

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0079	The Society for Poole	Legal compliance	Consultations have been inadequate	Objection		No action	Consultation arrangements have followed those set out in the relevant planning regulations for plan making.	NA
0096	Go South Coast	Legal compliance	Plan does not meet the NPPF requirements for engagement with communities and stakeholders. The Local Development Scheme was outdated and last revised in February 2024, suggesting the plan materials were prepared before the revised LDS. During the Issues and Options Consultation in 2022, no supporting evidence or draft Strategic Environmental Appraisal was published. There has been no formal consultation on the draft plan or its evidence base since the Issues and Options consultation. The consultation process has been inadequate, with key stakeholders, including transport operators, not given a meaningful opportunity to participate. The LDS proposes an unrealistic timeline, with consultation closing in May 2024 and Reg 22 submission in June 2024, leaving insufficient time to consider responses properly. The immediate examination commencement in July 2024 is also deemed implausible given the Planning Inspectorate's workload.	Objection		No action	The LDS has had to be updated to respond to changing circumstances within the Council, including a change in administration. The consultation arrangements have followed those set out in the relevant planning regulations for plan making and included opportunities for engagement with stakeholders and communities. Evidence to support the plan has been available on the Council website throughout the process and was uploaded as it was finalised and completed. SA Scoping was completed at Reg 18 stage.	NA
0148	FCERM	Legal compliance	Have worked jointly with local planning authority on the plan. Plan legally compliant regarding flood and coastal risk management legislation and regulations. Sound subject to strict enforcement of relevant policies; future plan reviews to consider whether relocation policies are required on basis of future evidence. Production of SFRA L2 for Poole and Christchurch harbours and delivery and funding of relevant FCERM strategies is critical for the plan to function as intended.	Support		No action	Support noted.	NA
0297	Sir Christopher Chope MP	Legal compliance	Does not consider that the consultation period was long enough and should have been extended for longer.	Objection		No action	Consultation arrangements have followed those set out in the relevant planning regulations for plan making.	NA
0453	Dorset & Wiltshire Fire and Rescue	Legal compliance	Concerned about complexity of consultation process and if information is easily accessible or interpretable in line with Gunning Principles. Large volume of information, forms are difficult.	Support with changes	No	No action	Local Plans are large and cover a complex range of issues, the plan has been broken down and presented clearly to make the information as accessible as possible. Consultation arrangements have followed those set out in the relevant planning regulations for plan making.	NA
0571	Home Builders Federation	Legal compliance	Insufficient Reg 19 consultation period (started end of first day and ended at 1pm on final day). Plan needs to be reviewed/revisited to ensure supports delivery of national mandatory BNG policy through clear guidance and, where possible, certainty. On-site BNG will impact housing densities and what can be provided under proposed policies. Requirements for environmental benefits must not reduce housing provision or lower requirement, rather should increase housing allocations to deliver environmental improvement and homes.	Objection	Yes	No action	The consultation was 6 weeks and 2 days, running from 20 March to 3 May 2024, which exceeds the 6 week requirement. BNG is a mandatory requirement as set out in Policy NE3. There is no reason to delay the plan to understand the implications of BNG as it is considered that this can be delivered alongside development. BNG will be assessed on a site by site basis at planning stage.	NA
0579	Richard Terry	Legal compliance	Not compliant as failed to engage community. Difficult to access document (including in physical locations). Limited help at hand where physically available. Difficult to view on phones and tablets and difficult for over 65s (who make up large part of population) to access virtually. Plan is not sound - it is very unlikely to be deliverable in the plan period.	Objection	No	No action	The process has followed consultation requirements within the regulations. The document was physically available within key libraries and the Civic Centre. The Plan is a large document and can be viewed electronically on a computer, tablet or phone and due to its size is best viewed on a larger screen.	NA
0225	Dorset Council	Duty to Cooperate	Will only consider accommodating unmet BCP need if all opportunities within the BCP area are evidenced as being maximised. Para 4.12 statement incorrectly states Dorset Council there are no opportunities to meet unmet BCP need. To date, BCP Council have not made a request to Dorset Council to meet its unmet need.	Support	Yes	Modification	Support noted. Councillors from the two Councils are represented on a joint strategic advisory group. Officers have held monthly duty to cooperate discussions and it is clear that meeting unmet BCP need in the South East Dorset area would be extremely challenging. Whether any unmet BCP need can be delivered in the Dorset Council area is unknown and needs to be tested through the Dorset Local Plan process. The legal requirement to prepare a local plan by 2024 has prevented BCP Council from delaying the plan making process to wait for the outcome of Dorset Council Local Plan testing. We have omitted to formally request if Dorset Council can meet BCP Council's unmet needs despite our discussions. However for completeness this SoCG includes a formal request at Appendix 1. The emerging Dorset Council and NFDC Local Plan's will provide the opportunity to explore unmet needs and BCP Council will engage in that process. The outcomes of testing strategic options around housing delivery in the sustainability appraisals may require a review of the BCP Local. New Forest District Council have suggested we include a policy to commit BCP Council to review the Local Plan. We could add a new policy as a modification and amend para 4.12.	Add new Policy ID3 for monitoring and review

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0079	The Society for Poole	Duty to Cooperate	Duty to co-operate is described as a work in progress at this stage with no indication of what organisations are doing to support the plan.	Objection		No action	Consultation arrangements have followed those set out in the relevant planning regulations for plan making. Any amendments needed will be agreed through examination with the inspector. Post adoption changes can only be made through review. Duty to cooperate arrangements are set out in the duty to cooperate compliance statement. The planning system requires the decision makers to apply weight and planning judgement in making decisions, supported by the policies in the Local Plan. Affordable housing policies support the provision of affordable housing. <b>The Council is actively bringing forward sites for affordable housing.</b>	NA
0096	Go South Coast	Duty to Cooperate	Draft BCP/DC SoCG, provided at very end of plan-making process, a place-holding exercise not formally agreed/endorsed by competent authorities. Principally covers housing issues to 'shut the door' on consideration of how housing needs will be appropriately met in South East Dorset HMA. Other themes, including cross boundary strategic infrastructure, not covered. Evidence presented in SoCG does not meet statutory or NPPF duty to co-operate requirements. No similar SoCGs with New Forest District Council, Wiltshire Council, Hampshire County Council or National Highways. Cross boundary strategic infrastructure issues are relevant and involvement of these bodies relevant to plan preparation. No evidence of any strategic cross-boundary consideration, therefore duty to co-operate not demonstrated and plan not legally compliant.	Objection		No action	Duty to cooperate arrangements are set out in the duty to cooperate compliance statement. Further statements of common ground will be prepared in advance of the hearing sessions.	NA
0133	Brentland	Duty to Cooperate	Not clear duty to cooperate has been passed.	Objection	No	No action	Details of the duty to cooperate arrangements are set out in the duty to cooperate compliance statement	NA
0137	Primetower Properties	Duty to Cooperate	Not clear duty to cooperate has been passed.	Objection	No	No action	Details of the duty to cooperate arrangements are set out in the duty to cooperate compliance statement	NA
0141	Amirez Ltd	Duty to Cooperate	Not clear duty to cooperate has been passed.	Objection	No	No action	Details of the duty to cooperate arrangements are set out in the duty to cooperate compliance statement	NA
0148	FCERM	Duty to Cooperate	Complies with duty to co-operate in relation to co-operation between Lead Local Flood Authority, Coast Protection Authority and Local Planning Authority.	Support		No action	Support noted.	NA
0150	Ken Parke on behalf of various clients 3	Duty to Cooperate	Council has failed to properly engage with and work jointly with neighbouring authorities to address housing, employment, and infrastructure issues beyond the Stour Valley River Corridors projects. No evidence of engagement with New Forest District Council or New Forest National Park Authority. Draft Statement of Common Ground with Dorset Council demonstrates no attempt to discuss whether a greater level of housing, to attempt to meet the standard method requirement, could be delivered. No consideration of Dorset Council's need for employment land and whether it can be met within its plan area or through cross boundary approaches to employment allocations. Council's claim to be working with neighbouring authorities to address phosphorous mitigation questionable, as council enacting an effective moratorium on development within River Avon catchment, while neighbouring authorities have signed up to and agreed suitability of a mitigation project. Council therefore holding up the meeting of needs.	Objection	Yes	No action	Details of duty to cooperate arrangements are set out in the duty to cooperate compliance statement.	NA
0171	Mrs P Bower and Mr R Blunden	Duty to Cooperate	Not clear duty to cooperate has been passed.	Objection	No	No action	Details of the duty to cooperate arrangements are set out in the duty to cooperate compliance statement	NA
0223	Fortitudo Ltd	Duty to Cooperate	Not clear duty to cooperate has been passed.	Objection		No action	Duty to cooperate arrangements set out in duty to cooperate compliance statement	NA
0235	Wyatt Homes	Duty to Cooperate	Lack of evidence on duty to cooperate discussions and co-operation on strategic matters with neighbouring councils. No SoCG or evidence of cross-boundary working between BCP and NFDC or NFNPA. BCP/DC SoCG shows common ground housing target not based on exceptional circumstance - just alternative demographic need to standard method. Constraints based approach not supported by robust evidence. No formal request to neighbouring authorities for assistance in meeting housing needs despite bespoke housing need evidence potentially not amounting to exceptional circumstances and strategy being led by constraints/perceived lack of sites. BCP/DC SoCG shows the contrary. Doubt over whether duty to co-operate obligations fulfilled.	Objection	Yes	No action	Duty to cooperate arrangements are set out in the duty to cooperate compliance statement. SD8b SOCG with New Forest DC and New Forest NPA was in draft and unable to be published during consultation. It has since been published.	NA
0245	Miller Homes and Bellway Homes (Wessex)	Duty to Cooperate	Duty to co-operate not complied with as not made formal requests to neighbouring authorities to see if they can assist with meeting unmet housing needs of 1,206 per year. Unknown whether any requests for assistance with meeting needs made by neighbouring authorities.	Objection	Yes	No action	Details of duty to cooperate arrangements are set out in the duty to cooperate compliance statement.	NA

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0247	Hallam Land Management Ltd	Duty to cooperate	Opportunities to accommodate unmet need in Dorset missed. BCP should properly assess its housing need in accordance with NPPF and engage with Dorset Council to accommodate any unmet needs sustainably.	Objection	Yes	No action	Duty to cooperate arrangements are set out in the duty to cooperate compliance statement.	NA
0263	Bellway Strategic Land, Miller Homes, AJC Group, Wyatt Homes, Fortitudo and WH White	Duty to Cooperate	Consider Council has not satisfied Duty to Co-operate as it has failed to engage with neighbouring authorities in purposeful, meaningful or active manner. Fails Duty to Co-operate requirement on assumption no unmet housing need.	Objection	Yes	No action	Duty to cooperate arrangements are set out in the duty to cooperate compliance statement.	NA
0267	Richborough Estates	Duty to Cooperate	Constraints based approach a 'policy on' approach not supported by evidence, fails to meet needs and not in accordance with NPPF. Standard method starting point for calculating housing need, and if cannot be met should ascertain whether neighbouring authorities can assist. Previous emerging Dorset Local Plan work indicated a surplus, thus argument no need for Dorset to accommodate unmet need unjustified. BCP area plays important role for growth in region.	Objection		No action	Details of duty to cooperate arrangements are set out in the duty to cooperate compliance statement.	NA
0271	Highwood Group	Duty to Cooperate	Claim no need for BCP Council to approach neighbouring councils to address need due to locally derived figure (SoCG, March 2024). No confirmation of any discussions, including regarding unmet need of neighbouring authorities despite difficulty meeting needs in those areas due to constraints. Not positively prepared, sound or sufficiently addressing duty to co-operate - cannot be delayed or left to review. BCP should consider how to address issues faced by neighbouring authorities in its plan area - greenfield sites in Green Belt, such as site 02/14, required; BCP Council must work with Dorset Council to meet conurbation's needs in most sustainable manner, including regarding consequences of locating development beyond Green Belt in unsustainable locations.	Objection	Yes	No action	Duty to cooperate arrangements are set out in the duty to cooperate compliance statement.	NA
0292	WH White	Duty to Cooperate	Not clear duty to cooperate has been passed. BCP has not engaged with Neighbouring Authorities. Constraints led approach does not generate any unmet need.	Objection	Yes	No action	Duty to cooperate arrangements are set out in the duty to cooperate compliance statement.	NA
0466	Jonathan Scott	Duty to Cooperate	Objection to Branksome Triangle as consider local plan to be not legally compliant or sound and failing to comply with duty to cooperate.	Objection	No	No action	There is no duty to cooperate issue with this site. The Council has met its own need on this site without needing to ask neighbouring authorities to help meet unmet need.	NA
0528	Michael Brooke	Duty to Cooperate	Considers plan to be legally compliant, sound and complying with duty to cooperate.	Support	No	No action	Support noted	NA
0571	Home Builders Federation	Duty to Cooperate	Not clear duty to cooperate has been passed.	Objection	Yes	No action	Details of duty to cooperate arrangements are set out in the duty to cooperate compliance statement.	NA
0579	Richard Terry	Duty to Cooperate	Not clear duty to cooperate has been passed - it has been and remains a very difficult process for people to engage with.	Objection	No	No action	Details of duty to cooperate arrangements are set out in the duty to cooperate compliance statement.	NA
0235	Wyatt Homes	Sustainability Appraisal	Sustainability Appraisal inadequate as reasonable options did not test meeting standard method requirement. No robust environmental or site availability evidence to support not meeting standard method, just a political decision. Many green belt sites could be released to significantly increase provision. Preferred approach results in very low growth rate. Meeting standard method results in improved growth. Sustainability objectives and sub-objectives flawed as skewed towards environmental sustainability, downplaying economic and social sustainability aspects. No sub-objectives test quantity of homes delivered to meet community needs, and only one assesses delivery of range of housing types/sizes to create balanced/sustainable communities. Flaws in how assessment undertaken. SO6 does not take into account of role adequate housing mix (including sufficient family homes). Option 4 should be assessed as most positive. This SA process should not have informed spatial strategy.	Objection	Yes	No action	The Sustainability Appraisal considers different growth options including option four which considers urban intensification and extensive Green Belt release, delivering around 2,440 homes a year. While this fall short of the standard method housing need figure there is not the land available to meet the full standard method housing need even with extensive Green Belt release. The economic, social and environmental consequences of a high level of growth and Green Belt release has therefore been tested through the Sustainability Appraisal process.	NA
0245	Miller Homes and Bellway Homes (Wessex)	Sustainability Appraisal	Council has behaved in politically opportunistic manner, using housing requirement that avoids need to release green belt. The Sustainability Appraisal was written in support of approach and does not assess option to meet housing need identified through standard method. No exceptional justification for departing from delivering housing to meet standard method figure. Plan has not been informed by an iterative SA process running alongside preparation of the plan. Question Sustainability Appraisal Findings and that Green Belt is not an environmental constraint. Sufficient land would likely be available to meet standard method figure if Council was willing to release Green Belt.	Objection	Yes	No action	The Sustainability Appraisal considers different growth options including option four which considers urban intensification and extensive Green Belt release, delivering around 2,440 homes a year. While this fall short of the standard method housing need figure there is not the land available to meet the full standard method housing need even with extensive Green Belt release. The economic, social and environmental consequences of a high level of growth and Green Belt release has therefore been tested through the Sustainability Appraisal process.	NA

