Gaps" with Bournemouth, there to prevent urban sprawl. We want to remain as West Parley – the policies above will join our conurbations and create urban sprawl a contradiction in terms. • Why are we having a 32% increase in our housing stock? Our Parish Plan clearly outlined our aspirations, a plan encouraged by the District Council; it appears that as residents we have been ridiculed, as these have not been considered at all. We are meant to live in a democratic society – we have not been consulted during the preparation of these new plans at all! • Both link roads will cause more congestion, during construction of the properties and more so after completion once occupied. We live on the main Christchurch Road, and have seen an increase in traffic since we moved here 4 years ago. • More noise, pollution and more industrial vehicles on this road already in 4 years, surely this is will increase the problems we already have a) with the ignorance of speed restrictions by drivers, b) no crossings midway for the pedestrians and horse riders c) more cyclists on our service road more hazards to create accidents d) more airport traffic. • No regard for our wildlife and any endangered species that will be affected. • What's it going to be like at Parley Cross, more congestion on all main roads backing up causing more delays at many more times of the day. • All with the added problem of a new shopping parade and the parking, entry and exit dilemmas associated with these					510		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>amenities, in an area already over its capacity.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How will it affect local businesses already in situ at Parley Cross • As for link roads passing through urban areas, surely this has not been thought through from a safety aspect for residents particularly for young children or the elderly. • Where are the children from families taking residence in these new homes going to school are their enough places in our existing local education facilities? • What plans have been thought for welfare, medical and dentistry requirements & local transport? <p>On 14th February we sent a e-mail to 35 Councillors, we received replies from Cllr J Wilson, Cllr S Lugg, Cllr B Manuel and Spencer Flower, only 4, that's only 11%. Its obvious where the other 31 votes are"! You're definitely not listening to us residents, is this because it does not effect each of you personally where you live? Please consider our views we really do care about where we live in West Parley.</p>						
656525	Mr James Rainsbury		CSPS2680	Policy FWP7							<p>I wish to object to the building of 220 houses on the FWP 7 and 300 on FWP6 sites for the following reasons The New Road and Dudsbury heights fields are "KEY GAPS" with Bournemouth. These gaps were to prevent urban sprawl, and the main reason for having a green belt in the first place. 520 more houses in Parley is a 32% increase in the housing stock. This is excessive, wrong and damaging, schools, doctor's surgeries etc will not be able to cope with the influx of people. Dudsbury Rings is an important heritage sight and this field is too closely connected to the site for the security of this important site to be protected. The new roads will not be started until half the houses are built so Parley Cross will have to cope with hundreds more cars a day. It is already over capacity and is dangerous at peak times. Traffic jams will merely be moved down the main road. Government legislation requires you to consult fully with local communities before setting out proposals. So far EDDC have ignored this legislation. Another Supermarket is not needed in the area and will only bring chaos to the already crowded roads of the area. We already have 2 Tesco stores in Parley and larger stores close by. I urge you to reconsider these proposals and find more appropriate locations for this level of residential housing.</p>				510		
656526	Mr & Mrs A Miller		CSPS2692	Policy FWP7							<p>I am writing about the plans to build 220 houses on the FWP7 and 300 FWP6 sites. I know more affordable housing is needed and some houses probably do need to be built, but to build such a huge number of houses in West Parley will join Bournemouth to Ferndown in a huge conurbation. West Parley would lose its identity and become part of the urban sprawl. The 2 new roads proposed will create islands of noise for all those living between them and it is likely that children will be</p>				510		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
											<p>living in houses near to what will become a rat-run. The roads will not ease the traffic situation in West Parley as there will be many extra cars on them due to the expanded population. I don't see any new doctors' surgeries or schools on the plans and I wonder how the existing ones will cope with the extra people? I already have to wait up to two weeks to see my doctor sometimes.</p> <p>However, I see there are plans for a supermarket. Why? We already have Tesco Express for emergencies, and there is an excellent bus service to the Supermarkets in Ferndown, which my 90 year-old neighbour uses without a problem. Surely a new Supermarket will bring even more traffic to the area and further erode the rural feel we have in West Parley at present. Most of my elderly neighbours do not have the internet and have been unable to find the information they need to look closely at the proposals.</p> <p>I am asking that you re-think these proposals and put forward some new ones that will take into consideration our rural environment and heritage, the needs and wishes of the present population and service providers of West Parley, and the needs of those who would be coming to live in new houses here, as I feel that none of these is being satisfied at present.</p>							
656533	Mr Mark Rainsbury		CSPS2667	Policy FWP7							<p>I wish to object to the building of 220 houses on the FWP 7 and 300 on FWP6 sites for the following reasons.</p> <p>The New Road and Dudsbury heights fields are "KEY GAPS" with Bournemouth. These gaps were to prevent urban sprawl, and the main reason for having a green belt in the first place. 520 more houses in Parley is a 32/ INCREASE IN THE HOUSING STOCK. This is excessive, wrong and damaging, schools, doctor's surgeries etc will not be able to cope with the influx of people.</p> <p>The proposed link road will go right through the middle of 300 houses in FWP6 which will be very dangerous for young children.</p> <p>The new roads will not be started until half the houses are built so Parley Cross will have to cope with hundreds more cars a day. It is already over capacity and is dangerous at peak times. Traffic jams will merely be moved down the main road.</p> <p>Government legislation requires you to consult fully with local communities before setting out proposals. EDDC have ignored this legislation.</p> <p>Another Supermarket is not needed in the area and will only bring chaos to the already crowded roads of the area. We already have 2 Tesco store in Parley and a larger store in Ferndown only 2 miles away.</p> <p>I urge you to reconsider these proposals and find more appropriate locations for this level of residential accommodation.</p>				510			
656538	Mr & Mrs R Bradshaw		CSPS2674	Policy FWP7							<p>As residents of West Parley, we are writing to express our concerns regarding the plan to build 300 houses on the FWP 6 site and 220 houses on the FWP 7 site.</p> <p>We wish to object most strongly to this proposed development</p>				510			

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
											<p>and state our objections as follows:</p> <p>1. A seriously flawed consultation process: We have attended several public meetings organised by West Parley Parish Council and a meeting Chaired by our local Member of Parliament. We have also researched the government criteria upon which this consultation process is supposedly based and find your methods to be totally unsatisfactory. The residents of West Parley took part in a detailed consultation organised by the Parish Council who then produced a Parish Plan based firmly upon this consultation. The Plan was well publicised (We helped in the delivery of copies to every household in the Parish). I understand that copies were also submitted to East Dorset District Council. It is clear in the Parish Plan that the maximum number of new houses which residents are prepared to tolerate is no more than 100, yet this part of what should be a democratic and transparent process has been ignored by your planners. Local Government, like any other elected body, is directly responsible to those citizens who put it there and should not hide behind "policy planning" to manipulate public opinion to suit their own agenda.</p> <p>Would you please explain why this part of the West Parley Parish Plan has been ignored by your planners?</p> <p>Communication between the concerned residents of this Parish and the District Council has been sparse to say the least. I must add that our family have experienced great difficulty in accessing the information necessary to gain a true picture of what East Dorset District Council are proposing and the reasoning behind this. We are all computer literate in our household but we fear that there are many residents of West Parley who do not have the same skills or who, indeed, do not even have access to the internet. How on earth are they supposed to be able to form an opinion on this consultation process? Surely, it was never the intention to keep a percentage of residents uninformed by excessive use of electronic information to the detriment of other methods?</p> <p>2. Green Belt Policy: The Town and Country Planning Act of 1947 defined Green Belt Policy and this is reiterated the Planning Policy Guidance 2: Green Belts: to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas, to prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another, to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment, to secure nature conservation interests, to retain land in agricultural use, to provide opportunities for access to the open countryside and to assist in urban regeneration by encouraging the redevelopment of brownfield sites. Building over 500 houses in West Parley, primarily on green belt land, is quite clearly contrary to this legislation. It will connect Ferndown with Bournemouth in an unbroken urban sprawl in which the distinctive character of the village of West Parley will disappear. We have no wish to become part of the Greater Bournemouth conurbation. Neither do we wish to see the destruction of valuable agricultural land upon which this proposed development would be built. We do not wish to see the destruction of the countryside adjacent to our village and</p>							

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>the tragic effect this will have upon local fauna and flora which is a pleasure to view. We would add therefore, that these proposals would seriously undermine the quality of life which residents of West Parley currently enjoy, living in close proximity to green belt land. It is a flawed concept that this country's Green Belt Policy can be reinterpreted. There do not appear to be any exceptional circumstances in which a reinterpretation could be applied to West Parley and we would ask you to reconsider the legality of such a course of action.</p> <p>3. We understand that an additional 520 houses in West Parley represents an increase in the housing stock of 32%. We can see no evidence of accompanying plans to increase the local infrastructure to cover this excessive increase in population. We would ask, where are the plans for new schools, policing, health facilities, etc., which should accompany these proposals? We can see proposals for two new roads, one of which will be constructed dangerously close to Dudsbury Rings (FWP7) a heritage site of major archaeological value. We are sure that East Dorset District Council would not wish to be accused of an uncaring approach to our national heritage akin to archaeological vandalism should this site be disturbed in any way by property developers. We also understand that this road would necessitate the felling of ancient trees significant enough to have been given preservation orders and the displacement of a bat colony.</p> <p>4. The traffic system in the West Parley area is already overstretched and cannot cope with the present amount of traffic which passes through at certain times of the day. Over 500 additional households would increase local car ownership, possibly by 1000. A proposed narrowing of the road system at Parley Cross and a traffic shunting exercise around the two proposed new roads will only move the problem around the housing development creating potential for an increase in road traffic accidents, not resolve it.</p> <p>5. We fail to understand the logic of yet another supermarket (to be located at Parley Cross – FWP6) when there are already 5 other such stores serving the area. The roads in the West Parley area are already overcrowded; an additional superstore would add to this congestion. We suspect that the only people to profit from this would be the new superstore proprietors. There is no demand for this development. Similarly, the residents of West Parley have not asked for and do not need an Orchard (FWP 6) as they enjoy the full benefits of the adjacent Green Belt. We do not recall any consultation on this or indeed on the need for allotments. We, the residents Close, West Parley, are appalled at the planning proposals for our village, we object to the high-handed manner in which East Dorset District Council have ignored the genuine concerns of residents and their representatives on the Parish Council, and we are bitterly disappointed in the absence of a transparent, democratic and genuine dialogue on the above proposals. We have no intention of allowing our village to become subsumed and give our full support to our representatives on the Parish</p>						

