

**CORE STRATEGY  
DEVELOPMENT PLAN  
DOCUMENT (DPD)**

**LDF EXAMINATION**

**Matter 4 – Strategic  
allocations: Christchurch**

**STATEMENT PREPARED BY:**

**WOOLF BOND  
PLANNING LLP**

**REPRESENTATION NUMBER: 507541**

**On behalf of:**

**Bodorgan Properties (Channel Islands)  
Ltd., Sainsbury's Supermarkets Ltd. &  
Taylor Wimpey Strategic Land**

**AUGUST 2013**

1. Our joint clients own and have interests in the proposed mixed use extension at North Christchurch (CN1) and wish to ensure that the planning policy framework aimed at securing release of the land is sound in that it is Positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy. To do so it must be sufficiently flexible.

***Question 1: Does the evidence demonstrate that this is the most sustainable site for an urban extension in the light of any alternatives?***

2. The justification for the identification of Roeshot Hill as a strategic urban extension to Christchurch is set out within the Council's evidence base documents including principally the SHLAA ED32 and Sustainability Appraisal SD6, and stage 1 and 2 masterplanning reports ED68 and ED69. Constraints to development elsewhere in the Borough are well established having regard to scarce land resources, including the protected European Dorset Heath sites and their buffer zones, proximity to the New Forest National Park and the flood plains of the various rivers.

***Question 2: Has the effect of the allocation on Burton and Somerford been taken into account?***

3. Yes and it is not considered there would be any significant adverse effects upon these settlements. The site is well contained by the railway line and the road and development to the south such that there will be no wider visual impacts associated with any future development scheme.

***Question 3: Is the figure of 950 dwellings justified and achievable?***

4. In principle and subject to the whole site being genuinely available it is considered that site CN1 can accommodate 950 dwellings. The site extends to some 46ha so there will be a gross density of 20.6 dwellings per hectare.
5. The development does require, inter alia, the undergrounding of electricity pylons across the site and this could be achieved in accordance with the attached statement (Annex A) produced by a national expert in this area, Mr Charles Hamer. It is considered this could be achieved within a reasonable

timeframe. Similarly the allotments site with the adjacent redundant nursery site which comprises land owned by Christchurch Borough Council extends to 5.86ha and could accommodate 185 dwellings. For this site to become available requires the release of an allotment site for development which is a matter which may be addressed by other parties at the EiP sessions.

6. The current position with the relocation of the allotments is set out in document FD2. A number of options for an alternative site are still being explored. In order to provide certainty to allocate the existing allotment site as part of the urban extension alternative allotment provision will need to be finalised. In the absence of a final alternative allotment allocation this may require either modification to the plan now (subject to further consultation and SA testing) or this could be addressed in a subsequent early review of the policy framework as this part of the development site is proposed as the last phase. In any event the development of the site should allow for the eventual redevelopment of the allotments when relocation is secured.
7. We note the numerous references within Policy CN1 and chapter 6 of the Core Strategy to an 'indicative masterplan'. This is the Stage 2 masterplan ED69. This document has no formal status and has not been subject to public consultation or a council resolution so it has no weight as guidance for the development of the site as currently presented. If it is to form part of the guidance for this site it will require further consultation with the community in terms of its final content to comply with the Statement of Community Involvement (SD 25) and will also require further refinement as to other commercial interests in terms of its implementation prior to any application being submitted. We have some concern that the Master Plan is relied upon within the Site Risk Assessment FD3.

***Question 4: Is the 35% affordable housing justified by viability evidence?***

8. No the provision of up to 35% affordable housing provision (as per page 46 of SD18) is dependent upon section 106 negotiations, but is probably achievable if off-site requirements are capped. If the community Infrastructure Levy is introduced as indicated in ED24 at £100/ sqm for residential development before planning permission is granted then it is already accepted by the Council

in their CIL background modelling work ED23 and ED23.1 that a much lower percentage will be possible.

***Question 5: Deliverability: Has the SANG strategy been agreed with all stakeholders, including adjacent authorities?***

9. A Statement of Common Ground (SOCG) between Natural England and Meyrick Estate Management (whose client is Bodorgan Properties (CI) Ltd) has been prepared and has been circulated to Hampshire County Council and Dorset County Council as mineral planning authorities and New Forest District Council and New Forest National Park Authority as some of the SANGS fall within their administrative area. The SOCG establishes how and when the SANG can be provided for the site whilst accommodating proposed mineral working and restoration. The SOCG has been separately submitted to the Examination.

***Question 6: Deliverability: Has funding been secured/ identified to enable transport infrastructure requirements to come forward as required?***

10. No overriding issues are anticipated in strategic transport infrastructure terms and it is anticipated that this matter will be considered as part of the usual planning gain package to be agreed by way of a Section 106 agreement.
11. This matter has in part been addressed in Matter 1 where the disparity between the expected start onsite and programming of the A35 works is noted and addressed. We do not consider this will cause any problem provided the A35 improvements are implemented as programmed.

***Question 7: Deliverability: In view of the absence of an identified site, is the relocation of existing allotments achievable?***

12. We have addressed this point in section 3 above. In particular we have noted that in the absence of an allocated alternative site for relocation of the allotments approximately 185 of the 950 dwellings may not be able to come forward in the early part of the plan period. However, the allotments area was considered as the last phase in the Masterplan (ED69) due to the need to

prepare an alternative site and allow time for allotment holders to relocate, and it is therefore a possible partial review of the plan can resolve the issue of the alternative site allocation if it is to be relocated within the Borough. A solution to this point is that the policy CN1 should be revised to ensure that the site layout of the major part of the site supports the development of the allotment site in a comprehensive manner.

***Question 8: Deliverability: Is there a clear strategy and funding for undergrounding of overhead power lines?***

13. The statement by Charles Hamer attached indicates how the undergrounding of overhead power lines can be achieved. This matter remains subject to the usual negotiations with National Grid.
14. As regards the impact on viability, financial provision has been made in the work carried out by the Council including reports prepared by relevant consultants and this is factored into delivery of the site as a whole including the provision and funding of affordable housing.
15. The normal way of dealing with this type of matter is the site to be allocated with a planning permission achieved, subject to a condition which would limit the delivery of housing on site until relevant negotiations have been undertaken to achieve the necessary works.

***Question 9: Transportation: has the impact of increased traffic on the roads in the adjacent National Park been taken into account?***

16. Such matters are covered within the Council's evidence base, principally the Habitat Regulations Assessment and SA. Our consultants iTransport have also investigated the matter (Annex B) and have generally concluded that based on relevant survey data there would be no unacceptable adverse impact on the National Park.

# **Annex A**

## **Annex B**