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0263	Bellway Strategic Land, Miller Homes, AJC Group, Wyatt Homes, Fortitudo and WH White	Sustainability Appraisal	Consider Council has not identified all reasonable options in sustainability appraisal, or considered consequences of failing to meet housing need. Counsel's opinion is plan is unsound as not positively prepared, justified or effective. SA does not try to consider option of meeting standard method.	Objection	Yes	No action	The Sustainability Appraisal considers different growth options including option four which considers urban intensification and extensive Green Belt release, delivering around 2,440 homes a year. While this fall short of the standard method housing need figure there is not the land available to meet the full standard method housing need even with extensive Green Belt release. The economic, social and environmental consequences of a high level of growth and Green Belt release has therefore been tested through the Sustainability Appraisal process.	NA
0267	Richborough Estates	Sustainability Appraisal	Unclear how council can conclude strategy is appropriate without assessing economic, social and environmental impact of meeting standard method figure (including role of green belt) in the sustainability appraisal. Land North of Townsend site's exclusion on basis of flood risk inappropriate - should have been considered in Sustainability Appraisal.	Objection		No action	The Sustainability Appraisal considers different growth options including option four which considers urban intensification and extensive Green Belt release, delivering around 2,440 homes a year. While this fall short of the standard method housing need figure there is not the land available to meet the full standard method housing need even with extensive Green Belt release. The economic, social and environmental consequences of a high level of growth and Green Belt release has therefore been tested through the Sustainability Appraisal process. Green Belt sites were not assessed by the sustainability appraisal as they were not considered reasonable options due the preferred local plan strategy.	NA
0271	Highwood Group	Sustainability Appraisal	Option 3 and 4 score negatively for providing homes when they provide more homes. Higher density brownfield preferable, but Green Belt release would not result in brownfield being used inefficiently or all brownfield suitable for higher densities. Commentary should be revised to reflect urban area focused growth will provide limited family/affordable homes. Objective 5 sub-objectives do not relate to BCP area needs. High positive scoring of option 4 against meeting identified housing need welcomed, but question scoring of other options. Option 4 allows identified need to be met, efficient/appropriate use of land, and local needs to be met through varied/diverse development.	Objection	Yes	No action	Options 3 and 4 of the Sustainability Appraisal strategic growth options do score positively for the contribution that they would make to providing communities that meet peoples needs. Overall these options have a negative impact as they score less well against other objectives such as those relating to environment assets and the consumption of natural resources. The commentary does acknowledge that Green Belt options would enable a greater range of housing needs to be catered for including the provision of affordable and family housing. The sub categories of objectives 5 allow the consideration of a range of issues impacting on the provision of communities including housing issues.	NA
0282	Historic England	Sustainability Appraisal	Do not wish to comment in detail on the Sustainability Appraisal at this stage.	Comment		No action	Comment noted	NA
0292	WH White	Sustainability Appraisal	Sustainability Appraisal not followed stages of preparation set out in PPG and judgements skewed to supporting preferred option. Also failed to consider all reasonable options and inadequate consideration given to Green Belt release and allocation including Canford Garden Village omission site.	Objection	Yes	No action	The Sustainability Appraisal considers different growth options including option four which considers urban intensification and extensive Green Belt release, delivering around 2,440 homes a year. While this fall short of the standard method housing need figure there is not the land available to meet the full standard method housing need even with extensive Green Belt release. The economic, social and environmental consequences of a high level of growth and Green Belt release has therefore been tested through the Sustainability Appraisal process.	NA
0307	Trustees of the Meyrick 1970 Settlement	Sustainability Appraisal	Sustainability Appraisal fails to deal with Christchurch Harbour from Habitats perspective and the Habs Reg Assessment fails to note its functional linkage River Avon SAC	Objection	Yes	No action	Christchurch Harbour is not a habitat site and therefore not covered by the Habitats Regulations. The River Avon SAC is designated for its freshwater habitat where nutrient enrichment has an adverse impact and so differs markedly from the harbour saltwater environs. Natural England has not provided advice that there is a potential adverse impact upon terns feeding in the Solent and Dorset Coast SPA.	NA
0571	Home Builders Federation	Sustainability Appraisal	SA inadequate, bringing whole plan, strategy and evidence base into question. Unacceptable for SA not to consider option where all housing needs met or consider/test a strategy where green belt released, and to conclude reduction in housing numbers needed due to environmental constraints without assessing social economic and environmental impacts of meeting all housing needs in BCP area. New SA required to inform fully reviewed plan. Lack of engagement with housebuilding industry.	Objection	Yes	No action	The Sustainability Appraisal considers the strategic options for growth, including option 4 which considers urban intensification with extensive settlement extensions in the Green Belt to meet housing needs as far as possible. Urban Intensification and extensive Green Belt release would deliver around 2,240 homes a year and tests the social, environmental and economic considerations of a higher level of growth. It is acknowledged that even with Green Belt release the housing needs identified in the Standard Method cannot be accommodated within the BCP area and an element of unmet need would arise, it is not a reasonable alternative to test to full standard method of housing need as there is not the land available to meet this level of need even if Green Belt sites were considered suitable.	NA
0020	RSPB	Habitats Regulations Assessment	Satisfied with conclusions of HRA into the potential recreational impacts of the draft local plan on sites in Dorset/New Forest and potential nutrient enrichment of River Avon/Poole Harbour. provided mitigation frameworks cover the plan period. Note the HRA conclusion that adverse air quality impacts cannot be ruled out and therefore must object to the draft local plan, but support the further actions recommended by the HRA to secure a solution.	Objection		Modification	Support noted. The new 2022 transport modelling data is currently being reviewed to assess air quality implications. The work will be complete in mid-November and provided to the examination. The output will be an air quality model that will inform a revised Air Quality Strategy.	Update para 6.14 on phosphates and delete final sentence. Add new second sentence to para 6.15.

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0038	PO4	Habitats Regulations Assessment Water Quality	Table 1 - Natural England has not formally published the applicable value for Christchurch waste water treatment works and 5.1mg/l is unsubstantiated. Occupation rates - no ref to calculator developed and published by Natural England and input value of 2.24 in NNA differs to 2.4 people in NE calculator. Unclear where figure derived from and no evidence to justify. Also differs to Dorset Heathlands calculations and should be consistent. Table 4 - Support recognition of Bickton Trout Farm as means to demonstrate neutrality. Details of remaining capacity not provided but considers there is potential to aid or fully mitigate strategic scale development in Dorset (beyond Alderholt 1700 and 45 homes) and in New Forest District as well as planned development in draft BCP Local Plan.	Objection	Yes	Modification	The government announcement on 24 May 2024 confirmed that Christchurch Waste Water Treatment works will be required to install phosphate stripping measures from 2030 to reduce the limit to 0.25mg/l. Subsequent to its representations Natural England has agreed the works is operating at 5.1mg/l up to 2030.	Update para 6.29 about phosphates. Amend the HRA.
0040	Natural England	Habitats Regulations Assessment	The conclusions reached in the HRA documents are agreed in principle subject to the specific additional information sought in this advice.	Support		Modification	Support noted. We are addressing the points raised by Natural England to improve the HRA.	Update the HRA to reflect Natural England advice.
0040	Natural England	Habitats Regulations Assessment Recreation	Concur with the conclusion that policy NE2 provides a break on allocated developments coming forward without adequate HIPs. However there are allocations meriting further consideration to be certain that a suitable mitigation may be delivered. Allocations close to the New Forest without suitable HIP mitigation for the Dorset heathlands face an increased risk of adverse effects. Agree with the conclusions on Poole Harbour SPA/Ramsar and the New Forest.	Support with changes		Modification	Support noted. Suggested changes to policy wording in accordance with NE advice, if agreed, can be reflected in a revised HRA prior to adoption.	Update the HRA to reflect Natural England advice.
0040	Natural England	Habitats Regulations Assessment Water Quality	Note that some developments may use a PTP system and the nutrient calculators provide a mechanism for calculating appropriate offsetting requirements. Support the HRA conclusions in principle but uncertainty remains about the LURA 2023 requirements for WRC discharge levels, and the HRA will need updating accordingly. Consider alternative mitigation by reducing waste water through higher water efficiency.	Support with changes		Modification	Support noted. The Plan and HRA will be updated following LURA announcements. Water efficiency in the Plan and will need reference in future updates to the HRA.	Update the HRA and Policy C3 to reflect Natural England advice.
0040	Natural England	Habitats Regulations Assessment Air Quality	Concur with the conclusions reached relating to additional air pollution impacts on habitats and international sites from greater vehicle activity related to increased housing.	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0272	Christchurch Harbour & Marine Society	Habitats Regulations Assessment	Habitats Regulations Assessment fails to deal with Christchurch Harbour by failing to note its functional linkage with River Avon SAC, the impact of nutrients on the feeding ground for terns protected by the Solent and Dorset Coast SPA, nor the SSSI status. Not legally compliant with Reg 63(1) of Habs Regs. Nothing in the plan analyses impact of development on Christchurch Harbour SSSI which comprises the estuary of the Stour and Avon and the Hengistbury Head peninsula, has varied habitats and is of great ornithological interest. Not properly considered for screening in respect of 'in-combination' effects. Until screening is undertaken the precautionary principle applies and the Local Plan should introduce a protective policy for Christchurch Harbour. Therefore, the HRA is defective and the plan is not sound. No policy to address implications of development for Christchurch Harbour. Any examination of the environmental health of the harbour and its functional linkage to the River Avon SAC and SPA should also include River Stour. Policy fails as no Christchurch Harbour policy to take strategic approach to maintaining habitat networks; and failure to safeguard or promote net gains for linked functional habitat.	Objection	Yes	No action	Christchurch Harbour is not a habitat site and therefore not covered by the Habitats Regulations. The River Avon SAC is designated for its freshwater habitat where nutrient enrichment has an adverse impact and so differs markedly from the harbour saltwater environs. Natural England has not provided advice that there is a potential adverse impact upon terns feeding in the Solent and Dorset Coast SPA.	NA
0292	WH White	Habitats Regulations Assessment	Habitat Regulations Assessment fails to consider alternative options including additional strategic urban extension at Canford Garden Village which needs to be included to deliver Standard Method housing need.	Objection	Yes	No action	The HRA process focussed on assessing the Draft Plan and higher growth levels / omission sites would need further HRA work commissioned. There are known HRA issues in the north Poole area from previous work on omission sites in the Poole Local Plan that remain unresolved and will require significant additional work to overcome, including securing the support of Natural England.	NA

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0307	Trustees of the Meyrick 1970 Settlement	Habitats Regulations Assessment	Not legally compliant with Reg 63(1) of Habs Regs. Functional linkage of Christchurch Harbour to River Avon SAC not considered. Nothing in the plan analyses impact of development on Christchurch Harbour SSSI which comprises the estuary of the Stour and Avon and the Hengistbury Head peninsula, has varied habitats including saltmarsh, wet meadows, grassland, heath, sand dune, woodland and scrub and is of great ornithological interest. This a highly relevant in terms of the Solent and Dorset Coast SPA, degradation of salt marsh in Christchurch Harbour and its functional linkage to tern habitats. Not properly considered for screening in respect of 'in-combination' effects. Accordingly, until screening is undertaken, the precautionary principle indicates it is appropriate for the Local Plan to introduce a protective policy for Christchurch Harbour analogous to that for Poole Harbour. Precautionary principle not applied. HRA screened out further assessment of the SPA but reasons given do not address issue of tern's ability to forage in algae-filled water. The failure to address the functional linkage of Christchurch Harbour with national site network (including River Avon SAC, Solent and Dorset Coast SPA). Therefore, the HRA Report is defective and the plan is not sound. No policy to address implications of development for Christchurch Harbour. Any examination of the environmental health of the harbour and its functionable linkage to the River Avon SAC and SPA should also include River Stour. The Harbour is a transit, habitat and feeding site. Policy fails as no Christchurch Harbour policy to take strategic approach to maintaining habitat networks; and failure to safeguard or promote net gains for linked functional habitat.	Objection	Yes	No action	Christchurch Harbour is not a habitat site and therefore not covered by the Habitats Regulations. The River Avon SAC is designated for its freshwater habitat where nutrient enrichment has an adverse impact and so differs markedly from the harbour saltwater environs. Natural England has not provided advice that there is a potential adverse impact upon terns feeding in the Solent and Dorset Coast SPA.	NA
0028	Susan Chapman	Evidence Base	Would like the publication Global ecological collapse by Dr Matt Montgomery (previously BCP Council) to be taken into account and published as evidence for tackling climate change.	Objection	Yes	No action	The Council are aware of a large range of academic papers relating to climate change but cannot publish all of these as part of the evidence base. The evidence is focused of BCP specific issues. The Council is working on a specific Energy Plan for the BCP area.	NA
0040	Natural England	Evidence Base	Certainty needed that the existing strategic mitigation approaches will be updated to facilitate ongoing development over the local plan period.	Support with changes		No action	These mitigation strategies will be updated in 2025.	NA
0064	Rose Young	Evidence Base	VODS5a-c Green Belt Assessment - Site land at Willet Road has been omitted. Land is available and deliverable for development, the land makes little to Green Belt Purposes	Objection		No action	The site is located within the Green Belt and in accordance with the NPPF the Plan does not propose to release Green Belt to meet housing needs.	NA
0079	The Society for Poole	Evidence Base	Brownfield register has not been validated since 2020. Policy supporting recycling of this land is supported.	Comment		No action	The Brownfield Register includes sites suitable, available and achievable for development and includes sites with planning permission and site allocations, these sites are found within the evidence base and HELAA and the Brownfield Register will be updated when resources allow. To date these have been focused on the preparation of the Local Plan.	NA
0096	Go South Coast	Evidence Base	Parking study has not been published to inform the plan or otherwise, but is referred to in plan at numerous points. The approach to parking on public car parks, on-street and in development impact upon the provision and use of the bus services. Any change in travel behaviour to reduce car dependency and use cannot be achieved without managing and providing for parking demand. High density development will result in multi-storey decked parking which has numerous implications for the development.	Objection	No	No action	Parking study is in production. It will be published as soon as possible to support the plan.	NA
0096	Go South Coast	Evidence Base	CAT4 Joint LTP3, although of high quality and largely relevant, not up-to-date evidence and no meaningful statement of transport priorities reflecting major changes to national and local policy (climate emergency declaration, net zero by 2050). Substantial rebalancing of provision and behaviour towards walking, cycling and public transport required to achieve; this is not reflected in plan or evidence base. Unclear how plan's strategy shaped by JLTP3, and no consistent or substantive ties to JLTP3 objectives to secure them. Plan does not demonstrate how planned intensification will avoid additional pressure on existing networks/internal road capacity. No significant improvement to road network since 2012. JLTP3 therefore a tokenistic placeholder for unpublished JLTP4.	Objection	No	No action	The sustainable transport masterplan is set out in examination documents CAT2a-f. Unfortunately these documents were not in a publishable format during the consultation.	NA
0096	Go South Coast	Evidence Base	CAT6 BCP Bus Service Improvement Plan - Supports its submission as evidence for Local Plan as shows a jointly formulated view between Council and bus operators of how attractiveness of bus use can be improve, although not a long term strategy (3 years). Further work will need to be done post 2026 to make buses faster and more reliable. JLTP4 will need to be adopted to inform the transport strategy. Strategic foundation for the plan regarding evidence on transport matters is limited which is a fundamental problem for the soundness of the plan.	Objection	No	No action	The sustainable transport masterplan is set out in examination documents CAT2a-f. Unfortunately these documents were not in a publishable format during the consultation.	NA

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0096	Go South Coast	Evidence Base	IAD2 Infrastructure Delivery Plan - Numerous projects directly reference bus, or have an impact on a major bus corridor, but they are not clearly aligned with the BCP Bus Service Improvement Plan to secure a more effective reliable and capable public transport offer across the conurbation. Many sites contain unspecified enhancements meaning costs are unknown. Some improvements may be unnecessary due to scale of developments, some improvements are already being discussed, concerns over intentions for bus station and depot at Poole, welcome changes at Turlin Moor, costly implementations around the Bournemouth Hospital/Wessex Fields site, interactions with major BSIP bus priority schemes that do not feature in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan list, pedestrian and cycle improvements which may have an adverse impact on buses on major routes. No overall costs are indicated for schemes, nor any potential funding which may assist with these improvements, and so delivery of schemes is speculative. It is not properly evidenced, not effective and judged to be unsound. Very low regard to transport theme and associated policies in Local Plan. Ignores existing transport problems and challenges and focuses on development sites. Does not ensure that new development prevents aggravation of existing issues, or contributes to a more sustainable pattern and mix of travel modes. Conflicts with NPPF para 108.	Objection	No	No action	The sustainable transport masterplan is set out in examination documents CAT2a-f. The IAD2b Infrastructure Delivery Plan was also updated in June 2024.	NA
0096	Go South Coast	Evidence Base	Transport Evidence Base CAT1a Transport Modelling Report - A very coarse model and thins out the network. A SATURN model for the network is not efficient for the purposes of the Local Plan, and cannot suggest or predict the outcomes of interventions that make sustainable modes relatively more attractive, despite this being the principle focus of the current LTP3. Data within SATURN network is not up to date as movements have changed since COVID, and don't take these in to account. SEDMMTM Model not reflecting peak times accurately, as these have extended beyond more traditional times, and a set hour in the day. Results of the model present no surprises at all. Model shows development will increase congestion, which will have implications for the efficient delivery of reliable and attractive bus services. Many junctions and A-roads are highlighted as congested (some over capacity) at varying times of the day. A3049 Wallisdown Road is a major congestion area with significant existing issues, and further development at Talbot Village will exacerbate this unless change occurs through behaviour or measures. Additional urban extensions to west of Bear Cross roundabout (A348/A341) will exacerbate existing congestion, when bus provision is likely to increase in this area in the early years of the plan. Routes may become inoperable if congestion isn't resolved. Many problem junction in the Christchurch area where bus services are less frequent, or destinations are outside of the conurbation, and so has a more prevalent impact on these. Key areas of congestion in Christchurch not acknowledged in report. Congestion at Hurn, and the predicted increase in this, makes it impossible to justify adding a bus service to the area, despite a need due to its outlying position in the conurbation. Impact of congestion on longer bus routes not reflected in the TMR. Bus routes which are longer and serving areas outside conurbation need to be able to access urban areas easily and with minimal congestion as reliance on these services is becoming more prevalent as people seek to occupy lower value housing. Congestion at junction which all buses leaving Poole Bus Station have to use is of concern, and should not be exacerbated. There are junctions outside of the conurbation which significantly affect bus journeys in and out of the conurbation. Agrees with concluding paras 8.22, 8.25, 8.44, 8.60, 8.61 and 9.7 of the Transport Modelling Report. Network is already operating at capacity at many places, and no mitigation is modelled or	Objection	No	No action	The transport model has been updated to the 2022 model. It provides the required evidence at a strategic local plan stage and alternative modelling would be onerous. The strategy relies upon improving the attractiveness of bus services with the sustainable transport masterplan is set out in examination documents CAT2a-f. The IAD2b Infrastructure Delivery Plan was also updated in June 2024.	NA
0096	Go South Coast	Evidence Base	Transport Evidence Base CAT7 Transforming Cities Fund - Much of Transforming Cities Fund strategy works have involved delivery of cycling infrastructure largely in Dorset rather than BCP. Great deal of design and investigative work undertaken which should underpin scheme definition and costs in IDP, but doesn't appear to have been, and doesn't appear to have shaped plan.	Objection	No	No action	The sustainable transport masterplan is set out in examination documents CAT2a-f. The IAD2b Infrastructure Delivery Plan was also updated in June 2024.	NA
0164	Environment Agency	Evidence Base	Support SFRA Level 1, approach to sequential/exception tests and functional floodplain . However, it needs to be finalised.	Support with changes		No action	Support noted. SFRA Level 1 has since been completed and published (June 2024) ref TCC4d-f.	NA
0287	Network Rail	Evidence Base	IAD2 Infrastructure Delivery Plan. Will feed into it. Accessibility improvements at Bournemouth and Branksome rail stations and funding opportunities from developer contributions or other third party sources should continue to be pursued to deliver these.	Support	Yes	Modification	Action add these projects to IDP.	The IDP June 2024 (IAD2b) was amended to include railway station improvements.