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
											Council who are working so hard to make residents' voices heard. Please begin to listen to them and act accordingly.							
656541	Mr R J Bradshaw		CSPS2677	Policy FWP7							<p>As residents of West Parley, we are writing to express our concerns regarding the plan to build 300 houses on the FWP 6 site and 220 houses on the FWP 7 site. We wish to object most strongly to this proposed development and state our objections as follows:</p> <p>1. A seriously flawed consultation process: We have attended several public meetings organised by West Parley Parish Council and a meeting Chaired by our local Member of Parliament. We have also researched the government criteria upon which this consultation process is supposedly based and find your methods to be totally unsatisfactory. The residents of West Parley took part in a detailed consultation organised by the Parish Council who then produced a Parish Plan based firmly upon this consultation. The Plan was well publicised (We helped in the delivery of copies to every household in the Parish). I understand that copies were also submitted to East Dorset District Council. It is clear in the Parish Plan that the maximum number of new houses which residents are prepared to tolerate is no more than 100, yet this part of what should be a democratic and transparent process has been ignored by your planners. Local Government, like any other elected body, is directly responsible to those citizens who put it there and should not hide behind "policy planning" to manipulate public opinion to suit their own agenda.</p> <p>Would you please explain why this part of the West Parley Parish Plan has been ignored by your planners? Communication between the concerned residents of this Parish and the District Council has been sparse to say the least. I must add that our family have experienced great difficulty in accessing the information necessary to gain a true picture of what East Dorset District Council are proposing and the reasoning behind this. We are all computer literate in our household but we fear that there are many residents of West Parley who do not have the same skills or who, indeed, do not even have access to the internet. How on earth are they supposed to be able to form an opinion on this consultation process? Surely, it was never the intention to keep a percentage of residents uninformed by excessive use of electronic information to the detriment of other methods?</p> <p>2. Green Belt Policy: The Town and Country Planning Act of 1947 defined Green Belt Policy and this is reiterated the Planning Policy Guidance 2: Green Belts: to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas, to prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another, to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment, to secure nature conservation interests, to retain land in agricultural use, to provide opportunities for access to the open countryside and to assist in urban regeneration by encouraging the redevelopment of brownfield sites. Building over 500 houses in West Parley, primarily on green belt land, is quite clearly contrary to this legislation. It will connect</p>					510		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>Ferndown with Bournemouth in an unbroken urban sprawl in which the distinctive character of the village of West Parley will disappear. We have no wish to become part of the Greater Bournemouth conurbation. Neither do we wish to see the destruction of valuable agricultural land upon which this proposed development would be built. We do not wish to see the destruction of the countryside adjacent to our village and the tragic effect this will have upon local fauna and flora which is a pleasure to view. We would add therefore, that these proposals would seriously undermine the quality of life which residents of West Parley currently enjoy, living in close proximity to green belt land. It is a flawed concept that this country's Green Belt Policy can be reinterpreted. There do not appear to be any exceptional circumstances in which a reinterpretation could be applied to West Parley and we would ask you to reconsider the legality of such a course of action.</p> <p>3. We understand that an additional 520 houses in West Parley represents an increase in the housing stock of 32%. We can see no evidence of accompanying plans to increase the local infrastructure to cover this excessive increase in population. We would ask, where are the plans for new schools, policing, health facilities, etc., which should accompany these proposals? We can see proposals for two new roads, one of which will be constructed dangerously close to Dudsbury Rings (FWP7) a heritage site of major archaeological value. We are sure that East Dorset District Council would not wish to be accused of an uncaring approach to our national heritage akin to archaeological vandalism should this site be disturbed in any way by property developers. We also understand that this road would necessitate the felling of ancient trees significant enough to have been given preservation orders and the displacement of a bat colony.</p> <p>4. The traffic system in the West Parley area is already overstretched and cannot cope with the present amount of traffic which passes through at certain times of the day. Over 500 additional households would increase local car ownership, possibly by 1000. A proposed narrowing of the road system at Parley Cross and a traffic shunting exercise around the two proposed new roads will only move the problem around the housing development creating potential for an increase in road traffic accidents, not resolve it.</p> <p>5. We fail to understand the logic of yet another supermarket (to be located at Parley Cross – FWP6) when there are already 5 other such stores serving the area. The roads in the West Parley area are already overcrowded; an additional superstore would add to this congestion. We suspect that the only people to profit from this would be the new superstore proprietors. There is no demand for this development. Similarly, the residents of West Parley have not asked for and do not need an Orchard (FWP 6) as they enjoy the full benefits of the adjacent Green Belt. We do not recall any consultation on this or indeed on the need for allotments. We, the residents Close, West Parley, are appalled at the planning proposals for our village, we object to the high-</p>						

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description		
											handed manner in which East Dorset District Council have ignored the genuine concerns of residents and their representatives on the Parish Council, and we are bitterly disappointed in the absence of a transparent, democratic and genuine dialogue on the above proposals. We have no intention of allowing our village to become subsumed and give our full support to our representatives on the Parish Council who are working so hard to make residents' voices heard. Please begin to listen to them and act accordingly.								
656544	Ms C Bradshaw		CSPS2681	Policy FWP7							As residents of West Parley, we are writing to express our concerns regarding the plan to build 300 houses on the FWP 6 site and 220 houses on the FWP 7 site. We wish to object most strongly to this proposed development and state our objections as follows: 1. A seriously flawed consultation process: We have attended several public meetings organised by West Parley Parish Council and a meeting Chaired by our local Member of Parliament. We have also researched the government criteria upon which this consultation process is supposedly based and find your methods to be totally unsatisfactory. The residents of West Parley took part in a detailed consultation organised by the Parish Council who then produced a Parish Plan based firmly upon this consultation. The Plan was well publicised (We helped in the delivery of copies to every household in the Parish). I understand that copies were also submitted to East Dorset District Council. It is clear in the Parish Plan that the maximum number of new houses which residents are prepared to tolerate is no more than 100, yet this part of what should be a democratic and transparent process has been ignored by your planners. Local Government, like any other elected body, is directly responsible to those citizens who put it there and should not hide behind "policy planning" to manipulate public opinion to suit their own agenda. Would you please explain why this part of the West Parley Parish Plan has been ignored by your planners? Communication between the concerned residents of this Parish and the District Council has been sparse to say the least. I must add that our family have experienced great difficulty in accessing the information necessary to gain a true picture of what East Dorset District Council are proposing and the reasoning behind this. We are all computer literate in our household but we fear that there are many residents of West Parley who do not have the same skills or who, indeed, do not even have access to the internet. How on earth are they supposed to be able to form an opinion on this consultation process? Surely, it was never the intention to keep a percentage of residents uninformed by excessive use of electronic information to the detriment of other methods? 2. Green Belt Policy: The Town and Country Planning Act of 1947 defined Green Belt Policy and this is reiterated the Planning Policy Guidance 2: Green Belts: to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas, to prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another, to assist						510		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment, to secure nature conservation interests, to retain land in agricultural use, to provide opportunities for access to the open countryside and to assist in urban regeneration by encouraging the redevelopment of brownfield sites. Building over 500 houses in West Parley, primarily on green belt land, is quite clearly contrary to this legislation. It will connect Ferndown with Bournemouth in an unbroken urban sprawl in which the distinctive character of the village of West Parley will disappear. We have no wish to become part of the Greater Bournemouth conurbation. Neither do we wish to see the destruction of valuable agricultural land upon which this proposed development would be built. We do not wish to see the destruction of the countryside adjacent to our village and the tragic effect this will have upon local fauna and flora which is a pleasure to view. We would add therefore, that these proposals would seriously undermine the quality of life which residents of West Parley currently enjoy, living in close proximity to green belt land. It is a flawed concept that this country's Green Belt Policy can be reinterpreted. There do not appear to be any exceptional circumstances in which a reinterpretation could be applied to West Parley and we would ask you to reconsider the legality of such a course of action.</p> <p>3. We understand that an additional 520 houses in West Parley represents an increase in the housing stock of 32%. We can see no evidence of accompanying plans to increase the local infrastructure to cover this excessive increase in population. We would ask, where are the plans for new schools, policing, health facilities, etc., which should accompany these proposals? We can see proposals for two new roads, one of which will be constructed dangerously close to Dudsbury Rings (FWP7) a heritage site of major archaeological value. We are sure that East Dorset District Council would not wish to be accused of an uncaring approach to our national heritage akin to archaeological vandalism should this site be disturbed in any way by property developers. We also understand that this road would necessitate the felling of ancient trees significant enough to have been given preservation orders and the displacement of a bat colony.</p> <p>4. The traffic system in the West Parley area is already overstretched and cannot cope with the present amount of traffic which passes through at certain times of the day. Over 500 additional households would increase local car ownership, possibly by 1000. A proposed narrowing of the road system at Parley Cross and a traffic shunting exercise around the two proposed new roads will only move the problem around the housing development creating potential for an increase in road traffic accidents, not resolve it.</p> <p>5. We fail to understand the logic of yet another supermarket (to be located at Parley Cross – FWP6) when there are already 5 other such stores serving the area. The roads in the West Parley area are already overcrowded; an additional superstore would add to this congestion. We suspect that the only people to profit from this would be the new superstore</p>						

