
The Christchurch and East Dorset Councils Core Strategy - Local Plan Examination in Public (EiP)

Hearing Statement
on behalf of Stour Valley Properties Ltd

Matters and Issues 11: Other Matters

Respondent Number: 656251

August 2013

Core Strategy - Local Plan

Examination in Public

Hearing Statement

on behalf of Stour Valley Properties Ltd

Matters and Issues 11: Other Matters

Respondent Number: 656251

Project Ref:	17422/P4/A5	17422/P4a/A5
Status:	Draft	Final
Issue/Rev:	P4	P4a
Date:	22 nd August 2013	28 th August 2013
Prepared by:	Gemma Care	Gemma Care
Checked by:	Nick Paterson-Neild	Nick Paterson-Neild

Beansheaf Farmhouse,
Bourne Close,
Calcot,
Reading,
Berkshire. RG31 7BW

Tel: 0118 943 0000
Fax: 0118 943 0001
Email: planningreading@bartonwillmore.co.uk

Ref: 17422/P4a/A5/GC/NPN/dw

Date: 28th August 2013

COPYRIGHT

The contents of this document must not be copied or reproduced in whole or in part without the written consent of Barton Willmore LLP.

All Barton Willmore stationery is produced using recycled or FSC paper and vegetable oil based inks.

1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This Statement has been submitted by Barton Willmore LLP on behalf of Stour Valley Properties Ltd (SVP).
- 1.2 This Statement provides SVP's responses to the Inspector's questions in respect of Matter 11 of the Examination into the Christchurch and East Dorset Councils' Core Strategy-Local Plan DPD.
- 1.3 SVP is actively progressing proposals for the site known as Land at Manor Farm, Wimborne for residential development as part of a wider redevelopment concept of the immediate surrounds, including the provision of an extensive area of open space to the south of the site (the subject of recently approved planning application reference 3/12/0702/COU) and a new rugby club on the site known as Little Burles, Manor Farm, Ham Lane (the subject of current planning application 3/12/0700/COU). It is in this context that SVP's representations to Matter 11 are made, with particular focus on the approach taken to establishing the overall housing requirement for the JCS.
- 1.4 This Statement addresses the Inspector's specific questions and explains further the representations submitted by Barton Willmore LLP on behalf of SVP in June and December 2012 in response to the Proposed Submission and Proposed Changes to the Pre Submission versions of the JCS, respectively.

2.0 RESPONSE TO INSPECTOR'S QUESTIONS

Previously developed site in the Green Belt

Q.1 VTSW7: St Leonards Hospital

- Does the policy set out a robust strategy to ensure that any future development avoids harm to the SNCI priority habitats on the site and to the adjacent SSSI and Dorset Heaths?*

1.1 We have no comment on this matter.

Areas of potential change

Q.2 WMC7 : Leigh Park Area of Potential Change

- Is there any realistic prospect that part of this area could be used for some housing development to meet local needs?*

2.1 We would refer back to our detailed comments in respect of Matter 1 (Overall Strategy) and our serious concerns that the housing need requirement currently proposed by the Councils is insufficient. In the context of the proposed housing target, the CS vision does not reflect an objective assessment of alternatives and the evidence base available is distinctly lacking in alternative economic-led scenarios for growth. It is therefore considered that the Council need to provide further scenarios as part of a full objective assessment of housing need, in accordance with NPPF requirements. Until this work has been conducted, there is grave uncertainty surrounding the accuracy of the proposed housing target.

2.2 Given the shortfall in the identified housing figure for East Dorset (SVP's original representations to the Pre Submission and Pre Submission Proposed Changes stages refer) and the indication from our research that the housing requirement must be higher than is currently the case, the failure of policy WMC7 to seek housing for local needs on the site following the potential relocation of the rugby club is unjustified. The Site represents a good location for the provision of affordable housing; as per the requirements of the NPPF (para 50) the Councils should be proactively driving the delivery of a choice of high quality homes and opening up opportunities for affordable home ownership.

2.3 We are aware that the inclusion of housing on the site as originally proposed in the Pre Submission document was subsequently deleted via the Proposed Changes as a result of the Town Council's reluctance to release the site for residential development and, as this change has been made in response to the landowner, this does place an unfortunate question mark over delivery. The undeliverability of sustainable sites such as this serves to exacerbate the need to release other greenfield sites for development in order for the Councils to ensure that housing targets are met, and that in accordance with the requirements of the NPPF, they are proactively providing a choice of high quality homes for all sections of the community.

Historic Heritage

Q.3 Policy HE1 Protection of Local Historic and Archaeological Interest

- *Is the policy heading coherent?*
- *Is the policy consistent with the NPPF?*
- *Is the policy internally consistent?*

3.1 We have no comment on this matter.

Open Space Provision

Q.4 Appendix 1

- *Do the guidelines for open space provision allow sufficient flexibility to allow for individual site circumstances?*

4.1 We have no comment on this matter.

Druitt Hall

Q.5 To address concerns raised by local residents

5.1 We have no comment on this matter.