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0245	Miller Homes and Bellway Homes (Wessex)	Evidence Base	CAT1a - Transport Modelling Report - Impacts identified may not constitute a 'severe impact' - modelling needs to assess this. Capacity for additional homes not tested in the local plan - modelling based on strategy meeting standard method needs to be undertaken, assessing against the severe test. Any required mitigation cannot be funded. Provenance of list of improvements in IDP unclear, and some may not be necessary as modelling does not identify what junctions will suffer severe impacts. Delivery of improvements at risk due to CIL and S106 being only funding sources identified, improvements not costed, and no designs so unclear whether deliverable on land within BCP (or applicant) control. No evidence that homes planned will fund improvements - need to allocate additional sites to enable funding. Plan unsound if infrastructure required to make development acceptable cannot be funded. No issues with capacity, potential impacts or required mitigation identified at Kinson, so Kinson Manor Farm ideal location for additional homes.	Objection	Yes	No action	CAT1b Transport Modelling Report has been updated to the 2022 model and IAD2b Infrastructure Delivery Plan was also updated in June 2024. The transport modelling tested the Draft Plan and did not consider higher growth scenarios or omission sites. New development can fund transport mitigation, but it must be linked to the proposed development and the package of measures outlined in IAD2b focuses on improving sustainable travel within the urban area.	NA
0245	Miller Homes and Bellway Homes (Wessex)	Evidence Base	CAT5 - Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan - No designs for LCWIP10 and LCWIP29 provided, therefore no confidence they can be provided on land within BCP's or applicant's control. Funding source unclear, but costs could be shared with development in areas served and proportionate contribution by Kinson Manor Farm. Absence of sites supporting delivery undermines deliverability causing plan to be unsound.	Objection	Yes	No action	Detailed design of specific projects is outside the scope of the Local Plan process	NA
0245	Miller Homes and Bellway Homes (Wessex)	Evidence Base	IAD1 Viability Study - Will be difficult to secure affordable housing or infrastructure contributions given limited viability of development on brownfield sites (in contrast to greenfield sites)	Objection	Yes	No action	Affordable housing thresholds reflect viability issues set out in the Plan Viability Report IAD1a	NA
0245	Miller Homes and Bellway Homes (Wessex)	Evidence Base	IAD2 Infrastructure Delivery Plan - Note no funding for Stour Valley Masterplan and no approach to fund with landowners/developers through development	Objection	Yes	No action	The Council is working in partnership with other organisations on the Stour Valley Corridor project and a strategy has been prepared to support delivery.	NA
0245	Miller Homes and Bellway Homes (Wessex)	Evidence Base	ONE18 Stour Valley Park Strategy - Decision to not release Green Belt will prevent Stour Valley Park placemaking ambitions being met.	Objection	Yes	No action	The delivery of the Stour Valley Corridor is not directly related to Green Belt development.	NA
0245	Miller Homes and Bellway Homes (Wessex)	Evidence Base	VODS7a-c Green Belt Assessment Stage 1 - Development of Kinson Manor Farm land parcel promoted in Green Belt would result in "moderate high harm"	Objection	Yes	No action	Comment noted	NA
0597	Hampshire County Council	Evidence Base	Evidence base does not include a Transport Assessment (TA). The traffic forecast report does not easily allow the County Council to identify the precise impacts on specific junctions and sections of the Hampshire highway and transport network.	Objection		Follow up	Our transport planners are in dialogue with Hampshire County Council over cross boundary flow data emerging from the new updated 2022 Saturn model for Dorset. A Statement of Common Ground will be prepared and submitted to the examination.	
0292	WH White	Evidence Base	HOM10 - Housing Delivery Report 2024 fails to adequately explain true delivery of affordable housing.	Objection	Yes	No action	Further detail about affordable housing delivery is set out in the updated Housing Delivery Report HOM10b. To date the delivery of affordable housing has been challenging and the Council acknowledge this.	NA
0292	WH White	Evidence Base	HOM1a-c Local Housing Needs Assessment 2021, Examining demographics and testing the standard method 2021, Impact of housing need sensitivity report 2021 considered inadequate and erroneous.	Objection	Yes	No action	The report is included for information as it highlights potential issues with the standard method calculation for the BCP area due to particularly migration trends that fed into the 2014 population projections. However, the Council are not seeking to rely upon this report to determine the housing requirement.	NA
0292	WH White	Evidence Base	VODS7a-c - Strategic Green Belt Assessment deficient due to lapse of time, events on the ground and differences in professional judgement. Contribution of some parcels to Green Belt within the Canford Garden Village omission site study area are overrated.	Objection	Yes	No action	Review is considered robust and scoring consistently applied by independent consultants.	NA
0424	NHS Property Services	Evidence Base	The viability assessment does not include a specific allowance for contributions towards healthcare. Financial contributions should be secured for healthcare. Healthcare mitigation is not explicitly mentioned and should be incorporated as a separate cost.	Objection		No action	The agreed approach with the NHS Dorset is to collect use CIL to fund healthcare infrastructure, and move away from Section 106 financial contributions.	NA
0424	NHS Property Services	Evidence Base	Further detailed needed in IDP needed and contributions for healthcare should be set out.	Objection		No action	The agreed approach with the NHS Dorset is to collect use CIL to fund healthcare infrastructure, and move away from Section 106 financial contributions. We await confirmation from Dorset NHS on what projects are necessary to mitigate the planned growth and will add these projects to the IDP.	NA



ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0579	Richard Terry	Evidence Base	Evidence base uses every report available without any clear understanding of impact. Overlaying the whole plan area with an ecological network from Dorset Local Nature Partnership does not seem to have any physical inspection base, is purely desk top study and therefore inaccurate.	Objection	No	No action	BCP has utilised the Ecological Network Maps prepared by the Dorset Nature Partnership as a starting point for the ecological network mapped by the Council. BCP Council have used the DLNP work to inform the ecological networks defined in the local plan. Any review will be informed by the forthcoming LNRS mapping.	NA
0292	WH White	Policies map	Object to ward map P2 showing Whites Pit (former landfill) and part of Energy Site Control Centre as public open space. Consider this to be incorrect as they are privately owned with no public access.	Objection	Yes	Modification	Remove the area which is not publicly accessible	Amend policies map to remove open space from Whites Pit.
0456	Highcliffe & Walkford Parish Council	Policies Map	Local Green Spaces from neighbourhood plan should be shown on the map. Public Rights of Way has a missing path from Greenways (Jesmond Avenue junction) to Lymington Road.	Objection		Modification	Agree Local Green Spaces designated by the neighbourhood plan should be included on the interactive policies map. There is no public right of way from Jesmond Avenue to Lymington Road.	Add Local Green Spaces from Highcliffe and Walkford Neighbourhood Plan to Policies Map
0092	British Speedway Promoters	Policies map	Stadium should be identified on policies map as an existing sports and leisure facility and protected as such. Stadium could be designated as an Asset of Community Value.	Comment		No action	The plan does not show existing sports and leisure facilities on the policies map, there are a large number of existing facilities which would be too detailed to map, these facilities are however protected by policy E12. A nomination for an Asset of Community Value can be made to the Council's community team, this process is separate to the Local Plan.	NA
0162	Bournemouth Airport	Policies Map	Considers that small triangular sliver of land immediately to the east of Chapel Land and north of Enterprise Way should be removed from the Green Belt as it services no Green Belt function and is hindering the provision of entrance features to the business park.	Objection	Yes	No action	The Council has chosen not to amend Green Belt boundaries through the local plan process.	NA
0259	Arts University Bournemouth	Policies Map	Site Allocation Em.2 (Innovation Quarter, Talbot Village) should not cover the university campuses for AUB and BU (identified as TV1 within Policy E4).	Objection	No	No action	Policy E2 and E4 cover the wider Talbot Village area including the campuses and this is reflected in the allocation on the policies map. The campuses are included as the policy support the delivery of additional academic floor space, student accommodation and a cultural hub.	NA
0616	Stephen Byrne	Policies map	Mapping of local area difficult to use as not clear what to look for and due to BCP Council watermarks	Objection		No action	The interactive mapping is provided to improve accessibility and improves usability over a pdf map. The watermarks are required due to copy right issues	NA
0148	FCERM	General	Refer to figures consistently	Support with changes		Modification	Amend figure numbering to be consistent	Figure numbering to be amended
0016	Brian Sutcliffe	General	Plan promotes congestion, pollution and climate change	Objection	Yes	No action	Transport chapter sets out our approach to encouraging walking, cycling and public transport and reducing the need to travel in order to help manage congestion and reduce pollution.	NA
0079	The Society for Poole	General	Concern regarding housing affordability affecting ability to achieved balanced communities. Council building or fostering of community land trusts should be considered in order to provide well-located, suitable housing with suitable tenures.	Objection		No action	The Council is pursuing the construction and acquisition of properties to deliver affordable housing. This activity sits outside of the Local Plan process.	NA
0200	Meyrick Estate	General	Plan lacks clear means of delivery, enforceability, vision, ambition and comprehensiveness. Sustainable neighbourhoods need to be distinctive with policies to support enhancements. Plan promotes site centred development without requirement for deliverable enhancements to community, context or infrastructure. Development needs to achieve better and more beautiful areas, with contributions sought to achieve this through its design, presence and contribution of use. Design codes required for all sustainable neighbourhoods where change is expected (notably East Cliff). Plan is a work in progress (not complete), and is reactive rather than proactive. Lack of mechanisms to achieve enhancements beyond sites. Plan needs to clearly show what aspects of the vision and objectives each policy relates to.	Objection	Yes	No action	Monitoring framework is included to monitor plan progress. Delivery will be across multiple agencies and private interests that are not all within Council control. Ward policies set out improvements within sustainable neighbourhoods. Infrastructure requirements set out for strategic sites and in other cases via CIL. Plan supports the use of Design Codes.	NA
0223	Fortitudo Ltd	General	Plan is unsound on all four tests. Plan is not positively prepared as it does not provide a strategy to meet the areas objectively assessed need. It is not an appropriate strategy as Green Belt release and provision of taller buildings in other locations has not been properly considered, and is highly restricted. The plan is not deliverable, with a key part of the regeneration area deemed to be unviable by the Council's own evidence, and the duty to co-operate has not been undertaken appropriately. Plan is not consistent with national policy in respect of the optimisation of brownfield land and fully meeting housing need. Plan should be seeking to meet housing numbers through standard method.	Objection		No action	The BCP area has significant constraints which mean the level of growth set out in the standard methodology cannot be achieved. In accordance with the NPPF the Plan does not propose to release Green Belt to meet housing needs.	NA
0268	Talbot Village Trust	General	Poole Local Plan and Talbot Village SPD support Trust's aspirations contrary to proposed BCP Local Plan. Plan fails to identify sufficient employment land and strategic opportunity represented by Talbot Village, is unnecessarily restrictive in relation to Talbot Village, and misses opportunity to enhance services and facilities at Talbot Village.	Objection		No action	The Council has sought to balance the need for economic growth with local concerns surrounding impacts on the surrounding land.	NA

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0280	Dorset CPRE	General	The plan is largely sound and in accordance with local needs whilst protecting the local environment. Need for development of new homes, in the right proportions of tenure type. Need for affordable has not been effectively targeted in the plan. Support protecting remaining Green Belt and brownfield sites first. Support proposed target of 1200 homes pa for initial period, which accurately reflects the constraints, and may be ambitious when compared to the circa 1000 pa delivered in recent years. 40% affordable housing planning obligation should be applied to all areas of BCP and question the viability/typology assessment for central areas and brownfield sites. Keen to see promotion of central retail areas and not expansion of the major stores and supermarkets on periphery and 'near centre' locations. Promotion of more comprehensive public transport is required. Support policy of increased employment but question that 9,000 extra jobs on Highmoor Farm. All new development should be carbon neutral and utilise solar panels on roof areas : 'magic triangle of 'heat pumps, solar PV and battery storage' being worth fostering. Believe pollution of Poole Harbour requires actual reduction, to be evidenced by 'algal mat' reduction.	Support with changes		No action	Support noted. The plan seeks to deliver affordable housing but has to consider viability constraints	NA
0319	Alan Webb	General	Blank	Support	No	No action	Support noted	NA
0325	Ana Nunes	General	Concerns regarding impact on quality of life, services, security, traffic, crime, vandalism, devaluation, and wildlife and environment (due to overpopulation, noise, pollution)	Objection	No	No action	Policies within the plan aim to manage and mitigate the various impacts from development.	NA
0342	Anthony Vickery	General	Plan requires more explicit criteria for sustainable construction (i.e. avoiding concrete and too much glass in new buildings). TPO update required. Policy for planting native trees and supporting landowners' responsible management of woodlands required - existing policy too restrictive, lead to loss of trees, and protection of non-native/unsuitably located trees. Conservation area policies need to be updated, with more specific guidance on site-splitting/where min. split size prescribed. Update list of locally listed buildings, include stronger presumptions against demolition (particularly before replacement proposed)	Objection	No	No action	Requirements for sustainable construction are set out in chapter 5 and reflect Building Regulations. Update of TPOs, Conservation Areas and Local List sit outside of the Local Plan process. Urban greening supports the use of native species. In line with legislations policies on conservation area require proposals preserve or enhance the character of the area. Heritage policies seek to retain the important aspects of non designated heritage assets.	NA
0371	Clifford Morse	General	Supports plan for tackling climate change, coastal erosion, sea cliff stability, flood risk, and natural environment including biodiversity and green infrastructure. Plan is comprehensive. Welcome use of approachable tables and maps. Welcomes spatial strategy at start of plan and the ward specific policies. However, queries the ability of the plan to implement the policies. Fears development will not be forthcoming in sufficient quantity to implement parts of the strategy. Should be more pro-active components to the plan 'to make it happen'.	Objection	Yes	No action	The Council is reliant on the private sector to deliver some aspects of the plan. The Plan will be monitored to assess delivery.	NA
0435	Howard Johnson	General	Blank	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0469	Judith Brocklehurst	General	Consultation process is difficult to access and use which is disappointing in a democracy. Improve essential services, get on top of urgent issues such as filling potholes, cleaning street signs, keeping beaches clean, providing adequate parking for visitors. Suggestion of further regulations to the planning system which would help developers increase their gain and restrict residents' rights is unfair and unconstitutional and would create dangerous precedent where Bournemouth and environs would become ghettos. To manipulate the planning regulations would surely need to be debated and voted on in the two Parliamentary Houses.	Objection	No	No action	Local Plans are large and cover a complex range of issues. Information has been made available in accordance with the regulations and broken down to be as accessible as possible. The Local Plan is prepared in the context of national legislation and guidance and seeks to mitigate the impacts from new development. Some of the issues identified in the representation are outside the scope of the local plan process	NA
0527	Michael Brocklehurst	General	Difficult to make comments, concentrate on core services not Local Plan, Plan is complex, not democratic, planning system is adequate without the Local Plan	Objection	No	No action	The Council has a statutory Duty to Prepare a Local Plan and cover the complex range of issues included. Information has been made available in accordance with the regulations and broken down to be as accessible as possible.	NA
0079	The Society for Poole	Foreword	Support actions to: improve biodiversity (including net gain); reach net zero; deliver relevant dwellings; improve tree cover and minimise risks of flooding and coastal erosion. Unclear how plan will attract and retain talent in area. Note area is promoted as an area to retire. Could be considered unsound due to lack of clarity on how balanced communities will be achieved. Lack of confidence in long-term availability of infrastructure services and facilities. Provision of lower-cost housing is inadequate.	Objection		No action	The plan allocates land for economic growth, seeks to retain existing employment land and support the needs of the universities where possible. The plan supports the provision of affordable housing in line with what is achievable from the viability evidence. The plan also supports the collection of CIL to provide infrastructure and the policies in the plan also seek to protect existing infrastructure where possible.	NA