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
											<p>proprietors. There is no demand for this development. Similarly, the residents of West Parley have not asked for and do not need an Orchard (FWP 6) as they enjoy the full benefits of the adjacent Green Belt. We do not recall any consultation on this or indeed on the need for allotments. We, the residents Close, West Parley, are appalled at the planning proposals for our village, we object to the high-handed manner in which East Dorset District Council have ignored the genuine concerns of residents and their representatives on the Parish Council, and we are bitterly disappointed in the absence of a transparent, democratic and genuine dialogue on the above proposals. We have no intention of allowing our village to become subsumed and give our full support to our representatives on the Parish Council who are working so hard to make residents' voices heard. Please begin to listen to them and act accordingly.</p>							
656547	Mr T.G Wood		CSPS2643	Policy FWP7							<p>I am writing to express my objections to the plans for building of 520 new houses on the green belt field alongside New Road West Parley and 200 new houses at Dudsbury Heights. My first objection is on the grounds that green belts were specifically established to maintain reasonable areas of open space between residential towns and conurbations and that by building on the remaining fields at West Parley, Ferndown will be effectively conjoined with the Bournemouth conurbation.</p> <p>Secondly, the houses proposed will be virtually beneath the flight path for Bournemouth International Airport and, as it is one of the aims of the local authorities in the area is to increase commercial air traffic at the airport; this will cause noise pollution problems for future residents. (I live in this zone and can assure you that extra flights will not be welcomed even by existing residents living under the flight path).</p> <p>Thirdly, the proposed road layout whereby traffic between the River Stour side of New Road and the airport side of Christchurch Road is to be routed through the new housing estate via 5 mini round-a-bouts and new major junctions on New Road and Christchurch Road will cause enormous traffic chaos. Up to 300 cars per hour pass between these two roads in the rush hour. With the additional cut through new road from the river Stour side of New Road up to the Longham side of Christchurch Road, this will mean all traffic from New Road heading for the airport will encounter three major road junctions and five mini round-a-bouts within the distance of ½ mile.</p> <p>The new residences will be subjected to this amount of traffic every day and it will not be a pleasant place to live.</p> <p>Fourthly, the proposal for 720 new houses in the area will mean that approximately 1000 to 1500 extra cars will be seeking to join the school run and rush hour traffic and the proposed new road layout will be very dangerous for all pedestrians.</p> <p>Finally, is the inclusion of plans for a new medium sized supermarket at the corner of the cross roads which we are all</p>					510		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
											amazed to see. This can only introduce the possibility of further conflicting traffic movements and, we know it will struggle for business in competition with the meagre trade seen at the existing Tesco Express. I trust that further more realistic thought will be given to choosing suitable sites for future housing development in East Dorset.							
656766	Mr & Mrs M.J Muncer		CSPS2636	Policy FWP7							I wish to place my concerns about the planning proposals for West Parley on record. In writing I am mindful of pages 220 of the Core Strategy Document and 57 of the National Policy Framework Document, plus the now superseded Government Document PPS12. I am a resident of Church Lane, West Parley and was attracted to the area due to its separate identity from Bournemouth and to a lesser extent the remainder of Ferndown. This separation is achieved by the open spaces that exist between West Parley and the rest of the conurbation. If building is allowed on these vital open spaces West Parley will lose its character and the conurbation will become yet more dense and overbuilt. There are presently a number of these Green Lungs in the West Parley area and they all appear to be under threat. A green belt has been in force in this area for many years but it now seems that at the very time its protection is needed it is being treated as a mere inconvenience. The planning proposals for West Parley would increase the population of the area by nearly a third which is a disproportionate part of the burden expected of the conurbation fringe. Increases in housing equals increases in traffic and the capacity of New Road is already near its maximum. The development on Dudsbury Heights (FWP7) has the advantage of being hidden from general view however 220 houses seems an enormous development whilst 300 houses on the New Road site (FWP6) will just turn the place into a town. I am mindful that there has been considerable "consultation" on this matter but it is becoming apparent that this is no more than window dressing. Proposal FWP 6 and FWP 7 are far more extensive than previously indicated and appear to have been foisted upon the area by local government with scant regard for local feeling. The Parish Council has genuinely consulted residents and the Parish Plan is a worthy document which I urgently ask the East Dorset District Council to fully respect when making decisions which will affect this community.					510		
656792	Mr R.G Williams		CSPS2650	Policy FWP7							I am writing to let you know that I am very angry at the fact that you and your Committee are proposing to build 520 houses on 2 sites FWP6/FWP7 in our small village of West Parley. This will bring 1000 cars to the village morning and evening. The new link road that is proposed just over the river will be a waste of time as you will be able to drive through the estate on the other link Road as this will be turned into a rat run mainly for cars. You have not mentioned that we will need more Doctors, Dentists and schools, all our schools are full at					510		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description		
											the moment and will probably be this way a quite a few years to come. We do not need more shops here as Ferndown is just up the road and Bournemouth is a short car ride away. We were told that houses could not be built on the Airport flight path for safety reasons, what would have happened if the Red Arrow plane crash was traveling in the opposite direction and was a Commercial Plane. I do feel that we need more houses but 520 is far too many, Why did you not ask to residents of West Parley for their views and proposals								
657421	Mr Chris Wells		CSPS2532	Policy FWP7							I am absolutely horrified and appalled at the proposed development in West Parley area. Nearly all the few remaining pockets of countryside in this already overcrowded area will get swallowed up. Also this will contribute to even more traffic at one of the busiest crossroads in Dorset. To build more link roads is not the answer because it will just create even more traffic in the long run. The higher density of population that will come about with more building will put even more strain on our amenities such as Doctors Dentists and schools etc. I think the only way ahead is to leave this area exactly like it is now and have no more development whatsoever. We also don't need any more food stores as there are already plenty in Bournemouth, Ferndown & Wimborne etc.				510				
660079	Mrs S Moore		CSPS2608	Policy FWP7							I live in Church Lane when I walk up the road to try and cross to the Curlew, Memorial Hall and Parley Sports Club, you can wait ages, you get a kind lorry driver stop to let you cross. I do hope there will be a crossing when they build all these houses and more cars. I am in my eighties. I don't want to walk up to Parley Cross lights to cross. I don't see why they have to build on a busy road its bad enough now. I hate to think what its going to be like.				510				
496473	Mr Brian Morgan		CSPS2665	Policy FWP7							Further to my previous response to the consultation document, I would like to raise the following additional points:- 1. In respect of Policies FWP6 and 7, 300 and 220 new homes are clearly far too many for what is now a greenbelt site, adjoining the built-up area of what is now a small parish. It represents a 32% increase in West Parley's housing stock; quite apart from the fact that building on these Key Gap areas at all is environmentally unacceptable and damaging, not to mention excessive, there are also financial factors to consider here. It is, in short, this very kind of overdevelopment, which has resulted in up to 80% discounts being available against Spanish property asking prices, with estates comprising dozens of houses remaining unoccupied, and even vandalized. Banks, which have lent heavily on such projects, are now virtually bankrupt, and here you are proposing exactly the same type of damaging (economically) overdevelopment, in what are clearly very straitened and difficult financial times, with a similar foreseeable outlook. 2. Why, having regard to the foregoing, propose yet another supermarket in FWP6 (and shopping centre), when the				510				

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description		
											<p>locality already has 4 of them, as well as many convenience stores? There is simply no need for it, and it would inevitably close down in my view, that is assuming anyone ever agreed to open it!</p> <p>3. A link road proposed to go through the middle of a 300 house estate, as per FWP6, would clearly be highly dangerous for occupying families – if there are any – while the decision to include a proposal for completion of this Link Road (and the one for FWP7) at some indefinite time, well after half the houses have been built, is little short of crazy; by this, I mean that the already severe vehicle congestion at Parley Cross, experienced, especially driving rush-hours, will simply be made unnecessarily very much worse indeed.</p> <p>All round, in my opinion, these proposals, along with many others in this consultation document, are appallingly damaging, and I trust that elected members will have the courage to treat them with the disdain they deserve unreservedly.</p>								
496987	Mrs M Marshall		CSPS2687	Policy FWP7							<p>I write to voice my concerns about the proposed building of 220 houses on the FWP7 and 300 on the FWP6 sites. I took a great interest in the published Parish Plan and thought that this was in keeping with the government legislation of a full consultation with the local community. This seems to have been subsequently ignored.</p> <p>The proposals change West Parley from being a community in its own right to an extension of Bournemouth. Will we become part of the Bournemouth Unitary Council and not part of EDDC?</p> <p>I do not wish to see the loss of the countryside around the area – it provides an essential part of our existence and is well used by residents for walking, nature trails etc.</p> <p>The increase in the number of houses is frightening. The seems little mention of more school places, doctors, dentists car parking places in Ferndown but another Supermarket is proposed – since when was shopping more important than health, schools and transport?</p> <p>I always know when there is an accident on the Bournemouth Spur road – the traffic is diverted through West Parley crossroads. The road junction is at maximum capacity anyway but to add 1,000 cars to the equation is to create a possible grid lock on many occasions. Please look at how often there is an accident on the Spur Road.</p> <p>There are many reasons why this proposal should not go ahead – I have to trust that you have the necessary information that says all these houses are needed, I have never been made aware of the great need.</p> <p>I hope that there will be much more public consultation before any plans are finalised.</p>				510				
500810	Mrs Elizabeth Le Rossignol		CSPS2690	Policy FWP7							<p>I am writing about the plans to build 220 houses on the FWP7 and 300 FWP6 sites.</p> <p>I know more affordable housing is needed and some houses probably do need to be built, but to build such a huge number of houses in West Parley will join Bournemouth to Ferndown in a huge conurbation. West Parley would lose its identity and</p>				510				