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0096	Go South Coast	Plan Period	Plan period must cover 15 years - earliest adoption date 2025 likely need for modifications to be consulted on, 2026 more realistic. Therefore earliest end date 2040, 2042 more realistic. Plan will not be adopted swiftly because the constraints based approach controversial and will take time to review at examination. No opportunity given to stakeholders/interested parties to shape plan given draft plan only consulted on at Regulation 19 stage - no meaningful input. More work required before and during examination and greater risk to council. Legal compliancy issues mean plan unlikely to be accepted for examination. Late base date means cannot account for under-delivery to date. Prevents consideration of extremely poor housing delivery record (significantly less than planned for in even first 5 years of plan). Deficit must be addressed in first 5/max 10 years after adoption through immediate boost. Heavily reliant on existing consents and undelivered allocations that have failed to come forward for many years. Council therefore have not positively planned to meet needs and plan is unsound.	Objection	No	Modification	It is recommended the time period of the plan is modified to reflect the proposed adoption date in 2025.	Plan period amended to <b>2025 to 2040</b>
0220	LGIM Real Assets	Plan Period	Welcomes overall approach. The time period of the plan does not run for 15 years.	Objection		Modification	It is recommended the time period of the plan is modified to reflect the proposed adoption date in 2025.	Plan period amended to <b>2025 to 2040</b>
0235	Wyatt Homes	Plan Period	Unrealistic for plan to be adopted in 2024. 15 year plan period required, so should cover 2024 to 2040, along with consequential changes to development targets (including homes)	Objection	Yes	Modification	It is recommended the time period of the plan is modified to reflect the proposed adoption date in 2025. As a result the text surrounding the date for review also requires modification	Plan period amended to 2025 to 2040
0247	Hallam Land Management Ltd	Plan Period	In accordance with paragraph 22 of the NPPF, local plans are required to look ahead over a minimum of a 15-year period from adoption. The 2024 Local Development Scheme (LDS) anticipates adoption before the end of 2025, but accounting for potential delays to submission and during examination, the Plan should cover at least to 2041, rather than 2039 as proposed.	Objection	Yes	Modification	Plan period to be modified.	Plan period amended to 2025 to 2040
0258	Royal London Mutual Insurance Society Ltd	Plan Period	Time period of plan needs to be 15 years from adoption, time period needs to be extended. Extending the plan period to 2041, to comply with paragraph 22 of the NPPF, would require an additional 3,200 dwellings to be added to the housing target. This equates to 27,200 (net) dwellings as a minimum over the plan period.	Comment		Modification	It is recommended the time period of the plan is modified to reflect the proposed adoption date in 2025. As a result the text surrounding the date for review also requires modification	Plan period amended to 2025 to 2040
0267	Richborough Estates	Plan Period	Object to plan period - not long enough to allow for 15 year period from adoption. Period to 2041/ideally 2042 required.	Objection	Yes	Modification	It is recommended the time period of the plan is modified to reflect the proposed adoption date in 2025.	Plan period amended to 2025 to 2040
0269	South West Housing and Planning Consortium	Plan Period	Need 15-year time horizon from adoption, period will most likely cover less than a 15-year period, need to go one or two years beyond 2039.	Objection	No	Modification	Amend to change plan period. The BCP area has significant constraints which mean the level of growth set out in the standard methodology cannot be achieved. In accordance with the NPPF the Plan does not propose to release Green Belt to meet housing needs.	Plan period amended to 2025 to 2040
0571	Home Builders Federation	Plan Period	Plan period to be extended to cover 15 years from adoption. 2041 or 2042 end date more realistic. Evidence will need to cover whole plan period (as well as longer timeframe).	Objection	Yes	Modification	It is recommended the time period of the plan is modified to reflect the proposed adoption date in 2025. As a result the text surrounding the date for review also requires modification	Plan period amended to 2025 to 2040
0028	Susan Chapman	Plan Period	Local Plan will attempt to cover the period 2023-2038 but accepts that in a fastmoving world of systems breakdown, of ecological and climatic disruption, of climate displacement and resource conflict we must all be exceptional flexible and now braced and ready for speedy and possibly unexpected changes. Does not feel one document will be sufficient to tackle climate change.	Objection	Yes	No action	The plan seeks to address the climate and ecological emergency in relation to planning matters, wide engagement and education on climate change sit outside the scope of the document.	NA
0292	WH White	Plan Period	Checklists and assessment add significantly to complexity and cost of the process.	Comment	Yes	No action	The aim of the checklists is to provide certainty upon application that the policy requirements can be met and correct information provided, to the benefit of applicants and the Council by speeding up decision making.	NA
0282	Historic England	Para 1.06	Completion and adoption of conservation area areas should be undertaken as a high priority.	Comment		No action	Agree but outside of the scope of the Local Plan process	NA
0292	WH White	Para 1.06	Number of DPDs and SPDs need to be rationalised and kept up to date.	Comment	Yes	No action	This Local Plan will significantly simplify the number of policies and documents currently used in the BCP area.	NA
0456	Highcliffe & Walkford Parish Council	Para 1.09	Reference needed to Highcliffe and Walkford Neighbourhood Plan.	Objection		Modification	Amend Highcliffe Ward policy to reference neighbourhood plan and set housing requirement.	Requirement added to policy H2. Amend Highcliffe ward policy to add 'The ward is covered by the Highcliffe and Walkford Neighbourhood Plan area. Further details about the neighbourhood plan and its policies can be found on our website.'
0148	FCERM	Para 1.15	Clarity needed on whether council intends to sign-up to the Coastal Concordat for England.	Support with changes		Follow up	For BCP Council to consider signing up to Coastal Concordat for England.	
0235	Wyatt Homes	Para 1.17	Plan should be reviewed in 2029 if adopted in 2024 (although that adoption date is unrealistic). Trigger for earlier review if monitoring shows needs are not being met should be clear, quantitative and set out in policy, based on housing delivery/achievement of other monitoring targets.	Objection	Yes	Modification	It is recommended the time period of the plan is modified to reflect the proposed adoption date in 2025. As a result the text surrounding the date for review also requires modification.	Plan period amended to 2025 to 2040

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0292	WH White	Para 1.17	Early review likely. Contingency measures needed such as reserve sites or triggers for Very Special Circumstances for selective Green Belt release.	Objection	Yes	Modification	It is recommended that the proposed review date is modified in line with the date of adoption. Further text to be added to clarify that an earlier review may be required as a result of work of neighbouring authorities on their local plans.	Plan period amended to 2025 to 2040
0020	RSPB	Para 1.17	Careful approach to mitigation needed. However, the mitigation hierarchy for designated sites requires all reasonable steps to avoid impacts on protected sites be taken first. Recommend change to wording to include reference to the mitigation hierarchy approach.	Support with changes		No action	Too detailed for the context of paragraph 1.17.	NA
0079	The Society for Poole	Para 1.17	Mechanism needed to correct errors in plan once adopted. Would require substantial support at Full Council (80%). Also note future review is described without reference to how any adjustments to the Local Plan will be effected.	Objection		No action	Any amendments needed will be agreed through examination with the inspector. Post adoption changes can only be made through review.	NA
0148	FCERM	Para 1.17	Support reference to flood defences, although should specifically refer to flood and coastal risk management assets.	Support with changes		No action	Support noted	NA
0150	Ken Parke on behalf of various clients 3	Paras 1.17-1.19	Clear distinction between strategic and non-strategic policies. Concerned an early review will be required and that this is reflected in the approach to allocating sites and not seeking to meet standard method housing requirement. Setting out number of homes required in each ward is over-prescriptive and is treating them as their own settlements goes far beyond what is reasonable within the frame of the overarching Strategic Development Plan. Likelihood of these sub areas delivering specific needs identified is extremely low. Spatial strategy not capable of meeting the plan area's objectively assessed needs. Significant doubt that even the 'constraints based approach' figures will be met. Plan does not properly consider the needs over the next 15 years or allow for appropriate adaptation and reaction to material changes.	Objection		No action	The strategic policies are specifically labelled as such. Setting out the number of homes in each ward has enabled people to engage with the local plan and is required to support neighbourhood planning, the homes in each ward is based upon commitments, site allocations and past windfall rates.	NA
0028	Susan Chapman	Para 1.19	Does not consider to be sound, positively prepared or effective. Concerned that wording is too vague and unhelpful with focus on money over the environment.	Objection	Yes	No action	The wording of the paragraph is considered clear.	NA
0079	The Society for Poole	Para 1.20	Plan supports decision makers applying weight and judgement to various matters taking account of other material planning considerations (as happened in Talbot Village site TV2 decision).	Objection		No action	The planning system requires the decision makers to apply weight and planning judgement in making decisions, supported by the policies in the Local Plan.	NA
0292	WH White	Para 1.20	A good pre app service is needed to support this which is not in place.	Comment	Yes	No action	The actions necessary to support the plan can be addressed by the Council outside of the examination process.	NA
0020	RSPB	Para 2.2	The internationally important Poole Harbour wetland should be included as outstanding natural environment.	Support with changes		Modification	Add reference to harbours in para 2.2.	Add reference to harbours in para 2.2.
0511	Dorset Local Nature Partnership	Para 2.2	Recommend adding here the importance of natural environment to ecosystem service delivery and importance in terms of natural capital and international importance for nature conservation of coast, rivers, harbours and heaths.	Objection	No	Modification	Amend to add reference to the importance to natural capital.	Add reference to natural capital in para 2.2.
0259	Arts University Bournemouth	Figure 2.2 - Characteristics of BCP	Universities should be listed in the key characteristics in figure 2.2	Objection	No	Modification	Add reference to universities in figure 2.2.	Include reference to universities in Figure 2.2.
0292	WH White	Figure 2.2 - Characteristics of BCP	Projections should be refreshed. BCP is second largest conurbation in south west. Demographic projections need updating.	Objection	Yes	Follow up	Modify figures to reflect the latest census information.	
0511	Dorset Local Nature Partnership	Figure 2.2 - Characteristics of BCP	Fig 2.2 and accompanying text should celebrate natural environment more strongly. Should include tree canopy data and details of protected sites	Objection	No	Modification	Amend figure 2.2 to add reference to nature conservation areas and tree canopy.	Include reference to nature conservation areas and tree canopy in Figure 2.2
0020	RSPB	Figure 2.2 - Characteristics of BCP	Would be worth separating out internationally important SPA, SAC and Ramsar sites from 47 heritage conservation areas.	Support with changes		No action	Some of these designations and their extents overlap, as such a map based illustration is considered more useful than a numerical breakdown.	NA
0292	WH White	Para 3.2	Local Plan has failed to address the challenges it sets out.	Objection	Yes	No action	The plan has sort to balance the competing objectives/challenges to provide an up to date plan for the BCP area	NA
0148	FCERM	Para 3.2	Include specific reference to sea level rise, coastal change and surface water flood risk.	Support with changes		Modification	Add reference to sea level rise, coastal change and surface water flood risk.	Add reference to sea level rise, coastal change and surface water flood risk in first bullet of para 3.2.

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0096	Go South Coast	Para 3.2	Significant housing stock imbalance with limited housing for young families. Significant projected ageing population increasing demand for local services and evidence demonstrates are not downsizing from family properties at rate required. Vision, strategy and policies fail to identify or address polarisation/socio-economic segregation between affluent majority in urban cores in under-occupied owner-occupied homes without mortgages, and poorer younger demographic in former council estates and those living in highly substandard high density private rented stock (including HMOs). Immense pressure for dwellings. Strategy for housing and infrastructure will 'squeeze out' economically active, and will result in exceptional pressures identified in spatial portrait becoming more severe. Strategy will result in greater dependency on areas beyond conurbation to maintain workforce, increasing journeys on saturated road network. Will increase extent and intensity of interactions between conurbation and ever wider hinterland - not socially, economically or environmentally sustainable.	Objection	No	No action	The housing mix policy seeks to provide a range of property sizes. A number of one and two bed properties have consent and would support options to downsize.	NA
0148	FCERM	Vision and Objectives	Expand to refer to minimising coastal erosion and sea cliff instability, avoiding flood risk where possible, and using SuDs to minimise flood risk and enhance green/blue infrastructure. Need to balance focusing most intensive development in town centre areas and justification for this with flood risk in affordable housing objective. Expand point regarding flood defences to refer to sustaining current level of risk over the next century. Expand to acknowledge need to provide flood defences and cliff stability solutions.	Support with changes		Modification	Agree.	Add coastal erosion and sea cliff instability to para 3.2 bullet seven.
0020	RSPB	Vision and Objectives	Recognition of climate and ecological emergency and commitment to climate mitigation measures welcomed. Would be helpful to have the proposed Climate Action Strategy published as an SPD and a carbon accounting mitigation programme to demonstrate how the plan will meet the objective of net zero by 2050. The commitment to protecting and enhancing the ecological network is welcomed. The plan should set out what the ecological emergency for BCP looks like and how the plan and supporting documents can assist in recovery. It would be helpful to identify priority areas for ecological restoration within the spatial strategy and priority species for recovery with action plans, in accordance with para 185a of the NPPF (informed by the Local Nature Recovery Strategy).	Support with changes		No action	Supported noted. SPDs will follow the adoption of the Local Plan. More detail about the climate and ecological emergency is set out on the Council's website and its 153 climate change actions. The Council is in the process of preparing an Energy Plan to consider actions to support working towards net zero.	NA
0028	Susan Chapman	Vision and Objectives	Does not consider vision to be sufficiently transparent as evidence by Matt Montgomery (previously BCP Council) has not been published. Public need to be more engaged and educated and timetable updated daily. No plans will prepare use for climate change impacts. More leadership needed and concerns of transparency, education and engagement with government. Dislikes use of word "sustainability" as it can be interpreted in different ways. Dismayed at Navitus wind farm being abandoned. Concerned regarding farming decline and lack of food production.	Objection	Yes	No action	The plan seeks to address the climate and ecological emergency in relation to planning matters, wide engagement and education on climate change sit outside the scope of the document. The Council are aware of a large range of academic papers relating to climate change but cannot publish all of these as part of the evidence base. The evidence is focused of BCP specific issues. The Council is working on a specific Energy Plan for the BCP area Navitus windfarm is a historic offshore wind proposal that is beyond the scope of the Local Plan. The BCP area is largely urban but does include some farmland within the Green Belt around the built up area. These areas are protected by virtue of the Green Belt designation and by agricultural land considerations in the NPPF.	NA
0040	Natural England	Vision and Objectives	Welcome the objectives to conserve and enhance our outstanding natural environment and sustainable transport.	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0167	Care South	Vision and Objectives	Significant need for specialist older peoples housing in the BCP area, unclear how current strategy will ensure the needs will be met.	Objection	Yes	Follow up	The strategy makes reference to the aging population and more detail and information relating to this and resulting needs for specialist accommodation is set out in chapter 8. Consider setting a target for specialist older peoples accommodation	
0175	Asda Stores Ltd	Vision and Objectives	Asda supports the overall objective of seeking to improve town centres and ensure they function to meet the needs of local residents and the fourth commitment to "support the provision of community uses, health services and shops to serve Town Centre residents". ASDA is main food store serving the town centre, however is not adequately recognised in the draft plan.	Objection	Yes	Modification	Agree.	Reference ASDA and the important role of the food store within the supporting text of the Bournemouth Central ward policy.

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0079	The Society for Poole	Vision and Objectives	Generally strongly support vision statements. Conservation and enhancement of natural environment should include areas that could be considered less than outstanding. Provision of affordable homes to meet needs should be prioritised over more expensive homes, holiday lets and similar. Objective to 'deliver' infrastructure outside Council's executive powers and no evidence of what other organisations' plans are to justify local plan. Ensuring biodiversity net gain supported. Note net gain easier on brownfield than greenfield. Regret nutrient 'neutrality' mentioned regarding protection of Poole Harbour protected sites, Nutrient reduction now necessary to halt continuing growth of de-oxygenating algal mats. Note reference to improved air quality. Hope incinerator proposals will be refused. Support gentle intensification of dwellings across urban area due to large presence of bungalows that could be converted into two storey dwellings. Note provision of 'affordable' homes will be increased. However, no evidence on correlation between management of waiting list and delivery of dwellings. Therefore unsound. Character of various sections of the sea front between Christchurch and Hamworthy should be protected. Surprised omit reference to solar panels on roofs and car parks. Support promotion of local distinctiveness - means improved consultation with communities. Support brownfield land redevelopment. Support design codes for good quality design and sustainable accommodation.	Support with changes		No action	Areas of support noted. The bullets under the conserve and enhance the natural environment bullet consider the actions in relation to the natural environment in general. The Council cannot insist that all applications are for affordable homes, affordable home requirements need to be viable for private developers. Local Plan is supported by infrastructure delivery statement and CIL will be collected to support infrastructure delivery. Nutrient neutrality is an important issue that is considered within the natural environment chapter and is referenced under the objectives. The principle of solar panels on car parks would be supported by the Local Plan but is too detailed to be referenced in the objectives.	NA
0082	Christchurch Harbour Ornithological Group	Vision and Objectives	Supportive of first two local plan objectives and actions to protect and enhance the green infrastructure network and ensure a net gain in biodiversity on page 6	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0096	Go South Coast	Vision and Objectives	Poor track record of planning strategies reducing dependence on private cars, contrary to objectives. Lack of investment in highway infrastructure leads to traffic congestion, leading to delays and unpredictability of journey, affecting bus services. Transport evidence shows lack of resilience. No objective highlighting need to resolve inadequate public transport infrastructure or make buses faster/more reliability - therefore strategy ineffective and plan unsound. No clear alignment with deliverable transport strategy addressing issues, therefore cannot meet transport and mobility objectives. Plan does not attempt to provide sufficient housing and therefore does not meet objective to meet new market and affordable homes, which itself is unspecific, passive and inconsistent with national policy. Plan does not meet identified needs as far as possible or provide sufficient amount and variety of land to meet needs. Lack of supply is adversely impacting working population, prosperity of area and resident wellbeing. Evidence needs to demonstrate intensification in town centres supports shorter journeys, inclusive and sustainability accessibility to employment, and quality of life, balanced against housing needs being met in broader range of locations and meeting broader needs. Significant departure from focusing growth on main public transport corridors. While Poole and Bournemouth are transport hubs, nature of conurbation means journeys to other areas can be long. Much of the area, particularly coastal areas and Bournemouth Town Centre, hilly and unfavourable to cycling and walking. Many employment areas, retail areas and key facilities located away from central areas	Objection	No	No action	Objectives reference improvements to bus services and policies within the plan support modal shift. It is not possible to meet the standard methodology housing need figure due to the constraints within the BCP area. In accordance with the NPPF the Plan does not propose to release Green Belt to meet housing needs. Our central areas have the best access to facilities and services, including public transport services which may be used for longer journeys. The majority of our centres are along public transport corridors.	NA
0150	Ken Parke on behalf of various clients 3	Vision and Objectives	Support vision. Strategy will not fulfil vision. Approach is consistent with existing failed approach which has failed to meet housing needs. Historic failure to meet housing needs through intensification along. Existing strategy with Green Belt release has improved delivery. Urban sites lighted by viability issues and constraints. Same issues remain. Other policies too prescriptive to allow urban development. Without Green Belt release the number of homes required will not be delivered. Council relying on current failed strategy. Reliance on windfall development. No evidence it will continue. Does not allow significant volume of development to come forward. New plan introduces new restrictions on development. Policies on heights and mix prevent optimal use of land. Strategy will not deliver affordable housing, greenfield sites needed for affordable housing. Plan does not do enough to provide more homes. Maintains status quo. Whole approach needs to be revisited.	Objection	Yes	No action	The BCP area has significant constraints which mean the level of growth set out in the standard methodology cannot be achieved. In accordance with the NPPF the Plan does not propose to release Green Belt to meet housing needs. Other policies are set out in the interests of good planning.	NA
0158	New Forest National Park Authority	Vision and Objectives	Welcomes objectives and recognition of nature conservation sites in New Forest.	Support		No action	Support noted	NA

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0159	Morrish Homes	Vision and Objectives	A housing requirement below identified needs fails to address key local plan issues, vision and objectives. Objective should seek to allocate sites to meet all housing needs. Over reliance on unidentified sites. Unclear how affordable housing objective would be assessed, under delivery likely. High costs with brownfield sites.	Objection		No action	It is not possible to meet the standard methodology housing need figure due to the constraints within the BCP area. There is a limited amount of suitable land known to be available. There area has a strong and consistent level of windfall but site availability not currently known, the HELAA identifies potential locations that illustrates a large number of windfall sites remain.	NA
0189	Sandbanks Community Group	Vision and Objectives	Agree with parts of vision and objectives which are aligned with Sandbanks Neighbourhood Plan (protect and intensify existing employment areas; sustain and support tourism through continued investment in the visitor experience and our seafront; Deliver high quality places that preserve or enhance our heritage; apply a design led approach to securing development that reflects or enhances the character of our communities; and 'ensure our neighbourhoods and centres have a mix of uses providing local amenities within walking and cycling distance of people's homes). Considers the Haven Hotel to be an existing employment site and wish to redevelopment site to incorporate a new/upgraded hotel with shopping, leisure and water sports activities incl improvements to the public realm/access/coastal park).	Support		No action	Existing hotels are covered by policy E9 of the plan	NA
0231	Castlepoint LP	Vision and Objectives	Support vision and objective. Castlepoint can make a contribution to a number of objectives	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0292	WH White	Vision and Objectives	Support vision. Generally supportive of objectives. Unclear why Green belt listed under conserve and enhance outstanding natural environment. Unclear if Stour Valley river corridor project is that same as the Stour Valley Park. Support measures to deliver new homes listed but the Plan will not deliver sufficient market or affordable homes. Strategic scale sites have significant lead in times - a strategy is needed for 5-15 years now not through future review. Pleased to see the link between the provision of 'good quality and affordable homes' and the 'health and productivity of employees' being made. It is unclear why high-quality places are only highlighted in relation to heritage; WHW consider that there are opportunities to promote high quality development and create or enhance sense of place elsewhere.	Support	Yes	Modification	Support noted. The focus should be on conserving and enhancing the countryside, but it is a fact that it is also Green Belt. Stour Valley River Corridor Project is the up to date name for the Stour Valley Park.	In natural environment objective refer to countryside (and Green Belt)
0235	Wyatt Homes	Vision and Objectives	Plan will not meet its objectives. The Plan will not provide enough new market and affordable homes. Green Belt release would significantly boost number of homes planned for and deliver more family housing. Insufficient new homes planned/significant unmet need severely stifles plan's objective for economic growth. Lack of effective planning for family homes needed to attract workers. Means employers less likely to locate within BCP stagnating economy, or employees will travel further distances resulting in very adverse impacts on transport networks and environmental sustainability. See Appendix 3 for demographic impact modelling. Lower growth of working age population. Existing employers concerned difficult to recruit due to lack of family housing and unaffordability. Failure to deliver sufficient homes/appropriate mix of homes will compromise ability to achieve carbon neutrality due to significant increase in transport emissions resulting from worker travel.	Objection	Yes	No action	It is not possible to meet the standard methodology housing need figure due to the constraints within the BCP area. In accordance with the NPPF the Plan does not propose to release Green Belt to meet housing needs. Housing mix policy seeks to provide a range of different property sizes.	NA

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0250	East Dorset Friends of the Earth	Vision and Objectives	Endorse plan's vision and objectives. Welcome aspiration to achieve "sustainable, safe and healthy communities". Economic and population growth will be unsustainable and conflict with climate and biodiversity objectives. Plan should manage pressures of in-migration and non-sustainable economic activities. Support objective to tackle climate change but insufficient to aim for "carbon neutrality ahead of 2050". Should reduce carbon emissions within first 10 years of plan and take up policy recommendations to achieve net carbon zero by 2030. Amend to clarify confusion between carbon reduction, mitigation and adaptation. Frequently, the policies only tackle mitigation and adaptation - greater emphasis on active reduction required. Policies can deter net-migration, such as through building small family units (rented, local authority) and not expanding high end jobs - such strategies would have other benefits. Little attempt to plan for enhanced public transport, and policies need to deter private vehicle transport (such as through LTNs etc.) Drainage issues need to be addressed more rigorously. Back development has adverse impacts. Intensification requires building upwards rather than infill. Additional storeys on bungalows linked to multiple occupancy could achieve many housing policy objectives, whilst minimising the impacts. More consistent and focused approach to biodiversity required. Upgrade and enhance habitats. One focus should be wildlife corridors – particularly 'stepping stones' threatened with infill. Developments which increase release of fertilizers/pesticides and plastics residues should be prevented due to soil/water quality impacts. Contamination a major threat to open spaces and protected natural habitats. Vehicles major source of plastics pollution - need to reduce vehicular numbers and journey lengths. Lack coherent set of targets for climate and biodiversity management to inform planning process. Made set of targets available in 2019. Not proactive enough to meet strategic goals.	Objection		No action	Plans policies support the provision of new homes and economic activity as outlined in the NPPF. Objectives surrounding climate change are inline with national requirements. Plan supports enhanced public transport and the Council works closely with bus operators but does not run services. Policies included to address surface water flood risk and all sources of flooding. Policy supporting biodiversity net gain and ecological networks are included. Overall strategy focuses on reducing the need to travel.	NA
0258	Royal London Mutual Insurance Society Ltd	Vision and Objectives	Support objectives but question if these will be achieved.	Comment		No action	Support noted	NA
0268	Talbot Village Trust	Vision and Objectives	Support some aspects of the vision and considers could be delivered through its Talbot Quarter proposals.	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0511	Dorset Local Nature Partnership	Vision and Objectives	The aim 'conserve and enhance our outstanding natural environment' feels dated. Need to strengthen to reflect urgency to restore and recover nature. Objective to ensure a biodiversity net gain is not sufficient. Need to reference nature based solutions to comply with NPPF para157. Recommend including aspiration to prioritise nature based solutions to mitigate and adapt to climate change and adding point to use public greenspace for carbon sequestration. No mention of recovering or restoring habitats beyond those already protected – should be added alongside 'enhance'. Point should be added about working with neighbouring partners in public and private sectors to create a Nature Recovery Network. Support use of brownfield sites, but some have high biodiversity values. Assessment of biodiversity values should be made prior to development to ensure BNG can be achieved. The aspiration: 'Flourishing green spaces that support the wellbeing of nature and people' is weak and insipid. Should change to be more ambitious and reflect urgent need to restore nature that BCP should be championing.	Objection	No	Modification	This wording is set out in the Council's corporate vision which has been agreed by the Council. Policies across the plan provide detail regarding urban cooling, carbon sequestration and natural flood management. Conserve or enhance is consistent with NPPF, restore goes beyond what the local plan can do for habitat sites. Assessment of biodiversity on site is completed as part of BNG arrangements.	NA
0282	Historic England	Vision and Objectives	Vision should recognise heritage and culture. Particularly supportive of objective relating to heritage.	Support with changes		No action	Support noted. Vision and the elements below our place and environment reflect the corporate vision which has been subject to ongoing member engagement, it has and been agreed that this section should reflect the corporate wording.	NA
0288	Meyrick Estate Solar Management	Vision and Objectives	More detail objective on carbon neutrality required. Council needs to positively supporting delivery of low carbon and renewable energy schemes. Need to deliver energy strategy.	Support		No action	Objective already proposed to achieve carbon neutrality	NA
0304	Sovereign Network Group SNG	Vision and Objectives	SNG provide quality affordable homes. SNG is a significant stakeholder in the area, providing 5,908 homes across the conurbation. Supportive of Tetlow King reps on behalf of the South West Housing Associations Planning Consortium (SWHAPC). Support Vision. Affordability and availability of affordable homes is a significant barrier to delivering thriving communities across the conurbation.	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0350	Bob Lord	Vision and Objectives	No mention of the community of wildlife. Should provide examples of how wildlife (BNG) is accommodated within building structures. Should be mandatory to install at least one swift brick (or universal brick) into every new building and in renovations to development.	Objection	No	No action	The detailed of how biodiversity net gain is to be achieved are set out in chapter 6.	NA



ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0464	Jonathan Dowty	Vision and Objectives	Climate policies in the Local Plan show lack of urgency, are inconsistent with net zero, and provide insufficient policy and implementation clarity to drive development forward to achieve the vision, objectives and strategic aims.	Objection	Yes	No action	The vision and objectives reference climate change and more detail is set out in chapter 5. Minsters have been clear that the planning system should not go further than building regulations.	NA
0473	Judy Windwood	Vision and Objectives	Support objective on carbon neutrality	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0540	McCarthy Stone	Vision and Objectives	Vision and objectives need to be revised to support specialist housing provision for older people to free up family homes in light if Local Housing Needs Assessment findings and NPPF requirements.	Objection	No	No action	Under the details of the objective to provide new market and affordable homes a specific reference is already made to housing for older people	NA
0082	Christchurch Harbour Ornithological Group	Figure 4.1	Constraints map key does not show all habitats sites SPAs are missing and SSSIs don't constitute habitat sites.	Support with changes		Modification	Agree.	Correct legend on Figure 4.1 to replace SSSI with SPA.
0020	RSPB	Figure 4.1	Welcome and strongly support this approach to development within the draft local plan, as outlined in paras 4.10 and 4.17. Welcome and support inclusion of the 400m heathland consultation area and that it is mapped.	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0028	Susan Chapman	Para 4.5	Considers policy to be unsound, and not positively prepared, not justified, or effective as it does not go far enough with regards to tackling climate change.	Objection	Yes	No action	The plan seeks to address the climate and ecological emergency in relation to planning matters, wide engagement and education on climate change sit outside the scope of the document	NA
0020	RSPB	S1	Policy supported but unclear how developer would be able to demonstrate with reasonable certainty how they would reduce carbon emissions to net zero by 2050.	Support with changes		Modification	The aim of the policy is to help the Council understand how development will help achieve sustainable development and the climate and ecological emergency.	Modify Policy S1 to be clearer on the intent, remove the requirement to be more flexible and improve the clarity of the policy.
0071	Goadsby on behalf of various clients	S1	Policy too onerous. Point 'g' prioritising re use of existing buildings does not make optimal use of land. Point 'n' if proposal can be implemented is irrelevant to the decision. Point 'j' cannot be met as family housing cannot be delivered in the settlement boundary.	Objection	Yes	Modification	Agree policy needs amendment as not all criteria are relevant or are too difficult to achieve.	Improve the clarity of Policy S1 and avoid duplication of other policies
0079	The Society for Poole	S1	Policy S1 is ineffective and unsound, because affordable housing targets are unknown, delivery of infrastructure is vested in other organisations and it is not known that methods for ensuring 'n' exist/can be created.	Objection		Modification	Agree policy needs amendment as not all criteria are relevant or are too difficult to achieve.	Improve the clarity of Policy S1 and avoid duplication of other policies
0082	Christchurch Harbour Ornithological Group	S1	Actions outlined in the objectives are not reflected in the policy, should include requirement to show how protected habitats will be conserved and enhanced, how visitor pressure and nutrient neutrality will be managed.	Support with changes		Modification	Agree policy needs amendment as not all criteria are relevant or are too difficult to achieve.	Improve the clarity of Policy S1 and avoid duplication of other policies
0096	Go South Coast	S1	Repeats broad and generic objectives. Point e. vague and passive, and will not achieve radical shift in behaviour to low/zero carbon travel modes (including public transport) required to achieve National Transport Decarbonisation Plan requirements.	Objection	No	Modification	Agree policy needs amendment as not all criteria are relevant or are too difficult to achieve.	Improve the clarity of Policy S1 and avoid duplication of other policies
0036	Southwood Partners	S1	Policy too onerous. Point 'g' prioritising re use of existing buildings does not make optimal use of land. Point 'n' if proposal can be implemented is irrelevant to the decision. Point 'j' cannot be met as family housing cannot be delivered in the settlement boundary.	Objection	Yes	No action	Optimal use of land versus retaining buildings on a site depends upon the context of the individual site. We want to see permissions implemented, not land trading exercises. Family housing will be delivered in the urban area.	NA
0223	Fortitudo Ltd	S1	Policy S1 is not consistent with national policy, and it is unclear as to what development proposals need to do to be compliant. Concerns include impracticability and unrealistic nature of demonstrating how proposals will be net zero by 2050 (external factors outside of developer's control), b-e should be achieved in other policies in the plan, how maximising social value is assessed, promoting optimal use of land but restricted by other policies regarding height and density, provision of services, facilities, jobs and recreation when national policy only require mitigation. There should be a policy addressing housing need, not for resolution through individual applications. Needs to be clearer in part j that only essential infrastructure required to mitigate impact of development. Not every planning application needs to demonstrate its viability and deliverability. Policy should be deleted, and desires put in to supporting text.	Objection		Modification	Agree policy needs amendment as not all criteria are relevant or are too difficult to achieve.	Improve the clarity of Policy S1 and avoid duplication of other policies
0040	Natural England	S1	Strategic Policy S1: Natural England support the policy and specifically sections b, c, e, m.	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0235	Wyatt Homes	S1	Criterion j. will often be unachievable as most sites located on brownfield sites in urban area, which will face viability, technical constraint, context and character issues, and therefore be unlikely to deliver family housing (more likely flats). Most sites also not required to provide affordable housing. Criterion therefore unsound.	Objection	Yes	Modification	Agree policy needs amendment as not all criteria are relevant or are too difficult to achieve.	Improve the clarity of Policy S1 and avoid duplication of other policies
0064	Rose Young	S1	Policy too prescriptive, plan policies will not achieve policy outcomes. Green Belt release needed.	Objection		No action	In accordance with the NPPF the Plan does not propose to release Green Belt to meet housing needs. The Council is not arguing exceptional circumstances for a lower housing figure, it is taking a constraints based approach.	NA

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0158	New Forest National Park Authority	S1	Supports Strategic Policy S1 which identifies how proposed new development should address the climate emergency through various criteria including incorporating and improving sustainable travel.	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0159	Morrish Homes	S1	Any requirements beyond building regulations must be well reasoned and ensure development remains viable.	Objection		No action	The policy is not seeking to go beyond building regulations. This is clarified in modifications to chapter 5.	NA
0164	Environment Agency	S1	Support policy	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0268	Talbot Village Trust	S1	Too broad to be a sound basis for considering future development - even best development unlikely to deliver against all criteria. No guidance on appropriate balance to be struck between competing criteria. Cannot become tool to refuse development on any one criteria. Policy repeats other criteria. Should be deleted or focus on specific climate related issues.	Objection		Modification	Agree policy needs amendment as not all criteria are relevant or are too difficult to achieve.	Improve the clarity of Policy S1 and avoid duplication of other policies
0271	Highwood Group	S1	Support aspirations. Inappropriate for every proposal to meet every criterion (rather should be a target) [reasons given] and should thus be revised. 'Suitable timeframe' to demonstrate proposals viable/deliverable unclear, so criterion should be removed. Not all applications require design and access statement, and reference to council checklist unclear and confusing, so reference to requiring demonstration of compliance through these should be removed.	Objection	Yes	Modification	Agree policy needs amendment as not all criteria are relevant or are too difficult to achieve.	Improve the clarity of Policy S1 and avoid duplication of other policies
0189	Sandbanks Community Group	S1	Agree with S1i which is aligned with Sandbanks Neighbourhood Plan.	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0329	Andrew Reed	S1	Reference to "suitable timeframe" ambiguous. Should define completion date, similar to 3 year start dates, due delivery not taking place after demolition on sites, not delivering required housing. Viability should be demonstrated at application stage but reviewed on completion due to changing market values. CIL should be based on final gross development value, not application stage estimate.	Objection	No	Modification	Agree policy needs amendment as not all criteria are relevant or are too difficult to achieve.	Improve the clarity of Policy S1 and avoid duplication of other policies
0226	Bournemouth Water / South West Water	S1	Supportive of S1, particularly points (b) and (m);	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0245	Miller Homes and Bellway Homes (Wessex)	S1	Plan significantly fails to meet area's objectively assessed needs. Restrictive strategy unjustifiably restricts quantum of housing to be provided. Developer Consortium Representations set out severe economic and social consequences.	Objection	Yes	No Action	The BCP area has significant constraints which mean the level of growth set out in the standard methodology cannot be achieved. Policy requirements set out in the interests of good planning	NA
0250	East Dorset Friends of the Earth	S1	Broadly support. Wording should be strengthened.	Support with changes		No action	Support noted	NA
0258	Royal London Mutual Insurance Society Ltd	S1	Support approach, highlight the importance of development in most sustainable locations and make effective use of land. Site allocations including Belvedere Hotel could accommodate more development	Objection	No	No action	Support noted	NA
0267	Richborough Estates	S1	Object - Plan does not deliver mix and type of housing locally needed. Should plan to meet standard method to meet government objectives, provide better quality housing, address affordability crisis, support economic growth, and not undermine long term prosperity - no exceptional circumstances to justify departure.	Objection	Yes	No action	The BCP area has significant constraints which mean the level of growth set out in the standard methodology cannot be achieved.	NA
0292	WH White	S1	Welcome the focus on climate change and ecology, place making and economy. Support the intent and wording of Strategic Policy S1. Spatial strategy and housing needs (para4.6-4.12, pg 11)	Objection	Yes	No action	Support noted	NA
0334	Peter Fenning	S1	No specific strategy to deliver GP funding which is an issue for Christchurch. Sugeries have closed and some have closed lists to new patients.	Objection	No	No action	The Council is not responsible for GP funding, CIL can help support proposals for surgery expansion.	NA
0339	Anthony Burrell	S1	No climate and ecological emergency - no evidence, therefore unjustified	Objection	Yes	No action	The Council has declared a climate and ecological emergency	NA
0350	Bob Lord	S1	Policy S1c. and Para. 33 - Need to give examples of how urban greening and BNG can be achieved. Swift brick (or universal brick or swift box) mandatorily installed into every new development an easy net gain – should be condition of permission. Energy efficiency significantly harming wildlife (no holes left for red-list birds declining).	Objection	No	No action	Details surrounding urban greening and BNG are provided in chapter 6 and further details set out in additional guidance	NA
0424	NHS Property Services	S1	NHS requires all new development projects to be net zero carbon, and support policies that promote car-bon neutral development. NHS property could benefit from carbon offset funds collected where on-site carbon mitigation requirements cannot be met.	Support		No action	Comment noted	NA