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>become part of the urban sprawl.</p> <p>The 2 new roads proposed will create islands of noise for all those living between them and it is likely that children will be living in houses near to what will become a rat-run. The roads will not ease the traffic situation in West Parley as there will be many extra cars on them due to the expanded population. I don't see any new doctors' surgeries or schools on the plans and I wonder how the existing ones will cope with the extra people? I already have to wait up to two weeks to see my doctor sometimes.</p> <p>However, I see there are plans for a supermarket. Why? We already have Tesco Express for emergencies, and there is an excellent bus service to the Supermarkets in Ferndown, which my 90 year-old neighbour uses without a problem. Surely a new Supermarket will bring even more traffic to the area and further erode the rural feel we have in West Parley at present. Most of my elderly neighbours do not have the internet and have been unable to find the information they need to look closely at the proposals.</p> <p>I am asking that you re-think these proposals and put forward some new ones that will take into consideration our rural environment and heritage, the needs and wishes of the present population and service providers of West Parley, and the needs of those who would be coming to live in new houses here, as I feel that none of these is being satisfied at present.</p>						
501822	Mr Stephen Collins		CSPS2630	Policy FWP7		No				Yes	<p>I argue against the strategy on the basis of protecting the Green Belt, a desire embedded in national planning policy, with which the strategy is inconsistent.</p> <p>Traditional shops and affordable housing are desirable, but not 'very special circumstances' worth the sacrifice of our important 'Key Gap' Green Belt. The proposal for a superstore is not justified as it is not based on any evidence, indeed the Issues and Options consultation found evidence for the requirement of tradition independent food shops. FWP6 closes up the Key Gap with Bournemouth and is therefore inconsistent with national policy which provides to prevent urban sprawl.</p> <p>The strategy is not justified because other, more appropriate alternatives have not been considered and it is not the most appropriate strategy. Government wishes to prefer brown field development and we have an ideal site available on the former Dormy hotel land.</p> <p>The impact on the green belt would be so adverse as to outweigh any perceived benefits and so destroying it is inconsistent with national policy. Indeed this strategy fails on so many counts of tests of soundness that one wonders how it ever got to this stage.</p> <p>Furthermore, if this strategy were implemented, there would be building on or removal of trees with TPOs. There is a bat reserve in the areas of the proposed link road. Grade 2 agricultural land will be lost – again, going against national policy.</p> <p>Roads pass through or close to housing estates. Children</p>				510		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
											playing outside will be in danger from the traffic. To drive to Chine Walk from New Road coming from Bournemouth, I would have to turn left into the link road, circumvent the estate, and then turn right into heavy Christchurch Road traffic before taking a left turn into Chine Walk. The statistics for delays and for road traffic accidents occurring when turning right from a minor road into a major one show how ludicrous the idea to close the left turn filter lane at Parley Cross. Furthermore, the link road will take heavy traffic across the Stour Valley Way, not improving access to nor enhancing nor protecting a national trail – again, against national policy. The strategy is also undemocratic, because, though you may have taken a survey of local people, you have largely ignored it. Local people said ‘we should try at all costs to preserve the Green Belt. Yet you are proposing a massive 32% increase in West Parley’s housing stock. Whether you talk of preserving 99.5% of East Dorset’s Green Belt or not, that is irrelevant when the cost to West Parley is so disproportionately high. SANG is no compensation when we already have Green Belt and when residents said ‘please keep West Parley and surrounding areas pleasant to live in, by limiting the density of all these options. Councils are elected. They work for the electorate. They do not ride roughshod over the expressed opinions, requirements and needs of the community they were elected to serve.							
502678	Mr R F Perry		CSPS2694	Policy FWP7							We came to live in this area because it is semi rural. With open fields etc. Now the policy seems to be to destroy all of what has been Green Belt, take away the Key Gaps that exist between Bournemouth and Ferndown. The sheer number of proposed dwellings are far too many with insufficient infrastructure, the roads at moment cannot cope. 32% increase in housing for West Parley to excessive. Why did the District Council virtually ignore the West Parley Parish Plan. What is the point of all this? Are we the people of Parley inconsequential. Why do we need another supermarket when one already exist? The shops we had on the Parade have now become virtually a trading Estate, so much for planning.				510			
502950	Mr I G Banks		CSPS2770	Policy FWP7	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes		I agree with consenses of W. Parley residents to retain the limited amount of Green Belt areas that remain. David Cameron PM said in Parliament of 27th April 2012 “Green Belt, etc will remain protected under new planning laws and wishes of local communities will be upheld!! This view has been supported by relevant committees as listed in my letter (by email) to John Wilson DCC, 25th April 2012, copy attached for references. COPY 187 New Road West Parley Ferndown Dorset BH22 8ED 25 February 2012 To: Mr John Wilson Dorset County Council	Cancel the development proposals to maintain Key Gaps with Bournemouth, as planning controls originally intended for the prevention of urban sprawl.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		510			