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0473	Judy Windwood	S1	Supports policy as it provides alternative transport to private vehicles which is important for reducing pollution, slowing down climate change, improving health through physical exercise.	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0511	Dorset Local Nature Partnership	S1	Policy should be focusing more on ecological emergency. Mitigation hierarchy should be clearly set out as the starting point.	Objection	No	No action	The mitigation hierarchy is more appropriate in Chapter 6.	NA
0571	Home Builders Federation	S1	Contrary to criterion j, plan does not deliver mix and types of housing (including affordable and specialist) to meet local needs. Commitment to meet housing needs in full should be an objective. Standard method figure should be minimum level of housing provided – higher requirement required to address housing crisis, housing need, affordable housing provision and need to for employment growth. No exceptional circumstances for alternative calculation and perverse approach taken given Dorset Council previously willing and able to help meet unmet needs.	Objection	Yes	No action	The BCP area has significant constraints which mean the level of growth set out in the standard methodology cannot be achieved.	NA
0579	Richard Terry	S1	Existing ecological network inaccurate and misses important stepping stones in Poole area. Remove reference to it.	Objection	No	No action	Ecological networks are considered important to reference.	NA
0614	National Trust	S1	Overall support but specific reference to green infrastructure provision and benefits to health, wellbeing and communities alongside natural environment required. Should cross-reference Council's vision to 'achieving carbon neutrality by 2050'.	Objection	No	No action	Support noted. Not considered necessary to provide cross referencing	NA
0292	WH White	Para 4.6-4.12	The rationale behind sustainable neighbourhoods need not preclude the creation of new or extended neighbourhoods, particularly where this entails the delivery of new community infrastructure. Whilst constraints restrict development potential in some parts of BCP Green Belt is a discretionary policy designation. Strongly contest statements relating to the Housing Needs Sensitivity report, the report is flawed The duty to corporate statement does not testify to any purposeful, active and meaningful dialogue on housing numbers. There are exceptional circumstances for allowing Green Belt release. There are consequences of insufficient housing supply.	Objection	Yes	No action	In accordance with the NPPF the Plan does not propose to release Green Belt to meet housing needs.	NA
0235	Wyatt Homes	Para 4.7	Further work would be required to demonstrate standard method figure not achievable (such as 'constraints and capacity study') - no real evidence constraints prohibit allocation of further sites. HELAA and Green Belt Study demonstrate many available sites with limited constraints and contribution to green belt of moderate or lower - HELAA indicates allocation of these could meet standard method figure. While not all suitable for allocation and may not be possible to meet 'density-generated figures' on sites, need for more homes, including family homes, a strong case for exceptional circumstances, but council has not seriously considered this and assert insufficient sites, a stance that will not stand up to scrutiny. Politically motivated and does not excuse council from obligation to seek to meet needs within BCP or through effective agreements with neighbouring authorities.	Objection	Yes	No action	In accordance with the NPPF the Plan does not propose to release Green Belt to meet housing needs.	NA
0096	Go South Coast	Para 4.9	Housing supply/delivery is well below what has been required. Lack of affordable housing. Viability constraints on high density development. No houses (as oppose to flats) are being built, family housing needed to maintain economic activity rates, most of existing stock is under occupied and aggravates lack of housing availability for economically active.	Objection	No	No action	The plan seeks to support housing delivery and the provision of a mix of units.	NA
0225	Dorset Council	Para 4.9-4.11	Supports intensification of urban area, but will this meet needs. Agree the standard method approach to calculating local housing is not realistic in BCP area and joint evidence demonstrates the projected levels of in-migration into the BCP area in the 2014 demographic baseline overestimate the need for new housing. Alternatively, locally derived housing need is more achievable and aligned to past housing delivery. Any Green Belt release should consider opportunities adjacent to the urban area first as there is sustainable access to facilities.	Support	Yes	No action	Support noted. Agree that the standard method approach significantly overestimates local housing need. Agree the alternative locally derived housing need is more realistic, aligns with past levels of delivery and provides a similar housing target to the constraint based approach we have used.	NA
0235	Wyatt Homes	Para 4.9 - 4.11	Standard method need 2,718 dpa at time of writing. Assumption area cannot absorb housing delivery over 1,600 dpa due to market constraints not based on evidence (no robust housing market delivery evidence and not addressed in Housing Delivery Report). Incorrect there is a lack of available sites - evidence shows potentially suitable sites available in Green Belt. Housing Sensitivity Report does not justify exceptional circumstances case for lower figure (see Appendix 2), therefore 1,600 dwellings does not reflect housing needs and standard method to be used. Para. 4.11 and BCP/DC SoCG indicate council accepts exceptional circumstances not demonstrated, strategy simply 'preferable' in council's view. Identified need and strategy therefore not positively prepared, effective, justified or sound.	Objection	Yes	No action	In accordance with the NPPF the Plan does not propose to release Green Belt to meet housing needs. The Council is not arguing exceptional circumstances for a lower housing figure, it is taking a constraints based approach.	NA

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0292	WH White	Para 4.13-4.14	Object to employment strategy, employment land is tightly constrained, Wessex Fields will be committed to hospital related uses, Talbot Village innovation hub faces hurdles. Commercial agents consider a need for additional employment land, this has been ignored. Airport delivers quantitative capacity but a dispersed pattern is required for choice and range. Additional sites needed to support business growth/investment. More consideration needed for logistics sector. WHW is disappointed by the limited recognition given to the logistics sector despite the pandemic and subsequent ministerial statements highlighting the need for consideration.	Objection	Yes	No action	The plan sets out how employment needs can be met.	NA
0292	WH White	Para 4.15	Support needed for cultural and creative spaces. Canford Garden Village would aid cultural and creative space.	Support	Yes	No action	Support noted	NA
0148	FCERM	Para 4.16	No mention of drainage infrastructure. Expand text regarding flood risk management strategies to refer to reliance on funding being secured, and caveat that alternative options need to be considered in future due to due to sea level rise"	Support with changes		Modification	Agree.	Add reference to drainage infrastructure, funding and possible future relocation to para 4.16 (flood risk).
0020	RSPB	Para 4.16	Welcome commitment to implement mitigation measures to protect designated sites from impact of development.	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0040	Natural England	Para 4.16	Paragraph 4.16: Natural England support and welcome the scope.	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0211	Susan Suliman	Para 4.16	Increasing clinical rooms to meet housing need does not resolve issue of lack of GP provision and staff retention. Burton surgery has just closed.	Objection	No	No action	The staff levels within surgeries are the responsibility of the NHS and outside the scope of the local plan.	NA
0292	WH White	Para 4.16	Residual capacity exists in Riverside SANG. Meadow SANG available. Both can help mitigate impacts. Further education infrastructure may be needed, Canford Garden Village could support this. Unclear what provision for burial space. Unclear how pitch need would be met. Canford Garden Village can be founded on mobility hierarchy and provide new doctors. Flood defences support in Poole town centre, timetable uncertain. Canford Garden Village has potential for recovered aggregates, renewable energy and waste management	Comment	Yes	No action	Education provision likely to be met on existing school sites. As set out additional burial space required in Christchurch. As set out pitch provision to be met by increasing carrying capacity and through the use of artificial surfaces.	NA
0351	Sport England	Para 4.16	References to Built Facilities Assessment and Playing Pitch Assessment, however both are coming to the end of their life at 5 years old, and not aware that regular meetings have occurred to provide annual updating of them to increase their longevity.	Comment	No	No action	The Council will continue to review and assess the contents of both studies.	NA
0292	WH White	Para 4.17-4.18	There is scope for new neighbourhoods. Exceptional circumstances exist to release Green belt. Social and economic consequences to not releasing Green Belt. Canford Garden Village site has SANG capacity and is well located and could deliver improvements to remaining Green Belt.	Objection	Yes	No action	In accordance with the NPPF the Plan does not propose to release Green Belt to meet housing needs.	NA
0292	WH White	Para 4.19-4.26	Development at Canford would not impact on delivery of town centre regeneration. Social value needs to be better defined. Many town centre sites have not been delivered due to market conditions and viability challenges. Many sites stalled. Over reliance on previous strategy which has not delivered. Quantum of homes challenging to deliver, wider economic uncertainty, high interest rates, market absorption of one/two bed flats, complexity of town centre sites, risk with building tall flats. Flexibility needed in trajectory. Support for stance on high density schemes having a good interface with public realm and amenity matters.	Objection	Yes	No action	Social value is defined in the glossary. Town centres continue to be a suitable focus for growth and applications continue to be submitted. Council seeking to support delivery where possible. Wider economic circumstance outside Council control.	NA
0082	Christchurch Harbour Ornithological Group	Figure 4.2	Key diagram should be updated to include all habitats to be conserved or enhanced, should include Poole Harbour, Avon Valley and Christchurch Harbour and SSSIs.	Support with changes		No action	It is considered too detailed to show all of the sites on the key diagram, the various sites are shown on the policies map/interactive mapping.	NA
0292	WH White	Para 4.27-4.32	Support walkabout neighbourhoods. Unclear how figure 4.1 derived, should take into account planned improvements in the area.	Support with changes	Yes	No action	Support noted. Planned improvement set out in the ward policies.	NA
0195	Christchurch Town Council Neighbourhood Plan Working Group	Figure 4.3	Need to add allotments and dental surgeries to sustainable neighbourhoods mapping	Support with changes		No action	Sustainability neighbourhood mapping is complete.	NA
0235	Wyatt Homes	Figure 4.3	Figure 4.3 does not take account of functional and proximity linkages between BCP area and services, facilities and employment within settlements just beyond BCP area's boundaries, accessible by foot, cycle and public transport. Some areas on periphery should therefore should not be shown as least sustainable. Skews impression of area that are sustainable, thus strategy based on map unjustified.	Objection	Yes	No action	The only area where this may apply is around Bransgore which contains some services but within BCP land around Bransgore is within the Green Belt, the boundaries of which are not being amended through the Plan	NA

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0268	Talbot Village Trust	Figure 4.3	New neighbourhood centre in Talbot Quarter with better links proposed could address low sustainability score in Talbot Woods sustainable neighbourhood area.	Comment		No action	Comment noted	NA
0195	Christchurch Town Council Neighbourhood Plan Working Group	Para 4.33	Unclear how neighbourhood plans could add to or alter the local opportunity areas. They should be non-strategic given definition and their size.	Support with changes		No action	The LOA are considered as part of strategic ward policies setting out where development within the ward will be appropriate. Neighbourhood Plan groups will be able to suggest further LOAs.	NA
0292	WH White	Para 4.33-4.34	Advise caution against over reliance on LOA as source of windfall supply. Current plans and permitted development rights are permissive of such changes. Delivery constrained by viability and lease issues. Presents windfall in a formalised manner. Avoid double counting. Some areas subject to heritage constraints. Question if this is a change in approach and if additional tools are required to accelerate delivery.	Objection	Yes	No action	The LOAs do not have a housing requirement or housing figure associated with them, these are areas where windfall would be suitable and is encouraged.	NA
0195	Christchurch Town Council Neighbourhood Plan Working Group	Para 4.34	Text as written suggests neighbourhood plans could refine local opportunity areas.	Support with changes		No action	Support noted, neighbourhood plans could set out additional LOAs	NA
0225	Dorset Council	Para 4.34	There is no detailed capacity analysis of the urban area that consider the constraints and so there is a lack of certainty that the housing estimates can be achieved. The proposed stepped housing target gives time for the policies to be implemented and enable a higher rate of delivery housing thereafter.	Support		No action	Support noted. The HELAA provides a street by street analysis of urban capacity in accordance with government guidance. Over 1,800 sites were considered and whilst there are considerably more opportunities for intensification, the local plan capacity assumptions are restricted by the requirement for land to be available (deliverable). HOM3e lists 258 sites and broad locations that could provide a significant amount of windfall (see figure 7 of HOM3a), but there is no indication that the sites are available so they are not allocated. There is an expectation to downplay windfall in the local plan despite it providing over 85% of past completions. New allocations, local opportunity areas and local opportunity streets provide positive policy to increase housing supply. Once the Local Plan is adapted we can commence work on Town Centre plans and design codes which are expected to help identify new opportunities.	NA
0280	Dorset CPRE	S2	1600 homes well short of need suggested by Standard Method, but choosing a lower housing target is sensible. Household growth in BCP is not constrained by supply. The Local Plan points to 9110 plots having permission but not built out which equates to approximately 9 years worth of average completions – indicates new homes not being constrained by permissions. People and household rates are the constraints, not supply of homes. Household growth not significantly constrained by suppression. Analysis suggests BCP not particularly constrained by supply of homes or affordability. Household growth is constrained by slow population growth. Large disparity between 2014 based population projection and ONS actual population estimates. If gap continues to widen, BCP will be planning more houses than market can find and house prices will not fall enough to increase household formation to compensate. A cautious approach subject to review is justified. Assuming average of 2 occupants per home, 1,200 houses would require annual growth of 2500 people. An annual supply of 2,806 homes (as per Standard Method) would require growth of around 5,900 new occupants, a growth so far above historical levels as to appear ridiculous. S2s cautious target is justified (graphs submitted with rep to support argument). S2.6. Is not sound - allocation of Talbot Village and Wessex fields is not appropriate. Retention of these sites as valuable green space would better serve the community. Numbering of sections of policy not contiguous	Objection	Yes	Modification	The BCP area has significant constraints which mean the level of growth set out in the standard methodology cannot be achieved. Modify policy numbering. Talbot Village and Wessex Fields are required to meet employment needs. Potential impacts can be mitigated.	Amend numbering in Policy S2

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0235	Wyatt Homes	S2	Level of new homes insufficient to meet needs/local housing need, and not based on any exceptional circumstances or robust/up-to-date evidence that additional sites not available or constraints insurmountable. HELAA and Green Belt Study demonstrate many available sites with limited constraints and contribution to green belt of moderate or lower - HELAA indicates allocation of these could meet standard method figure. Assumption area cannot absorb housing delivery over 1,600 dpa due to market constraints not based on evidence (no robust housing market delivery evidence and not addressed in Housing Delivery Report). Figure 4.3 does not take account of functional and proximity linkages between BCP area and services, facilities and employment within settlements just beyond BCP area's boundaries, accessible by foot, cycle and public transport. Policy therefore based on political expediency and not on any sound, reasonable or evidence-based strategy. Very few of the sites identified will provide any much needed family homes needed. Only a lower portion of 3+ bed homes likely to be achieved on three urban extensions due to 40% affordable housing requirements. Wyatt Homes' assumptions indicate only 5% of dwellings delivered will be family homes, and is likely to be worse as a result of longer lead in times. New site allocations unlikely to deliver until 2029/30 at earliest and strategic extensions likely to take longer. Will exacerbate shortage and unaffordability of family homes. Have not plan for meeting needs of different groups.	Objection	Yes	No action	The BCP area has significant constraints which mean the level of growth set out in the standard methodology cannot be achieved. Housing mix policy seeks to provide a range of different dwelling sizes.	NA
0020	RSPB	S2	Policy S2 welcomed. Inclusion of 1a and protection of 'habitat sites' supported but should also refer to SSSI network and SNCIs as part of hierarchy of nature conservation sites as expressed more fully in NE2.	Support with changes		Modification	Amend to reference a wider range of nature conservation sites	Add national and local wildlife sites to Policy S2 1(a).
0040	Natural England	S2	No objection but term 'Habitats sites' has a specific meaning under the NPPF for SAC and SPA sites and should be reworded.	Support with changes		Modification	Amend to reference a wider range of nature conservation sites	Add national and local wildlife sites to Policy S2 1(a).
0082	Christchurch Harbour Ornithological Group	S2	SSSIs need to be referenced in part 1a. Support constraints based approach but concerned that 1,600 homes will still put pressure on wildlife sites and biodiversity, mitigation will be required, levels of growth will have implications on habitats outside of BCP area.	Support with changes		Modification	Amend to reference a wider range of nature conservation sites	Add national and local wildlife sites to Policy S2 1(a).
0036	Southwood Partners	S2	Housing target is flawed, predicated on Housing Need Sensitivity Report, which is flawed in its consideration of migration trends. Target should be 2,800 pa as per the standard method to satisfy housing needs.	Objection	Yes	No action	The BCP area has significant constraints which mean the level of growth set out in the standard methodology cannot be achieved. The plan does not rely on the housing sensitivity report to set a housing requirement, it takes a constraints based approach. The housing sensitivity report is included for information as it highlights that there could be some potential issues with the level of housing need calculated through the standard methodology.	NA
0046	John Lambon	S2	Housing must support genuine needs, population is declining, green areas have depleted to provide homes, valuable green land should not be lost to provide homes. Support is needed for facilities/services (health, police, welfare etc), unclear if CIL can be used for essential services, new homes result in more council tax, how will council tax be spent, how is social housing provided, is there vacant properties/second homes that can be used.	Objection		No action	CIL will help support new infrastructure. The Council has its own housing provision and acquisition strategy to help provide affordable homes.	NA
0064	Rose Young	S2	Level of growth too low, Green Belt release needed to meet housing targets. Developing low quality areas of Green Belt needed. Housing target phasing is too low in first five years.	Objection		No action	The BCP area has significant constraints which mean the level of growth set out in the standard methodology cannot be achieved. In accordance with the NPPF the Plan does not propose to release Green Belt to meet housing needs.	NA
0128	Woodside Farms	S2	Housing requirement should be minimum of 41,505. Local Housing Need figure stated in the plan is out of date. Not clear how unmet needs are being accommodated, should be identified in policy. Recognise total housing requirement and set a framework for meeting them. Well located sites in Dorset can help address unmet needs.	Objection	yes	Modification	Consider modification to set out how unmet need will be addressed. The BCP area has significant constraints which mean the level of growth set out in the standard methodology cannot be achieved.	Amend para 4.12 to reference unmet need
0071	Goadsby on behalf of various clients	S2	Housing target is flawed, predicated on Housing Need Sensitivity Report, which is flawed in its consideration of migration trends. Target should be 2,800 pa as per the standard method to satisfy housing needs.	Objection	Yes	No action	The BCP area has significant constraints which mean the level of growth set out in the standard methodology cannot be achieved. The plan does not rely on the housing sensitivity report to set a housing requirement, it takes a constraints based approach.	NA
0078	Hum Parish Council	S2	Support part 1 of Policy S2	Support		No action	Support noted	NA

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0079	The Society for Poole	S2	Policy S2 could be made sound. Reference to Talbot Village and Wessex Fields is unsound due to need to secure biodiversity net gain and work in public interest. Soundness also undermined by lack of clarity on effects of the almost 10,000 dwellings that have been approved but have not yet been built. Under vision and objectives it is suggested that: -conservation and enhancement of natural environment should include areas that could be considered less than outstanding. -Provision of affordable homes to meet needs should be prioritised over more expensive homes, holiday lets and similar.	Support with changes		No action	Talbot Village and Wessex Fields are required to meet employment needs and can secure biodiversity net gain. The bullets under the conserve and enhance the natural environment bullet consider the actions in relation to the natural environment in general. The Council cannot insist that all applications are for affordable homes, affordable home requirements need to be viable for private developers.	NA
0096	Go South Coast	S2	Securing a wide range of dwelling tenures and typologies through urban intensification will be difficult. Delivery highlight questionable. Development is not steered toward the most sustainable locations along prime transport corridors. Plan should be related to transport considerations, it does not link development patterns to maximise the use of sustainable modes and is unsound. Strategy is to avoid planning for new housing as far as possible. Green Belt not comparable to other constraining designations as can be changed at Council's discretion to release lowest performing elements to meet needs - very special circumstances to justify this exist. Historic failure by legacy authorities to meet housing needs, particularly affordable housing. Only strategic extensions providing range of housing (including affordable and family homes). Planned provision significantly lower than standard method figure. Inconsistent for council to suggest exceptional circumstances exist to diverge from standard method, while suggesting very special circumstances exist to justify green belt review on unconstrained land on periphery of urban area. Inability for neighbouring authorities to help meet needs further reason to meet needs near where they arise with less extensive movement patterns. Among most unaffordable locations in UK - nearly impossible for average earner (including under 45s and service workers (including transport)) to get on housing ladder in area without financial support. Rental market lacks affordable/suitable and available accommodation. Smaller proportion of affordable rental properties than average in area. Worsened by retired in-migration to area. Morebus one of the largest private employers in area and provides almost all internal public transport, so important to economy and society dependent on. Significant issues recruiting, training and retaining staff due to housing costs and no suitable accommodation, younger candidates having no driving license due to costs acquiring, and competition from other service work providers. Issues will worsen and limited ability for increased wages to address and would adversely affect other sectors. Poor housing supply credible causative factor in slow growth in Dorset LEP. Highlight impact of flood risk in Poole and Christchurch town centres on design, economics and time for development to come forward due to need for agreement with EA. Increased flood risk in future. BCP Council have not approached adjoining authorities to attempt to meet housing need. High level of past under delivery of	Objection	No	No action	The plan supports development within sustainable neighbourhoods. Housing mix policy seeks to provide a range of dwelling types. NPPF sets out that Green Belt boundaries do not need to be amended to meet housing needs. On going duty to cooperate discussions that will continue as neighbouring authorities prepare their own local plans. The HELAA demonstrates a supply of windfall sites that can support urban intensification, along with the allocations. The area has a strong and consistent record of windfall delivery over 15 years and there is not evidence to suggest this would not continue. Transport approach supports alternatives to the private and the location of development within the urban area provides options for journeys to be made by sustainable transport. Densities are indicative and the intensification appropriate will depend on the site.	NA
0103	Ken Parke on behalf of various clients 2	S2	Policy fails to provide housing requirements and other needs for BCP area. Existing allocations have failed to be delivered. Plan restricts where development can take place. Development focused in urban area which has previously failed to meet development needs. Policies too restrictive. Housing delivery failing. Plan continues a failed strategy. Green Belt release needed. Housing figure below actual requirement	Objection		No action	The BCP area has significant constraints which mean the level of growth set out in the standard methodology cannot be achieved. In accordance with the NPPF the Plan does not propose to release Green Belt to meet housing needs. The policies in the plan aim to achieve a balance between different planning considerations.	NA
0106	Hazel Balkaya Shore	S2	Housing policies need to be braver and more instructive and should require all housing to be built for inclusive function to stop need for retrofitting and include built in environmental housing features Flood mapping for Poole and Christchurch needs to be done Need to identify schools and social/health services needed for 26000 + homes. All development should contribute to this, not just those above 100; 8000 homes in other areas need to be identified or target will be missed Surface water drainage at source will only work if harvesting tanks are set at each property which allow for grey water use and reduce bills and flood risk	Objection		No action	The requirements of new development in relation to climate change are set out in chapter 5. Flood mapping is included in the SFRA. Infrastructure delivery plan sets out infrastructure requirements. A proportion of development will be achieved through windfall development, as historically. It is not possible to identify specific sites as their availability is not known but a range of potential sites are set out in the HELAA.	NA
0133	Brentland	S2	Housing requirement of 24,000 homes is an unsound deviation from the standard method. Will result in fewer family and affordable homes. Exceptional circumstances to justify an alternative approach to housing need not demonstrated. Mix of regeneration and greenfield sites needed. Reliance on urban regeneration with high build costs.	Objection	No	No action	The BCP area has significant constraints which mean the level of growth set out in the standard methodology cannot be achieved. In accordance with the NPPF the Plan does not propose to release Green Belt to meet housing needs.	NA

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0162	Bournemouth Airport	S2	Considers wording in relation to flooding is inconsistent with the NPPF. Considers that the business parks at Bournemouth Airport should be specifically referenced in this strategy policy as they are fundamental to the strategy for employment.	Objection	Yes	Modification	Role of airport can be referenced in policy. The sequential test for the airport has been passed on the basis that a sequential approach can be taken within the site, and that it is possible for development (including access/egress) to be located outside areas within the Medium, High and Very High flood risk areas. The site has been remodelled, and alternative modelling submitted by an applicant and agreed by the Environment Agency has shown that flood risk on site is less prevalent than shown in the current SFRA Level 1 data. The submitted modelling will therefore be used to update the SFRA Level 1 data. There should therefore be no issues avoiding the flood risk present within the site. In light of this, the policy text ensures development is steered to the areas at lowest risk as far as possible on site, and is therefore consistent with national policy. It would therefore be inappropriate to revise the policy wording as recommended by the respondent, although the wording should be revised to reflect that development (including access/egress) needs to be sequentially located outside of areas at flood risk, or Medium, High and Very High flood risk areas (as opposed to "Flood Risk Areas", which include the Low and Low-Medium flood risk areas).	Highlight Bournemouth Airport in Policy S2 6 and clarify that development should avoid Medium, High and Very High areas of flood risk in Policy E4 and Para 9.18.
0137	Primetower Properties	S2	Housing requirement of 24,000 homes is an unsound deviation from the standard method. Will result in fewer family and affordable homes. Exceptional circumstances to justify an alternative approach to housing need not demonstrated. Mix of regeneration and greenfield sites needed. Reliance on urban regeneration with high build costs. Target has an adverse impact on housing land supply.	Objection	No	No action	The BCP area has significant constraints which mean the level of growth set out in the standard methodology cannot be achieved. In accordance with the NPPF the Plan does not propose to release Green Belt to meet housing needs.	NA
0141	Amirez Ltd	S2	That land adjacent to 7-9 Purewell, Christchurch should be allocated for new homes. Housing requirement of 24,000 homes is an unsound deviation from the standard method. Will result in fewer family and affordable homes. Exceptional circumstances to justify an alternative approach to housing need not demonstrated. Mix of regeneration and greenfield sites needed. Reliance on urban regeneration with high build costs.	Objection	No	No action	The BCP area has significant constraints which mean the level of growth set out in the standard methodology cannot be achieved. In accordance with the NPPF the Plan does not propose to release Green Belt to meet housing needs.	NA
0150	Ken Parke on behalf of various clients 3	S2	BCP Local Plan has not been positively prepared as required by national policy. Does not guarantee/properly plan for level of development required will meet objectively assessed needs by bringing forward land at a sufficient rate, priorities for development within the area, or for meaningful growth over plan period in a co-ordinated manner. Spatial strategy for meeting housing needs not aspirational or cohesive. Suppressed level of growth planned for also not deliverable or properly planned for. Overall approach is unsound and conflicts with the vision and objectives and presumption in favour for sustainable development. Allocations are largely within urban area, may or may not come forward for development, and are generally existing allocations that have not come forward. Heavy reliance on windfall development - 8,390 homes allowed for (around a third of the development required) - no evidence or guarantee that this will be deliverable 'Plan is not legally compliant. Sites within and on the green belt periphery are reasonably available and deliverable. Green belt sites need to be released to provide family homes with adequate amenity space and meet objectively assessed needs. Brownfield first approach required but should not be end of assessment. Only 7,820 homes allocated within urban area despite council identifying sites for 34,000 homes within the urban area. 'Gentle increases in densities' does not make efficient use of land in urban area to meet needs. Proposed policies will preclude appropriate innovation in terms of density and arrangement of sites needed to increase housing completions. Need for affordable homes outstrips standard method need figure. No attempt has been made to address this issue, rather town centre sites (which will deliver the most housing) are not required to provide any affordable housing (rather than setting an aspirational percentage that will be subject to viability considerations), contrary to the plan's objectives and other statements in the plan. Green belt sites that would result in very low/low harm if released need to be released to provide affordable housing. Have not properly assessed all opportunities in green belt and urban area to meet the standard method need figure. Plan will not meet strategic priorities, objectives, objectively assessed needs or wishes of respondents to the Issues and Options consultation and is not founded in reality. Responses to Issues and Options consultation have not reasonably or rationally been taken into account in	Objection	Yes	No action	The BCP area has significant constraints which mean the level of growth set out in the standard methodology cannot be achieved. There area has a strong and consistent level of windfall but site availability not currently known, the HELAA identifies potential locations that illustrates a large number of windfall sites remain.	NA



ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0151	Landowner and Bracken Developments	S2	Strategy fails to provide for the development needs of the town and release additional land for development. Policies for a continuation of a failed approach. Policies restrict development in the urban area. Green Belt Land needs to be released. The site adjacent to Throop Cemetery can provide additional housing that would not have an adverse impact on the Green Belt. Could accommodate 40 homes, including affordable housing. Site ideal for allocation.	Objection		No action	The BCP area has significant constraints which mean the level of growth set out in the standard methodology cannot be achieved. In accordance with the NPPF the Plan does not propose to release Green Belt to meet housing needs.	NA
0158	New Forest National Park Authority	S2	Rational for approach will be assessed in examination, recognise designated habitats constrain the area	Comment		No action	Comment noted	NA
0195	Christchurch Town Council Neighbourhood Plan Working Group	S2	Part 3b Concerned density lower limit in Christchurch Town Centre is particularly high for extensive area covered. Lack of justification for indicative densities in this area (particularly minimum). Strategic opportunity area not on policies map. Query why minimum density in strategic urban extensions is lower than for other locations 'elsewhere'. Density for locations 'elsewhere' should be lower for Christchurch due to infill sites. Query whether sustainable neighbourhoods should be on the policies map. Part 5g Query if removal of forecourt parking is meant to be a requirement, and whether some parking should be retained, particularly for disabled access. Car parking removal could be detrimental to service viability. Part 6 Query whether prevention of small scale office and other employment uses outside centres is intended, and whether should be revised to apply to major/large scale proposals only. Part 3aii Should be clear that strategic urban extensions will not only include family houses. Part 3a Clarify indicative densities do not apply to whole wards.	objection		Modification	Part 3b The densities reflect development that has come forward with the area. Lower densities are proposed on the urban extensions due to large number of family homes. Part 5g The policy is intended to support the removal of forecourt parking in these areas. Part 6 The policy is intended to direct office and employment into existing centres.	Add 'primarily' to Policy S2 3aii. Amend table in Policy S2 3.b to clarify where the reference is to a ward or a site.
0159	Morrish Homes	S2	Having explored other reasonable options the release of green belt to meet housing needs does represent exceptional circumstance. Green Belt release needed on sites with a lesser role in meeting Green Belt purposes. Deviating from standard method only appropriate in exceptional circumstances, rational put forward in Icenl 'Review of Housing need' not supported, justification is not exceptional, approach is flawed. Significant shortfall in housing needs. Over reliance on windfall sites, garden sites may not be suitable in the context of the NPPF, finite reassure, heritage constraints. Nature of windfall and regeneration sites will result in 1/2 bed flats. Strategy does not allow for family housing.	Objection		No action	In accordance with the NPPF the Plan does not propose to release Green Belt to meet housing needs. The Council is not arguing exceptional circumstances for a lower housing figure, it is taking a constraints based approach. There area has a strong and consistent level of windfall but site availability not currently known, the HELAA identifies potential locations that illustrates a large number of windfall sites remain.	NA
0167	Care South	S2	Objects to Policy S2 as fails to meet level of housing need identified in the standard method. Fails to meet needs for affordable housing, family housing and specialised older persons housing. Exceptional circumstance exist to release Green Belt. Number of sites perform weakly when assessed against green belt purposes.	Objection	Yes	No action	The BCP area has significant constraints which mean the level of growth set out in the standard methodology cannot be achieved. In accordance with the NPPF the Plan does not propose to release Green Belt to meet housing needs.	NA
0223	Fortitudo Ltd	S2	S2 1. - not consistent with national policy. Should be worded as 'inappropriate development' rather than 'protected' from any form of development. Directing development away from flooding, but many sites in town centres at risk of flooding have been allocated, so its confusing and inconsistent with national policy and other polices in the plan. Weight of harm to heritage assets assessed in para 208 of NPPF is not included within policy. Test of Very Special Circumstances in NPPF ignored in policy text. Part 1 of S2 should be deleted. Part 2 - Plan sets out housing requirement from 2024 to 2039, but this should run until 2041 to be consistent with national policy of 15 years from adoption. Green Belt sites should be released. Part 3 - Strategy has failed to acknowledge the large proportion of development on windfall sites and not on allocated sites. Changes in character will be unavoidable to deliver housing desperately needed. Densification across all areas of conurbation. Policy requirements prevent focus of densification in LOAs and LOSSs. Policy is inflexible. Land assembly is not necessary in point f. Policy prevents sufficient windfall which is essential to contributing to housing delivery.	Objection		Modification	Modification required to address plan period and improve clarity of the policy. The BCP area has significant constraints which mean the level of growth set out in the standard methodology cannot be achieved. In accordance with the NPPF the Plan does not propose to release Green Belt to meet housing needs. There area has a strong and consistent level of windfall but site availability not currently known, the HELAA identifies potential locations that illustrates a large number of windfall sites remain.	Amend plan period. Clarify established Green Belt boundaries will be retained in Policy S2 1(d)
0169	Malmesbury Estate	S2	Object to policy S2 as fails to meet housing need identified through standard method and underplays and fails to recognise the role of rural area in meeting development needs. No reference to employment or leisure uses outside urban area.	Objection	Yes	No action	The BCP area has significant constraints which mean the level of growth set out in the standard methodology cannot be achieved.	NA
0171	Mrs P Bower and Mr R Blunden	S2	Housing requirement of 24,000 homes is an unsound deviation from the standard method. Will result in fewer family and affordable homes. Exceptional circumstances to justify an alternative approach to housing need not demonstrated. Mix of regeneration and greenfield sites needed. Reliance on urban regeneration with high build costs.	Objection	No	No action	The BCP area has significant constraints which mean the level of growth set out in the standard methodology cannot be achieved. In accordance with the NPPF the Plan does not propose to release Green Belt to meet housing needs.	NA