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>Re: Development of Green Belt at West Parley</p> <p>I was dismayed to learn that the "old chestnut" to include the green belt within new housing proposals incorporated within the core strategy plans is presently up for debate at the EDDC meeting scheduled for 5th March 2012 at Village Hotel Bournemouth.</p> <p>May I remind you of the various personages and relevant committees who have previously spoken out in support of preservation of Green Belt areas both nationally and locally.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "I believe that decisions on local issues like use of Green Belt areas for housing development should be decided by local people" – (David Cameron, and Chris Chope MP for General Election ...and) • "We believe that election promises should be kept. It's a matter of trust" – (David Cameron as Prime Minister for EU elections.) • "...area enjoys some of the most sylvan settings ...will continue towards maintaining these and resist the tide of urbanisation that is threatening this by ever increasing housing development" – (Wilson, D. Burt for DCC elections.) • "Support the protection of our Green Belt against it becoming a concrete jungle" – (R.Daw, B.Manuel for EDDC elections) • "The Council voted unanimously to oppose plans for building on Green Belt land" – (EDDC meeting held 3 Sept 2008.) • "The Council objected in the strongest possible manner ... and consider the Green Belt housing plans no longer deliverable."- (DCC press release confirming decision in Oct 2008.) • "Conservative councillors are pledged to resist extensive development in our Green Belt." – (for May 2010 General elections.) • "We pledge to safeguard our Green Belt from inappropriate development in the local plan" – (J. Wilson, B. Manuel for EDDC elections May 2011.) <p>I understand that over 80% of West Parley residents are against the proposals and therefore ask you and all members that have expressed opposition in the past to vote against the proposal in respect of Green Belt development and thus demonstrate that democracy at local level does prevail. It is a shame that so much time and resources have had to be expended over this matter in the past, but we can avoid going through the same rigmarole all over again facing a long battle to get an unpopular decision reversed.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Ian Banks</p>						
656811	Mrs Lesley White		CSPS2652	Policy FWP7							<p>I am writing in response to the proposed Green Belt Plans, and specifically policy FWP6, which would affect the New Road area of Parley Cross.</p> <p>I do not agree that these proposals are suitable for this area. For a start the 520 houses which are suggested would mean a huge increase of 32% for a small semi – rural village. Also the area is not ideal for young families as there are not enough school places or suitable transport links available.</p>				510		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
											<p>The small green belt that is the last space separating West Parley from Bournemouth should remain, in order to avoid the whole area from becoming an urban sprawl.</p> <p>These fields are home to a large amount of wildlife, and used by sparrowhawks searching for food. No thought has been given to the impact that housing would have on their needs. Also large areas of these fields are under water for weeks at a time after heavy rain, so houses would be flooded on a regular basis.</p> <p>The proposed link road from Christchurch Road to New Road would turn what has always been a quiet country lane into a very busy and dangerous road, with large gravel lorries passing very close to the houses several times a day, posing a danger to elderly and very young residents, and generally making their lives miserable.</p> <p>In conclusion I would like to point out that we need to have some areas that people can aspire to. There is no point in working hard all your life and paying taxes if there are no "nice" areas to aspire to. If everywhere becomes an urban sprawl we have no incentive to work or pay taxes. We NEED our green spaces. Please think again.</p>							
657385	Mr W.P Rees		CSPS2657	Policy FWP7							<p>I would like to register my deep concern and opposition to the current proposals to build 500 houses on Green Belt land at West Parley. These proposals show a complete disregard for the village of West Parley and a disdain for the principles of environmental conservation.</p> <p>The two planning policies FWP7 and FWP6 differ considerably from the proposals of 2010. Consequently neither of these policies have been properly consulted upon. In fact the council have apparently avoided any input from West Parley Parish Council and appear to be attempting to steam-roller these proposals through while ignoring the well known local and national opposition to any encroachment on the Green Belt.</p> <p>Another 500 houses at West Parley would increase the size of the village by over 30%. By anyone's standard, this explosion in size over such a short time scale is wholly unsustainable, especially considering the current congestion at West Parley cross roads.</p> <p>The Green Belt is perhaps the most important environmental constraint within current planning law. It has protected countless Dorset villages from avaricious developers for many years. The current West Parley Green Belt that the council plan to destroy is even more important as these sections of Green Belt from Key Gaps. Without these Key Gaps West Parley would inevitably be subsumed into Bournemouth.</p> <p>The people of West Parley have recorded their dissent. The Parish Plan recorded that 80% of residents opposed building on the Green Belt. In fact this is not just a West Parley issue. A poll by the CPRE also found the same percentage (80%) of the national population were opposed to any encroachment onto the Green Belt.</p> <p>The Green Belt is too precious to be lost. The Green belt is a legacy for our children. It should be conserved at almost any</p>					510		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											cost. Any encroachment on the Green Belt is wholly reprehensible. West Parley is quintessentially English village protected by the surrounding Green Belt. Both are too precious to be destroyed by what amounts to planning vandalism. Please review and amend these proposals.						
660162	Mrs H M Wood		CSPS2646	Policy FWP7							<p>I am writing to express my objections to the plans for building of 520 new houses on the green belt field alongside New Road West Parley and 200 new houses at Dudsbury Heights. My first objection is on the grounds that green belts were specifically established to maintain reasonable areas of open space between residential towns and conurbations and that by building on the remaining fields at West Parley, Ferndown will be effectively conjoined with the Bournemouth conurbation.</p> <p>Secondly, the houses proposed will be virtually beneath the flight path for Bournemouth International Airport and, as it is one of the aims of the local authorities in the area is to increase commercial air traffic at the airport; this will cause noise pollution problems for future residents. (I live in this zone and can assure you that extra flights will not be welcomed even by existing residents living under the flight path).</p> <p>Thirdly, the proposed road layout whereby traffic between the River Stour side of New Road and the airport side of Christchurch Road is to be routed through the new housing estate via 5 mini round-a-bouts and new major junctions on New Road and Christchurch Road will cause enormous traffic chaos. Up to 300 cars per hour pass between these two roads in the rush hour. With the additional cut through new road from the river Stour side of New Road up to the Longham side of Christchurch Road, this will mean all traffic from New Road heading for the airport will encounter three major road junctions and five mini round-a-bouts within the distance of ½ mile.</p> <p>The new residences will be subjected to this amount of traffic every day and it will not be a pleasant place to live.</p> <p>Fourthly, the proposal for 720 new houses in the area will mean that approximately 1000 to 1500 extra cars will be seeking to join the school run and rush hour traffic and the proposed new road layout will be very dangerous for all pedestrians.</p> <p>Finally, is the inclusion of plans for a new medium sized supermarket at the corner of the cross roads which we are all amazed to see. This can only introduce the possibility of further conflicting traffic movements and, we know it will struggle for business in competition with the meagre trade seen at the existing Tesco Express.</p> <p>I trust that further more realistic thought will be given to choosing suitable sites for future housing development in East Dorset.</p>				510		
660933	Mr Mark Loveder		CSPS2951	Policy FWP7							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities				510		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)						
360302	Mrs Hilary Chittenden	Environment TAG (East Dorset)	CSPS3316	Policy FWP7	No	No	No	No	No	No	<p>The policy does not recognise adequately the importance of the sub-region's environmental assets. Sustainable development must include all three strands of Sustainability - social, economic and environmental. (NPPF para 7)</p> <p>In the absence of biological survey at appropriate times of year and in the absence of inappropriate land management (in this case very heavy horse grazing) there is no evidence on which to base unequivocal assessment of the damage/loss that would be caused by development. Based on ETAG members' expertise and experience it is believed that this site in particular could well be a significant area of BAP acid grassland much of which would be lost to development. Further, it is inappropriate to pre-empt survey and recommend that the potential SANG should be set out as parkland. It is essential to look at the wider picture and ensure that the SANG reflects and enhances the existing habitat and contributes to wider and more resilient ecological networks (NPPF para 109).</p> <p>The topography of the site raises concern about the acceptability of the steepest areas for housing. Similar gradients are one of the criteria that have ruled out land at Corfe Mullen. The original BroadwayMalyan Masterplan identified a required surface run-off attenuation storage capacity of 10,668 cu.m. It is assumed that this would have to be tanked to ensure it did not become a magnet for waterfowl and hence risk air strike. No reference has been made to the ecosystem services afforded by the land (NPPF para 109), the "future proofing" of the proposal with regard to climate change issues in the longer term (NPPF para 99) or the provision of SUDs for the development. We are concerned that leaving FRA to the planning application stage is inappropriate for a site that may prove undeliverable, at least in part.</p> <p>The topography also raises concerns about the suitability of the SANG for the elderly, for young children and for parents with buggies. Much of the SANG should be DDA compliant. It is understood from local residents and councillors that the lower (SW) part of the SANG is flooded or at best waterlogged following heavy rain. There should be links for both people and wildlife across New Road to the smaller area of SANG shown for FWP6. This should be made an attractive option so that people do not simply drive round to Parley Common. It is essential that this SANG works so that there is no adverse impact on the N2K heathland at Parley Common. There is no reference to the problem of light pollution here (particularly from the new link road and other street lights) nor</p>	<p>The housing allocation should be informed by biological survey (to ensure that high value BAP grassland, if identified, is not lost) and by flood risk assessment (to ensure that longer term climate change impacts are taken into account. Flood risk assessment should include consideration of the ecosystem services provided by the land and the impact on the SANGs areas that are prone to flood. Additional suitable dry areas should be identified. Because of the open aspect of the site, the policy should include a requirement for avoidance or mitigation of light pollution impacts on the R. Stour.</p> <p>Layout and design of the land between the Hillfort and the development should be informed by existing nature conservation interest of the land</p> <p>The SANG design should be informed by biological survey to create coherent ecological networks more resilient to current and future pressures. The majority of the SANG</p>	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	As part of the East Dorset Community Partnership, ETAG's remit on biological sciences and sustainability is wider than that of Natural England or Dorset Wildlife Trust. Membership includes highly qualified natural scientists and town & parish representatives.	510		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description				
											any proposal for its avoidance or mitigation particularly in relation to the damaging impact on the R Stour. (NPPF para 125). The SANG car park should be located away from the river to minimise polarised light. Deliverability is in doubt: i) Flood Risk Assessment and biological surveys should inform the selection of sites that are short listed; ii) the proposal lacks flexibility to deliver objectives if major parts of the site fail. Sustainability Appraisal SA Objective 1 Protect, enhance and expand habitats and protected species ETAG believes that the site may well be a significant area of BAP acid grassland that properly managed could make a substantial contribution to habitat enhancement and connectivity. Much would be lost beneath built development. SA Objective 3 Minimise pollution Policy and SA should address light pollution. Comparative data on air pollution of other options for the road system would be valuable to inform the eventual decision: this is important for local residents, pedestrians and impact on Parley Common.	should be DDA compliant and accessible from new development on the site. A safe road crossing should be provided at the junction of the new link road and New Road with ecological links to the smaller area of FWP6 SANG.									
490823	Mr Ian Jones	Ferndown Town Council	CSPS3001	Policy FWP7	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes		The Town Council would object on grounds of increased traffic movements and journey time, primarily to and from Ferndown on the A347 (see also FWP5) Any additional capacity created around Parley Cross by the two new link roads will be more than offset by the additional traffic from this and the proposed development east of New Road (FWP6)				510						
359571	Mr Renny Henderson	Royal Society for the Protection of Birds	CSPS3734	Policy FWP7							Policy Allocation Dwellings/land area Comment WMC3 Cuthbury allotments and St Margaret's Close New Neighbourhood, Wimborne 260 SANG to be provided in accordance with policy ME3 WMC4 Stone Lane 90 SANG to be provided in accordance with policy ME3 6 WMC5 Cranborne Road New Neighbourhood, Wimborne 600 SANG to be provided in accordance with policy ME3 WMC6 South of Leigh Road New Neighbourhood and Sports Village, Wimborne 75 ha SANG to be provided in accordance with policy ME3 CM1 Lockyer's School and Land North of Corfe Mullen New Neighbourhood		Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	we would like to confirm that we wish to reserve the right to appear at the Examination into the Core Strategy, on the grounds the Core Strategy raises significant issues relating to the protection of internationally important wildlife sites (as highlighted in the HRA) and that there remains uncertainty over the delivery of appropriate and effective mitigation measures.	510						

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>250 SANG to be provided in accordance with policy ME3 FWP3 Holmwood House New Neighbourhood, Ferndown</p> <p>110 SANG to be provided in accordance with policy ME3 FWP4 Coppins new Neighbourhood, Ferndown</p> <p>30 SANG to be provided in accordance with policy ME3 FWP6 Land East of New Road New Neighbourhood, West Parley</p> <p>320 SANG to be provided in accordance with policy ME3 FWP7 West of New Road New Neighbourhood, West Parley</p> <p>200 SANG to be provided in accordance with policy ME3 VTSW4 North West Verwood New Neighbourhood</p> <p>230 SANG to be provided in accordance with policy ME3 FWP8 Blunt's Farm Employment Allocation, Ferndown</p> <p>30ha A mitigation strategy to be agreed to avoid harm to European sites and SSSI VTSW5 North Eastern Verwood New Neighbourhood</p> <p>50 SANG to be provided in accordance with policy ME3 VTSW6 Woolsbridge Employment Allocation, Three Legged Cross</p> <p>9.7ha A mitigation strategy to be agreed to SSSI The RSPB does not, in principle, object to the residential allocations above. However, the table does illustrate the heavy reliance on SANGs as a mitigation measure. The Councils will be aware of the relatively untested nature of SANGs as effective mitigation, albeit in the context of available measures, it is clear that SANGs offer perhaps the best opportunity of addressing potential adverse impacts on the European sites. SANGs are a principal component of the approach taken by the Dorset Heathlands Interim Planning Framework (IPF), and are used as a mitigation vehicle elsewhere in England, notably in the Thames Basin Heaths. Research continues on the effectiveness of SANGs, and it is imperative that this research informs SANGs development anticipated under the Core Strategy. Long-term management and monitoring is also critical (as is identified in policy CN1). Testing of the suitability of SANGs as a mitigation measure for the above policies is essential and has not yet been undertaken. We are concerned that some of the SANGs proposed may be ineffective, particularly SANGs associated with smaller allocations.</p>						

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
											With respect to employment allocations FWP8 (Blunt's Farm) and VTSW6 (Woolsbridge), we are not familiar with these locations. We do not object to these policies subject to receiving clarification from Natural England of the issues pertinent to these sites, and the likely efficacy of mitigation strategies anticipated by these policies.							
524088	Mr Ken Parke	Ken Parke Planning Consultants	CSPS3634	Policy FWP7	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Please see attached representations document and appendices	Please see attached representations document and appendices	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	The representation has a significant bearing on the distribution of housing within the district and will require detailed oral examination.	510	2260318_0_1.pdf		
514156	Mr J Breeze		CSPS2621	Map 10.10	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	<p>TRANSPORT AND ACCESS: diverting traffic from the village centre will not alleviate the existing very severe traffic congestion in Christchurch Road for traffic E – W / W – E just merely move the congestion 400 yds further up the road to the proposed new junction in Christchurch Road. The effect of giving access at that point to traffic from a further estimated 200 new homes solution. It is noted the "Highways Agency" is not included in the Core Strategy Document "Key Stakeholders" a fact that speaks for itself. From the above: The "Transport and Access of FWP7 has not been properly prepared or thought out. From the above: It cannot be considered effective or justified. It can only be considered consistent with National Policy, if that policy is to Congest roads and slow the economic growth of the area</p> <p>GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE - FWP7 Para 10.39 (Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace for Public Access)</p> <p>SANG To replace the Green Belt areas currently required for development FWP7, as shown on Map 10.10, the area of "Potential SANG" is currently and in the foreseeable future, undeliverable, both to the Development, its occupants and the wider public.</p> <p>Of the 100% "Potential SANG" area Some 25% Adjacent to the River Stour, is on a flood plain, often under water and unusable for long periods of time. Some 5% is bog/waterlogged land for much of the year. Some 8% is steep cliffs/valley rides up to 20mts or more. (All the above areas are currently fenced off, specifically preventing access and the associated dangers, particularly to children)</p> <p>Some 15% is an existing, working Public House, beer garden and pub car park, which although an excellent facility, is not a suitable area to claim as "potential SANG". Some 30% is currently a private house, garden and grounds in private ownership, and not either owned by the developers or within the development area. Why this "Dudsbury Manor" estate has been included in the potential SANG area is inexplicable and an explanation should be given. Of the some 17% of the "potential SANG" remaining that is the only SANG for FWP7 that is currently or for the</p>	<p>Layout and Design FWP 7 The Core Strategy document states that the FWP7 area is of a higher landscape value than the main development at FWP6. It is a fact that within FWP7 itself, that sector west of the of the proposed link road (Dudsbury Monument area adjacent) is of a far higher order of natural beauty again. Council Policy HE3 applies and, particularly with any removal of Green Belt protection, should give protection to the quality and diversity of the landscape in this special sector of FWP7. This is not mentioned in the Core Strategy. It should be. The present Green Belt policy has afforded significant protection to the ancient hedgerows lying in the proposed area west of the link road, that are recognised as providing a major protected habitat for numerous bird, animal and insect species,</p>	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		511			

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>foreseeable future, actually available or deliverable on the grounds of Land Suitability, Availability, or (Safety for Public use under Policy HE2) Implementing Policy D.</p> <p>To remedy this SANG shortfall a significant sector of the development should remain open space. The area abutting the Ancient Monument may be considered, providing a improved 'setting zone' and protecting the better habitat found west of the link road in FWP7.</p> <p>No development on FWP7 should be permitted until equivalent area to that shown on Map 10.10 can be allocated to actually usable SANG by all ages of the public, all year around.</p> <p>Policy HE4 Local Play and Sports</p> <p>The development area of FWP7 located to the west of the proposed link road is designated as a "Sports Field" on numerous local maps. Compilers of the Core Strategy may consider this area to supplement SANG, given its previous use.</p> <p>For the above reasons,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Positively Prepared: I do not believe the presented plan meets the objectives and needs of the area. 2) Justified The actual SANGs portion needs greater clarity and justification. 3) Effective: the plan is not deliverable in respect of "potential SANG" areas shown, and Policy HE2 public safety. 4) Would not be consistent with National Policy in providing unusable and unsafe SANGs set off. 	<p>including butterflies not widely found. The Ancient Hedgerows contain dense thicket of a wide variety of indigenous shrubs and wild plants, interspersed with Mature Oak trees and within the Development site, immediately adjacent to proposed housing places these at severe risk. They should be specifically protected in their entirety.</p> <p>Policy ME1 Protection of designated areas of Nature Conservation interest/Protected Habitat.</p> <p>If the Greenbelt status is removed then ME1 should be actioned for this area. The "right of way" from Christchurch Road (Adjacent to and behind the Owl's Nest Restaurant) running to the rear of "Dudsbury Manor" runs alongside the western Hedgerow and is a footpath for most of its length. It is not used for Vehicular access. This hedgerow would be at risk, being within the development, should developers require to widen the current access to provide either access to the development, during building or to provide a permanent main vehicular access to Dudsbury Manor, which may be required by virtue of the new development.</p> <p>The Council should meet with English Nature/CPRE/RSPB/</p>					

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
												<p>and local Parish Council to determine a future protection for these ancient hedgerows and the flora and fauna therein. Policy ME1 should provide a minimum future safeguard and distance between the sensitive habitat and housing increased. The final document should note that if the Inspector removes green belt status from this area west of the link road, nature will be so protected. Policy HE1 (safeguarding the historic heritage of the Country) The FWP7 development area west of the link road, and adjacent to the Hill Fort Ancient Monument is significant in historical and archaeological terms, to this area of Dorset/West Parley District. Previous maps show archaeological finds that are consistent with the monument and access to it. The public gallows, was located next to the development, and it is highly likely, as was usual that burial of the victims was actioned very nearby. The first maps of this area indicate habitation of two cottages adjacent to the development (possibly dating back to 1500's or earlier) at a time when no other habitation was found locally, it is behind.</p>						

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
												<p>For all the above reasons, and the HE1 policy, the Council (EDDC) should action a full archaeological survey of this area of development, west of the proposed link road, It should involve English Heritage/Dorset County Architects Dept, CRRE, and Local Universities. This survey should be actioned and discussed results before this area is included in any permitted development.</p> <p>As drawn, map 10.10 in the Core Strategy, shows the proposed affordable housing, west of the link road, within just 75 mrs of the Ancient Monument Hill Fort, just a 15 second cycle ride away. It is difficult to equate this fact with the opening Statement in para 10.39 of the Core Strategy "The Hill Fort is an ancient monument, so development must be kept clear from it and open space used to maintain its integrity" (A 15 second bike ride to a "ready made" playground/BMX track, or under a 50 odd seconds walk, is that adequate protection?) 75mts is not an adequate buffer zone for the public visiting it or the monument itself. It will put the monument under stress and the buildings that close will</p>						

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
												<p>ruin the existing picturesque "setting zone" in which the monument currently sits and which visitors see on arrival, with attractive hedgerows and established countryside along its access via the "StourWay" national footpath.</p> <p>It is noted that the Statutory body responsible for the Ancient Monument, "English Heritage", is not listed as a Key Stakeholder in the Core Strategy Document for FWP7 although lesser bodies are. This is clearly a serious omission, and it seems unlikely that English Heritage would give Statutory Approval for such an immediate distance as 75 mrs, given the present ideal situation and the detrimental impact both visually, and practically that such a distance will bring to the Ancient Hill Fort.</p> <p>In the present proposal, intense use of the Monument Site for all manor of activities by estate residents is highlighted, by the fact that of the "potential SANG" area (Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace for Public Recreation) in FWP7 on Map 10.10, only some 17% of it is usable to the Public of all ages on a year round basis. A fact that will not be lost on the</p>					

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
												<p>Statutory body (EH) who would undoubtedly seek a greater distance from such a large scale development.</p> <p>The Hill Fort site incorporates land owned by the Girl Guides Association and main guide camps for Dorset facility within it. It is important for the safety of the hundreds of children guides, using the site annually, and despite the levels of supervision, to ensure security. A good level of security is currently provided by the isolation and distance away from any housing.</p> <p>Development so close to the monument will eventually put unneeded pressure on the Guides facility, which has been a wonderful retreat for parent and children alike, and its interests require safeguarding.</p> <p>For all the above reasons:</p> <p>1) Positively Prepared: I do not believe the present plan meets the objectives and meets the objectives and needs of the area.</p> <p>2) Justified: The plan is not the most appropriate strategy given the constraints of the particular area of FWP7.</p> <p>3) Effective: The plan is not deliverable in respect of HE3, ME1, the limited actual usable SANG and the distance from/effect on</p>					

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
												the ancient monument. 4) Would not be consistent with National Policy for the protection of ancient monuments and the Flora and Fauna of the specific area west of the link road in FWP7.					
703944	Cllr John Little	Christchurch & East Dorset Conservative Association	CSPS458	Policy FWP8							The proposed development of 30 hecatres of Green Belt for employment development is supported.				515		
654320	Mrs Meghann Downing	Highways Agency	CSPS758	Policy FWP8	Yes	Yes					Given the location of this site immediately adjacent to the A31 trunk road, the Highways Agency will work with the Council and developers to ensure that the safety and operation of the A31 are maintained and that traffic impacts are appropriately mitigated. We are suppoortive of the inclusion of the statement in FWP8 that a comprehensive travel plan must be part of future proposals.		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		515		
654962	Mr Christopher Choape		CSPS924	Policy FWP8	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	The removal of 30 hectares of land from the Green Belt is not justified under the National Planning Policy Framework.	Deletion of this policy from the Plan.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	On behalf of constituents who are very concerned about the urbanisation of this important area of green space which is much utilised for recreational purposes.	515		
475541	Mr and Mrs P Spencer		CSPS1275	Policy FWP8		No			Yes		The Brook Road Recycling Centre in Wimborne is totally inadequate to cater for the demands from its catchment area. This situation will be significantly worsened by the provision of new neighbourhoods within East Dorset. It should therefore be a pre-requisite that a modern recycling facility is provided in Ferndown to reduce the otherwise unacceptable pressure that would be placed on the current sub-standard Brook Road facility.	An additional bullet point to be included as shown (in italics) below "30 hectares of land to the west of the Ferndown and Uddens Industrial Estates is removed from the green belt and allocated for employment development. This should involve λ The provision of B1 (Office and Light Industrial), B2 (General Industrial) and B8 (Warehousing and Distribution) employment uses λ A new household recycle facility λ Ancillary support services, such as cafes"	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		515		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
359461	Mrs Nicola Brunt	Dorset Wildlife Trust	CSPS1348	Policy FWP8	No	No	No	No	No	No	<p>Whilst Dorset Wildlife Trust supports the protection given to the designated nature conservation sites given in this policy, including the Ferndown Bypass SNCI (SU00/060), and the need to retain significant landscape buffers that should include heathland habitat, we are concerned that there is no biodiversity survey information to inform the decision to allocate this site or provide prerequisites for development, especially given its current location in the Green Belt. NPPF (165) states that planning policies and decisions should be based on up-to-date information about the natural environment.</p> <p>This site is identified in the RSPB 'heathland extent and potential' maps as having potential to re-create heathland habitat and falls within a Strategic Nature Area identified on a landscape scale as an area with potential for heathland restoration. Given its history, it is likely to support remnant heathland and protected species and represents a significant opportunity to recreate priority habitat and expand the range of priority species, extending the local ecological network and creating a more robust ecosystem supporting the SNCI and adjacent SSSI, which we believe is in line with NPPF (117, 118).</p> <p>The Ferndown Bypass SNCI (SU00/060) (site package attached for information) has dry and wet heath, acid grassland, woodland and scrub and is known to support 11 Dorset Notable Species. As the SNCI is linear and already subject to disturbance and pressures from the road and adjacent development, we consider that the SNCI requires significant buffering to comply with ME1. We consider that, without this, the SNCI would become squeezed between two industrial blocks and become unsustainable. DWT therefore recommend that as a minimum the whole north-eastern part of the site between the SNCI and the road should be defined as an ecological buffer and heathland and complimentary habitat protected, enhanced and expanded within this area. We consider that this area should be indicated on the map for such purposes, along with environmental designations and rights of way</p>	<p>Dorset Wildlife Trust would like to see full survey information inform the allocation. As a minimum, DWT recommend a prerequisite of development to be a significant ecological buffer for the SNCI to protect it from further development along its boundaries and, through this, enhancement of the ecological network to comply with NPPF (117, 118). Suggested wording Protection of the Site of Nature Conservation Interest through provision of a substantial ecological buffer, managed to enhance priority habitats and species. We consider that an indicative layout based on ecological information would be helpful, with an ecological buffer shown between the bypass and SNCI and landscape buffers to the northern and western parts of the site. We also consider that all environmental designations and rights of way should be shown on the Map 10.11.</p>	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	<p>Dorset Wildlife Trust is a voluntary nature conservation organisation which has specialist knowledge of the wildlife of Dorset and can offer local expertise. We manage the Sites of Nature Conservation Interest scheme for the county, are members of the East Dorset Environment Action Theme Group, the Dorset Biodiversity Officers Group and Dorset Biodiversity Partnership.</p>	515	2256009_0_1.pdf	
656249	Ms Gemma Care	Barton Willmore LLP	CSPS1083	Policy FWP8	Yes	Yes					<p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on the Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy (JCS) Pre-Submission document. On behalf of our client, Stour Valley Properties (Dorset) Ltd., we are pleased to provide the following response, which should be read in conjunction with the accompanying Consultation Response Forms.</p> <p>Background Barton Willmore LLP has been instructed to make representations to this document, on behalf of Stour Valley Properties (Dorset) Ltd. ('SVP')</p>		Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	<p>To ensure our case is presented in full and to be party to discussions.</p>	515		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>SVP have land interests within East Dorset and welcome the opportunity to contribute to the emerging Core Strategy (JCS). SVP are currently promoting the release of their land to the south of Wimborne for housing.</p> <p>Fundamentally, SVP have serious concerns over the level of overall housing provision identified within the draft JCS and the degree to which that which is proposed is sufficient to meet identified needs within the East Dorset and Christchurch locality. We submit, having regard to the evidence base material available that the level of housing proposed for East Dorset within the draft JCS is inappropriate and inconsistent with national planning policy, which states that each local planning authority should ensure that the Local Plan is based on adequate up-to-date and relevant evidence about the economic, social and environmental characteristics and prospects of the area. Local planning authorities are expected to ensure that their assessment of and strategies for housing, employment and other uses are integrated, and that they take full account of relevant market and economic signals.</p> <p>Consideration is given within the submitted representations to the strategic site allocations for Wimborne and Colehill identified within the JCS and the extent to which the proposed allocations fulfil the overall objectives and spatial vision for East Dorset and Christchurch. On the premise that insufficient housing requirements are identified in the Pre-Submission JCS we submit that additional strategic allocations or an increase in the specified number of required new dwellings are required in order to plan positively for the further housing growth we consider necessary in light of our appraisal of the Council's published JCS evidence base.</p> <p>In accordance with section 20 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended) local plans must be 'sound': i.e. they must be positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy. We suggest that the housing strategy adopted within the JCS as it stands is (a) not the most appropriate (on the basis that it is not considered fully justified) and (b) it is not 'positively prepared' – i.e. it is not based on a strategy which in our view genuinely seeks to meet objectively assessed needs.</p> <p>Within these representations we do not comment on every aspect of the JCS; our intention is to comment on those sections where we non-compliance with tests of soundness is apparent, or where we are particularly supportive. To be clear, our primary concern in this instance is the content and justification of Policy KS4 and the proposed housing allocations for Wimborne and Colehill – specifically Policy WMC6.</p> <p>An alternative proposal for housing to the south of Wimborne is considered with specific reference to the SVP land shown on the concept plan attached at Appendix 1 to these submissions.</p> <p>Comments are also provided on a number of other policies within the JCS, on individual response forms, as requested. The full list of policies to which these representations respond are:</p>						

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description	
											<p>Policy KS1, KS4, KS5, KS10 Policy WMC3, WMC6 Policy FWP3, FWP4, FWP6, FWP7, FWP8 Policy ME3 Policy HE4 Copies of all Core Strategy Response Forms relating to each policy addressed within these representations are contained at Appendix 4. Appendices 1 – 3 to this cover letter are those referred to in the various consultation forms. I trust that all of the enclosed is clear and in order and we look forward to engaging with you further in the consultation process. Strongly support this allocation. The site represents a logical extension to an existing employment site in a sustainable location..</p>							
612430	Mr Nick Squirrel	Natural England, Dorset and Somerset Team	CSPS1923	Policy FWP8	Yes	Yes					<p>This policy set out clear constraints on the location and objectives for biodiversity. Natural England has also commented on this site as part of the Gypsies and Travellers DPD consultation. The site is large and Natural England advise that there is a significant risk to its sustainable development if it is brought forward in a piecemeal basis. The site should be planned as a whole to allow for the proper and proportionate planning of the various uses. Natural England advise that a Masterplan approach based upon survey data is required to determine existing and potential biodiversity taking account of the potential for road widening along the northern edge and the need to provide compensatory habitats.</p>	Natural England would welcome discussions with the authority about how best to ensure these concerns are secured.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		515			
498554	Mr Paul Davenport	Stour Valley Properties Ltd	CSPS2889	Policy FWP8		Yes		No		No	<p>I support the inclusion of Policy FWP8 in the Core Strategy but feel an opportunity has been missed to link this employment land with associated housing to create a more sustainable whole. As with my comments on WMC6 I think a mix of employment and housing makes better sense. Moondale Developments are proposing around 100 homes only 1300m from Blunts Farm (see attached drawings). Should EDDC or the Inspector need more information on these proposals for the Alternative Site consultation later this year we would be most happy to oblige.</p>		Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	To ensure our case is presented to the Inspector in full as the promoter of a number of alternative strategic housing sites.	515	2257828_0_1.pdf 2257830_0_1.pdf		
360302	Mrs Hilary Chittenden	Environment TAG (East Dorset)	CSPS3317	Policy FWP8		No	No	No	No	No	<p>The policy does not recognise adequately the importance of the sub-region's environmental assets. Sustainable development must include all three strands of Sustainability - social, economic and environmental. (NPPF para 7) The wording "significant landscape buffers" is open to interpretation. Proposals should reflect the fact that the whole site has been identified by the RSPB in their Heathland Extent and Potential Mapping. There is known important biodiversity on the site including nightjar, smooth snake, sand lizard and dormouse, not just within the SNCI but within the heathy habitat between and beneath the conifers (and possibly beyond). It is imperative that site design is informed by biological survey and seeks to enhance, expand and buffer the SNCI through recreating areas of priority habitat (NPPF para 117). At the very least the NE section of the site should</p>	The allocation should be informed by full biological survey The SNCI should be expanded and buffered substantially, recreating areas of priority habitat: provision should be made for its long term management. Other screening of the industrial area should reflect and enhance existing natural habitat.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	As part of the East Dorset Community Partnership, ETAG's remit on biological sciences and sustainability is wider than that of Natural England or Dorset Wildlife Trust. Membership includes highly qualified natural scientists and town & parish representatives.	515			

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>be protected from development and provision made for its long term management.</p> <p>This site drains into the Uddens Water which feeds into the Moors River SSSI only slightly downstream of the site, and is itself part of the SSSI. This riverine system supports an exceptional range of biodiversity including rare Odonata and otters. There have been serious pollution issues in the past from employment estates which drain into the Uddens/Moors River system which have proved highly damaging to its biodiversity.</p> <p>We are therefore deeply concerned about the pollution threat from this proposal – both acute pollution from accidental spillage and diffuse pollution via ongoing surface water drainage.</p> <p>The site is included within areas which the EA has warned may be prone to surface water flooding and which is likely to increase in the longer term due to climate change (NPPF para 99). Thus the issue of pollution through surface water drainage, as and when this flooding inevitably occurs, is especially worrying.</p> <p>The Environment Agency's GP3 (2011), Groundwater Protection, Policy and Practice explains the need for the precautionary approach and the very real problems that pollution can cause, sometimes taking decades to resolve. Of particular relevance is Part 2, the Technical Framework and the section on pollutants. (http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk/research/library/publications/40741.aspx)</p> <p>Without absolute certainty that there will be no damage to the Moors River system the policy fails to comply with NPPF para 120.</p> <p>Sustainability Appraisal SA Objective 1 Protect, enhance and expand habitats and protected species Although welcome, simply protecting designated sites does not meet this objective. As identified in comments on the proposal the whole area presents opportunities for significant habitat enhancement of heathland and the two areas of wet woodland . These would be lost to development. Negative score not neutral. SA Objective 3 Minimise pollution Pollution risk is a threat to biodiversity of the site and Uddens Water. SA Objective 5 Provide access to meet people's needs Travel to work plans may limit GHG emission. Current plans for improving cycleways will contribute to meeting the objective. Cumulative effects and summary The policy does not score positively on objectives 1 and 3</p>	The policy should include a prerequisite for all surface water from the new and existing estate to pass through a balancing/pollution control feature for which a detailed management plan must be agreed by the Council, Environment Agency and Natural England.					
490823	Mr Ian Jones	Ferndown Town Council	CSPS3004	Policy FWP8	Yes	No	No	Yes	No		Although need for additional employment land is accepted, the Town Council believe this development is likely to have a negative impact on the local road network and adjacent native conservation area.		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		515		
498034	Mr Richard Cutler	Green Park Land Company Ltd	CSPS3177	Policy FWP8		No	No	No	No	No	Our representation on the Core Strategy Options, submitted on 11 January 2011, together with Stourbank Park,	Policy FWP8 can be made sound by East	Yes, I wish to participate	East Dorset has failed to engage with us on	515	2254009_0_1.pdf	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>Wimborne: A Compelling Case – Part 1 (May 2010), resubmitted with our January 2011 representations, set out a detailed case for the allocation of Stourbank Park for employment purposes (with some residential, given the adjoining properties). This can be developed in conjunction with the adjoining Wessex Water Depot.</p> <p>We therefore fundamentally disagree with the strategy of allocating one very large site, and two small sites in the East Dorset area (as shown on Map 4.3). Blunt’s Farm, in particular, is highly constrained, as evidenced by the constraints shown on Map 4.1.</p> <p>If a local Employment Land Review had been completed we suspect that it would have analyzed the employment land take up of Blunt’s Farm and concluded that the existing 9 hectares of consented employment land would comprise many years’ supply. This seems to have been accepted by the Workspace Study where, at page 67, Blunts Farm is suggested for release from 2021-31. Our argument is that greater dispersal is likely to provide greater flexibility and choice and, therefore, greater take up. Hence Stourbank Park should be allocated.</p> <p>We also note that for the period 2011-21 that there seems to be no new allocations capable of accommodating knowledge economy, B1 or, simply, the ‘ordinary’ local business employers who comprise an important but often overlooked element of the local employment mix (these being well illustrated by the accommodation available nearby at www.glasshousestudios.co.uk). This sort of small scale, characterful accommodation is incompatible with the sort of business environment offered at the Uddens and Ferndown Industrial Estates and the Woolsbridge Industrial Estate.</p> <p>As we have argued elsewhere, the approach to policy FWP8 does not provide the mix or balance of employment uses proposed by Policy KS5. Greater dispersal would help in meeting local needs and in offering a range of locations and, most crucially, choice and competition on rent, cost and quality. Finally, it provides nothing new or innovative that might help create a ‘step change’ in the economy or, simply, just something different (eg to add diversity).</p> <p>Policy FWP8 is therefore unsound. It is not justified by up to date evidence in a local Employment Land Review. The policy is not positively prepared and it is unlikely to be effective as it is not founded on an analysis of local needs and local employment market dynamics.</p>	<p>Dorset commissioning Stages 2 and 3 of the local Employment Land Review and then recasting its allocations and approach to employment based on the evidence that is made available. It should also identify the key sites; and 5 hectares of employment land at Stourbank Park should be included in the list. This would leave 25 hectares at Blunt’s Farm which, with the existing, consented 9 hectares, is still a substantial allocation.</p>	<p>at the oral examination</p>	<p>our representations so a third party hearing is essential in order to mediate our case. As a former Director of Arlington Securities Plc (now Goodman), the company that originated the business park concept in the UK, we have substantial experience in the delivery of employment and economic strategies, which ought to be of assistance to the examination.</p>			
359571	Mr Renny Henderson	Royal Society for the Protection of Birds	CSPS3737	Policy FWP8							<p>Policy Allocation Dwellings/land area Comment WMC3 Cuthbury allotments and St Margaret’s Close New Neighbourhood, Wimborne 260 SANG to be provided in accordance with policy ME3 WMC4</p>		<p>Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination</p>	<p>we would like to confirm that we wish to reserve the right to appear at the Examination into the Core Strategy, on the grounds the Core Strategy raises significant issues relating to the</p>	515		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>Stone Lane 90 SANG to be provided in accordance with policy ME3 6 WMC5 Cranborne Road New Neighbourhood, Wimborne 600 SANG to be provided in accordance with policy ME3 WMC6 South of Leigh Road New Neighbourhood and Sports Village, Wimborne 75 ha SANG to be provided in accordance with policy ME3 CM1 Lockyer's School and Land North of Corfe Mullen New Neighbourhood 250 SANG to be provided in accordance with policy ME3 FWP3 Holmwood House New Neighbourhood, Ferndown 110 SANG to be provided in accordance with policy ME3 FWP4 Coppins new Neighbourhood, Ferndown 30 SANG to be provided in accordance with policy ME3 FWP6 Land East of New Road New Neighbourhood, West Parley 320 SANG to be provided in accordance with policy ME3 FWP7 West of New Road New Neighbourhood, West Parley 200 SANG to be provided in accordance with policy ME3 VTSW4 North West Verwood New Neighbourhood 230 SANG to be provided in accordance with policy ME3 FWP8 Blunt's Farm Employment Allocation, Ferndown 30ha A mitigation strategy to be agreed to avoid harm to European sites and SSSI VTSW5 North Eastern Verwood New Neighbourhood 50 SANG to be provided in accordance with policy ME3 VTSW6 Woolsbridge Employment Allocation, Three Legged Cross 9.7ha A mitigation strategy to be agreed to SSSI The RSPB does not, in principle, object to the residential allocations above. However, the table does illustrate the heavy reliance on SANGs as a mitigation measure. The Councils will be aware of the relatively untested nature of</p>			protection of internationally important wildlife sites (as highlighted in the HRA) and that there remains uncertainty over the delivery of appropriate and effective mitigation measures.			

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>SANGs as effective mitigation, albeit in the context of available measures, it is clear that SANGs offer perhaps the best opportunity of addressing potential adverse impacts on the European sites. SANGs are a principal component of the approach taken by the Dorset Heathlands Interim Planning Framework (IPF), and are used as a mitigation vehicle elsewhere in England, notably in the Thames Basin Heaths. Research continues on the effectiveness of SANGs, and it is imperative that this research informs SANGs development anticipated under the Core Strategy. Long-term management and monitoring is also critical (as is identified in policy CN1). Testing of the suitability of SANGs as a mitigation measure for the above policies is essential and has not yet been undertaken. We are concerned that some of the SANGs proposed may be ineffective, particularly SANGs associated with smaller allocations.</p> <p>With respect to employment allocations FWP8 (Blunt's Farm) and VTSW6 (Woolsbridge), we are not familiar with these locations. We do not object to these policies subject to receiving clarification from Natural England of the issues pertinent to these sites, and the likely efficacy of mitigation strategies anticipated by these policies.</p>						
645873	Mr Reg Villa		CSPS60	Map 10.11	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	<p>The land is Green Belt and can only be developed i.a.w. Gov't policy in "exceptional circumstances"</p> <p>Over 40 Business premises are Closed or To Let on the Ferndown/Uddens Ind. Estates and the need that may have been identified in 2008 no longer exists for an increased industrial area of 30%.</p> <p>The area traffic is already at gridlock in the rush hour times and at Friday/ Sat peak times.</p> <p>The existing tree barrier all along the A31 is a major part of the noise insulation protection for the local settled community from the incessant traffic noise of the A31 and should not be removed.</p>	Blunt's Farm Employment allocation is removed from the Core Strategy as no longer required	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		516		
359461	Mrs Nicola Brunt	Dorset Wildlife Trust	CSPS1349	Map 10.11		No		No	No	No	<p>Whilst Dorset Wildlife Trust supports the protection given to the designated nature conservation sites given in this policy, including the Ferndown Bypass SNCI (SU00/060), and the need to retain significant landscape buffers that should include heathland habitat, we are concerned that there is no biodiversity survey information to inform the decision to allocate this site or provide prerequisites for development, especially given its current location in the Green Belt. NPPF (165) states that planning policies and decisions should be based on up-to-date information about the natural environment.</p> <p>This site is identified in the RSPB 'heathland extent and potential' maps as having potential to re-create heathland habitat and falls within a Strategic Nature Area identified on a landscape scale as an area with potential for heathland restoration. Given its history, it is likely to support remnant heathland and protected species and represents a significant opportunity to recreate priority habitat and expand the range of priority species, extending the local ecological network and creating a more robust ecosystem supporting the SNCI and</p>	Dorset Wildlife Trust would like to see full survey information inform the allocation. As a minimum, DWT recommend a prerequisite of development to be a significant ecological buffer for the SNCI to protect it from further development along its boundaries and, through this, enhancement of the ecological network to comply with NPPF (117, 118). Suggested wording Protection of the Site	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	Dorset Wildlife Trust is a voluntary nature conservation organisation which has specialist knowledge of the wildlife of Dorset and can offer local expertise. We manage the Sites of Nature Conservation Interest scheme for the county, are members of the East Dorset Environment Action Theme Group, the Dorset Biodiversity Officers Group and Dorset Biodiversity	516	2256009_0_1.pdf	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	Description
											<p>adjacent SSSI, which we believe is in line with NPPF (117, 118).</p> <p>The Ferndown Bypass SNCI (SU00/060) (site package attached for information) has dry and wet heath, acid grassland, woodland and scrub and is known to support 11 Dorset Notable Species. As the SNCI is linear and already subject to disturbance and pressures from the road and adjacent development, we consider that the SNCI requires significant buffering to comply with ME1. We consider that, without this, the SNCI would become squeezed between two industrial blocks and become unsustainable. DWT therefore recommend that as a minimum the whole north- eastern part of the site between the SNCI and the road should be defined as an ecological buffer and heathland and complimentary habitat protected, enhanced and expanded within this area. We consider that this area should be indicated on the map for such purposes, along with environmental designations and rights of way</p>	<p>of Nature Conservation Interest through provision of a substantial ecological buffer, managed to enhance priority habitats and species. We consider that an indicative layout based on ecological information would be helpful, with an ecological buffer shown between the bypass and SNCI and landscape buffers to the northern and western parts of the site. We also consider that all environmental designations and rights of way should be shown on the Map 10.11.</p>		Partnership.			