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0183	Evans and Traves	S2	S2.3. Whole conurbation is well served and connected. Few areas not easily accessible. Higher density (exceeding 45-150dph) could be accommodated across BCP in line with NPPF. Failure to accept increase in density across the conurbation will result in need to release green belt land to fulfil OAN.	Objection	Yes	No action	The densities reflect other planning considerations along side the need for new homes such as heritage, design and character considerations.	NA
0189	Sandbanks Community Group	S2	Agree with sentiments about S2b which is aligned with Sandbanks Sustainable Neighbourhood.	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0200	Meyrick Estate	S2	Plan policies are competent, but lack vision/opportunity. Limited confidence in delivery. Question whether Plan is justified, positively prepared, effective and consistent with National Policy. Plan is not fully sound. Strategy for the Green Belt represents a unnecessary limitation that is inconsistent with the presumption in favour of sustainable development. Need to re-examine inclusion of all Green Belt in the BCP area against the five purposes (including its boundaries; 2020 Green Belt review failed to do this).	Objection	Yes	No action	In accordance with the NPPF the Plan does not propose to release Green Belt to meet housing needs.	NA
0220	LGIM Real Assets	S2	Supports direction of growth to town centre locations for residential, office and employment but objects to low housing target of 24,000 over the Plan period (against standard methodology figure of 40,000) as consider this is not justified or positively prepared or accord with Para 16(b) of the NPPF.	Objection	No	No action	The BCP area has significant constraints which mean the level of growth set out in the standard methodology cannot be achieved.	NA
0225	Dorset Council	S2	Supports intensification of urban area, but will this meet needs. Agree the standard method approach to calculating local housing is not realistic in BCP area and joint evidence demonstrates the projected levels of in-migration into the BCP area in the 2014 demographic baseline overestimate the need for new housing. Alternatively, locally derived housing need is more achievable and aligned to past housing delivery. Any Green Belt release should consider opportunities adjacent to the urban area first as there is sustainable access to facilities.	Support	Yes	No action	Support noted. Agree that the standard method approach significantly overestimates local housing need. Agree the alternative locally derived housing need is more realistic, aligns with past levels of delivery and provides a similar housing target to the constraint based approach BCP Council have used. No change required	NA
0232	Brookfield Gospel Hall Trust	S2	More strategic urban extensions needed, Brownfield sites have constraints, Green Belt review has not been undertaken effectively. Land north of Muscliff presents an opportunity.	Objection	Yes	No Action	In accordance with the NPPF the Plan does not propose to release Green Belt to meet housing needs.	NA
0233	University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust	S2	Support levels of growth and strategy, agree offices should be focused in sustainable locations of town and district centres. More flexible approach needed in respect of employment generating uses at Wessex Fields and align with hospital aspirations.	Objection	yes	No Action	Support noted. Consideration of Wessex Fields issues set out below.	NA
0237	Toklon Ltd	S2	Amount of new homes does not meet the standard method. Indicative densities for Poole town centre is too low.	Objection	No	No action	The BCP area has significant constraints which mean the level of growth set out in the standard methodology cannot be achieved. Poole town centre has character and heritage constraints which impact on indicative densities.	NA
0245	Miller Homes and Bellway Homes (Wessex)	S2	Plan fails to meet soundness tests as does not meet objectively assessed needs	Objection	Yes	No action	The BCP area has significant constraints which mean the level of growth set out in the standard methodology cannot be achieved.	NA
0247	Hallam Land Management Ltd	S2	No exceptional circumstances to justify an alternative method of calculating housing need. Housing supply meets just 58% of standard method figure. Opportunities to accommodate unmet need in Dorset missed. Reliance on increased densities neglects huge need for family homes. Plan does not accord with NPPF and is not positively prepared - fails test of soundness. This policy is not considered sound. Causes plan as a whole to be unsound. BCP should properly assess its housing need in accordance with NPPF and engage with Dorset Council to accommodate any unmet needs sustainably.	Objection	Yes	No action	The BCP area has significant constraints which mean the level of growth set out in the standard methodology cannot be achieved. duty to cooperate arrangements set out in duty to cooperate compliance statement.	NA

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0248	Hathor Property	S2	Plan does not deliver sufficient homes to meet the area's objectively assessed needs, and therefore plan is flawed and unsound. There will be a shortfall in houses by the end of the plan period. Of the 24,000 homes within the plan, a large proportion have been allocated in earlier plans, some dating back 20 years, and yet to be delivered. Plan is neither aspiration or deliverable. The constraints to development outlined at para 4.10 are not exceptional, unique or insurmountable. ICENI report justifies deviation from Standard method on the basis that in-migration has reduced, however the report is dated and does not take in to account the impact of Covid-19 on demographic trends. It does not count as evidence that the conurbation is unique. Starting point for Standard Method should be ONS data from 2014 Household Projections and not trends in data seen in later projections, to be consistent with PPG. Whilst there may have been a reduction in in-migration pre-2018, it does not reflect more recent trends, including shift towards home-working and increase in people moving away from the capital and towards coastal areas such as BCP. Plan should be seeking to provide as many of the 42,000 homes from Standard Method as physically possible. It is not clear how overcoming a long history of lack of progress of previously allocated sites will be achieved, and is highly unlikely that these sites will come forward to deliver new homes to assist in meeting the low target of 24,000 homes. Cannot rely on investment to enable delivery of these historic sites. BCP has a duty to review its own Green Belt to ensure development is delivered in the most sustainable location to meet its own housing requirement. Housing need will either not be met, or met in an unsustainable and inappropriate manner, if required to be met by Dorset, and neither approach is acceptable or sound. Supporting text states that LHNA suggests a need of 1653 affordable homes per annum, but this is higher than the number of homes the draft plan will deliver per annum (1600). Current restrictive supply is impacting affordability. Sufficient urban extensions need to be allocated in the plan to meet the needs for family housing and to take pressure off the existing housing stock. There are suitable and sustainable Green Belt sites that would not impact the integrity of the Green Belt, and the level of unmet need and the alternative options to meet that need provide exceptional circumstances that enable the review of the Green Belt boundaries. It is not reasonable to conclude	Objection	Yes	No action	The BCP area has significant constraints which mean the level of growth set out in the standard methodology cannot be achieved. The plan takes a constraints based approach and is not seeking to demonstrate exceptional circumstances through the housing sensitivity report. In accordance with the NPPF the Plan does not propose to release Green Belt to meet housing needs.	NA
0250	East Dorset Friends of the Earth	S2	No development should be permitted in the Green Belt. Additional housing only required for in-migrants, and additional employment land encourages in-migrants - resulting in negative climate and environmental impacts. Should be for developers to justify new housing/employment, and demonstrate will result in net reductions in carbon emissions, net positive gains in biodiversity, and health/well-being of existing residents. Broadly support Strategic Opportunity Areas, Sustainable Neighbourhoods and Local Opportunity Areas concepts. Object to expansion of Talbot Village and Wessex Field due to biodiversity, traffic congestion and pollution, and flood risk concerns. Should be for developers to choose locations which do not require new infrastructure, or pay costs of providing/upgrading it. All new development required to suit the needs of in-migrants - should not come at a cost to existing residents.	Objection		No action	Talbot Village and Wessex Fields are required to meet employment needs. Potential impacts can be mitigated.	NA
0251	Bloor Homes Southern	S2	Housing needed for social and economic benefits. Housing requirement below the standard method disappointing and missed opportunity. Exceptional circumstances exist to release Green Belt. BCP need to work with Dorset to plan for housing need.	Objection	yes	No action	The BCP area has significant constraints which mean the level of growth set out in the standard methodology cannot be achieved. In accordance with the NPPF the Plan does not propose to release Green Belt to meet housing needs.	NA
0258	Royal London Mutual Insurance Society Ltd	S2	Support planning for housing growth, object to not using the standard method to set amount of development	Objection	No	No action	The BCP area has significant constraints which mean the level of growth set out in the standard methodology cannot be achieved.	NA

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0263	Bellway Strategic Land, Miller Homes, AJC Group, Wyatt Homes, Fortitudo and WH White	S2	Representation by consortium of national and regional promoters and developers with shared concern regarding objectively assessed housing need figure is only 58% of standard method. Justification for very significant departure (constraints led approach and purported demographic anomalies) is unfounded and without precedent and considers plan to be not legally compliant or sound. Constraints based approach not advocated in NPPF and BCP constraints not exceptional. Not evidenced based but policy based evidence which fails to address development needs. Turley Economics conclude that Council's position is not justified or sound due to new data demonstrating projections to be higher than 2014 projections. Slower population growth not unique to BCP and not influenced by housing delivery. 26% few homes delivered since 2014. Appropriate to retain 2014 based projections. S2 not positively prepared as fails to present strategy as per area's objectively assessed needs resulting in consequence of frustrating access to appropriate housing, reducing choice and range and ability to 'right size'; reduced affordability and social mobility; suppressed household formation and aging population; housing inequality; lack of financial security and stability; poor impacts on physical and mental health; decreased social mobility; negative impact on children's education and development; reduced safety within households; risk of housing outside social support network; prioritisation of paying unaffordable rent or mortgage over basic human needs; increased national housing benefit bill; suppressing growth of working population and job creation; exacerbate recruitment and retention; reducing funding for infrastructure; reducing employment growth; increased in-commuting; and reducing funding for green infrastructure. Evidence not up to date. Plan inconsistent with national policy as won't enable sustainable development	Objection	Yes	No action	The BCP area has significant constraints which mean the level of growth set out in the standard methodology cannot be achieved.	NA
0267	Richborough Estates	S2	Plan period too short and extending it would add additional 3,200 homes to target. Falls short of standard method figure. Not releasing green belt to meet housing needs (Land north of Townsend could deliver significant family/affordable housing and area making moderate/low contribution).	Objection	Yes	No action	The BCP area has significant constraints which mean the level of growth set out in the standard methodology cannot be achieved. In accordance with the NPPF the Plan does not propose to release Green Belt to meet housing needs.	NA
0282	Historic England	S2	Policy does not reflect the distinctive character of the key settlements.	Objection		Modification	Agree.	Highlight local distinctiveness, and responding to the local context and heritage in Policy S2 4c
0268	Talbot Village Trust	S2	Object to scale of proposed employment provision - target should be higher to increase employment growth opportunity. Clear risks to adopted approach in terms of misalignment of assumptions across HELAA, Employment Land Study and draft plan [see Appendix 1].	Objection	Yes	No action	Employment land allocate reflects the amount needed identified in the Employment Land Study.	NA

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0271	Highwood Group	S2	Object to overall level of identified need (locally derived figure), as fails to meet standard method need and to identify opportunities to more fully meet this (including significant family, affordable and older people's housing needs (including care needs)). Availability and affordability major issues reflected in LHNA (affordability worsening, inaccessibility of market purchases and rental, barrier to business growth, ageing population). Plan not aspirational or significantly boosting supply of homes. Net migration recently highest on record and BCP likely to attract many migrants. Standard method should be used, BCP case does not represent exceptional circumstances to justify alternative method. Council failed to act on Icení advice to take factors justifying higher figure into account. Claim no need for BCP Council to approach neighbouring councils to address need due to locally derived figure (SoCG, March 2024). No confirmation of any discussions, including regarding unmet need of neighbouring authorities despite difficulty meeting needs in those areas due to constraints. Not positively prepared, sound or sufficiently addressing duty to co-operate - cannot be delayed or left to review. BCP should consider how to address issues faced by neighbouring authorities in its plan area - greenfield sites in Green Belt, such as sites 21/01 and 21/04, required. Contention area so constrained a greater need cannot be met. Green Belt policy (not environmental) constraint and national guidance does not preclude green belt review. Review should take place if no intention to ask neighbouring authorities to meet need. Choice exists to release green belt in exceptional circumstances which exist in BCP. Green Belt release in sustainable locations to accommodate housing to support centres in terms of retail, employment and leisure required - 21/01 and 21/04 could achieve this. BCP Council must work with Dorset Council to meet conurbation's needs in most sustainable manner, including regarding consequences of locating development beyond Green Belt in unsustainable locations. Plan period. Must cover 15 years from adoption - realistic plan period would cover to 2041 given issues - this should be reflected in employment/housing needs/allocations. - focus of growth within urban area without green belt release. Broad locations for development unclear (via text or policies maps). No evidence base to support/justify or set out strategy for broad locations. Family housing with gardens	Objection	Yes	No action	The BCP area has significant constraints which mean the level of growth set out in the standard methodology cannot be achieved. In accordance with the NPPF the Plan does not propose to release Green Belt to meet housing needs. Duty to cooperate arrangements are set out in the duty to cooperate compliance statement.	NA
0273	Churchill Retirement Living	S2	Support identification of Christchurch Strategic Opportunity Area to delivery new housing. Indicative densities supported. Optimisation of use of land to deliver more homes supported.	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0275	Gervis Properties Ltd / Hinton Admiral Estate	S2	Stark difference between housing requirement and the standard method. Insufficient justification for approach with high housing needs and housing affordability issues. Green Belt release needs to be considered. Constraints an excuse to reduce housing development. Poor track record of housing delivery, over reliance on brownfield sites. Planning allocations restrict potential of brownfield sites. Strategy is flawed.	Objection		No action	The BCP area has significant constraints which mean the level of growth set out in the standard methodology cannot be achieved. In accordance with the NPPF the Plan does not propose to release Green Belt to meet housing needs.	NA
0286	Bournemouth University	S2	Objects to spatial strategy as does not meet sports and education needs of area. Does not consider S1 meets NPPF test for soundness because not positively prepared, justified or effective.	Objection	Yes	No action	The policy sets out the council will work with service providers and agencies to ensure that new infrastructure and improvements to existing infrastructure will be delivered to support development. Details of this are set out in the supporting text and within the infrastructure delivery plan.	NA
0287	Network Rail	S2	Bournemouth and Poole are well served by the rail network. Additional train services are planned to accommodate the growth of BCP, improvements are needed to the platforms at Bournemouth rail station.	Support	Yes	No action	Support noted.	NA
0291	Yvonne McTeague	S2	Does not consider Local Plan to be positively prepared as housing target (24,000) does not meet the Standard Housing Method (42,000). Lower figure is attempt to replace out of date plans with minimal contention and hold up. Site at corner of Mill Road and Careys Road is available, suitable, achievable and viable for development and within Green Belt (parcel BO25) but assessed as only moderate harm if released. This site and other Green Belt sites should be examined in more detail otherwise plan not positively prepared. Reconsider designation of site as Green Belt to meet housing need.	Objection	Yes	No action	The BCP area has significant constraints which mean the level of growth set out in the standard methodology cannot be achieved. In accordance with the NPPF the Plan does not propose to release Green Belt to meet housing needs.	NA

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0292	WH White	S2	Object that Green Belt boundaries aren't changed, need changes to deliver against housing need. Lack of justification for low housing figure. Will result in worsening affordability issues, overcrowding, reduced labour mobility, staff retention issues and longer commuting patterns, frustration in accessing appropriate housing, suppressed household formation, housing inequality, a lack of financial security and stability, poor impacts on physical and mental health, negative impacts on children's education and development, reduced safety, being housed outside social support networks, an increasing national housing benefit bill, suppressed growth of working age population, recruitment and retention issues, reduced funding, reduced employment, increased commuting, reduced infrastructure funding. Strategic urban extensions already have planning permission and off set past under delivery. Strategic extensions take time to deliver next sites need to be considered now, not left to review. No consideration given to such sites or reserve sites. Triggers for very special circumstances could be used or early review mechanism. Caution against over reliance on town centre sites. Canford Garden Village would be a natural sustainable neighbourhood. Concern about reliance placed upon Talbot Village and Wessex Fields, additional disbursed employment allocations are needed.	Objection	Yes	No action	The BCP area has significant constraints which mean the level of growth set out in the standard methodology cannot be achieved. In accordance with the NPPF the Plan does not propose to release Green Belt to meet housing needs.	NA
0295	Local Enterprise Partnership LEP	S2	Affordability and availability of housing is key to our economy and communities. Decline in working age population. Working age people priced out of area. Method to assess housing numbers flawed. Plan will not deliver housing needed.	Objection		No action	The BCP area has significant constraints which mean the level of growth set out in the standard methodology cannot be achieved.	NA
0304	Sovereign Network Group SNG	S2	Considers that exceptional circumstances exist to justify Green Belt release. Support Green Belt release. Strategy falls well short of meeting housing need, no exceptional circumstances to depart from standard method. Updated 2024 standard method figure is 2,776 dpa. More housing is desperately required. Use standard method figure. Any unmet need should be declared, and neighbouring authorities approached to assist. Ward policies are overly prescriptive which add additional complexity.	Objection		No action	The BCP area has significant constraints which mean the level of growth set out in the standard methodology cannot be achieved. In accordance with the NPPF the Plan does not propose to release Green Belt to meet housing needs.	NA
0378	Daniel Poole	S2	Growth strategy needs to be revisited. Plan seeks absolute protection of green belt rather than a pragmatic and justified green belt release to meet housing need due to political reasons. No robust evidence to support requirement significantly lower than standard method. Lack vision for growth. Insufficient housing for residents impacting affordability. Suggestion green belt a constraint to growth inconsistent with national policy and unjustified. Sustainably located urban extension sites available to help meet market and affordable needs and provide social infrastructure and open space, as well as improving health, wellbeing and area vitality. Lack of dwelling types (particularly houses) available preventing ownership, moving to houses, and family households meeting needs. Stour Valley Country Park project includes sites that could contribute to delivery.	Objection	No	No action	The BCP area has significant constraints which mean the level of growth set out in the standard methodology cannot be achieved. In accordance with the NPPF the Plan does not propose to release Green Belt to meet housing needs.	NA
0415	Magwatch (local action group)	S2	The strategy should not include Green Belt land. Any development on Green Belt in Bearwood and Merley will be contravention of NPPF and render the plan unsound.	Support	Yes	No action	Support noted	NA
0436	Ian Blackhurst	S2	Strengthen and protect green space, Green Belt and heritage. Concerned Plan implies appropriate development is suitable in the Green Belt. There are sufficient brownfield sites.	Support with changes	No	No action	Protections for Green Belt, heritage and open space exist across the plan and are inline with national policy	NA
0473	Judy Windwood	S2	Supports policy as contributes to creation of sustainable neighbourhoods and invests in pedestrian, cycling and public transport infrastructure	Support		No action	Support noted	NA

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0545	Nick Guildford	S2	Lack of vision for growth to address previous failings of legacy Bournemouth Council to provide sufficient housing and right type of housing (family houses rather than flats primarily provided) for residents. Not positively prepared. Bournemouth Hospital, University, and Football Club have highlighted aspirations for growth to support economy and need for housing growth to address needs in full due to affordability issues. Plan plans for growth significantly lower than standard method figure. Suggestion green belt is a constraint for growth, and resultant strategy is inconsistent with national policy, unjustified, unsound planning, without intention to meet residents' needs, and politically motivated. Strategy has prevented residents from buying a home due to increased prices and rental levels. Right type of housing (family houses most needed) and sites required – greenfield and green belt sites can help provide. 91% of completions in 2017/18 were flats according to AMR – forces purchase/rent of flats rather than houses needed. Flatted development in urban area often undeliverable due to viability issues, and provide limited/no affordable housing – only 13% of completions affordable housing (10% with right to buy allowance). Bournemouth Core Strategy Inspector raised concerns about that plan's similar strategy and modified to require early reviews, including potential need for strategic green belt housing allocations, but reviews did not take place. Sustainably located urban extension sites are available that could contribute towards needs for market/affordable family housing alongside social infrastructure and significant public open space. Also could contribute to Stour Valley Park initiative. More positive strategy supporting new residential on available greenfield and green belt sites in addition to further growth in urban areas <del>required to be sound</del> .	Objection	No	No action	The BCP area has significant constraints which mean the level of growth set out in the standard methodology cannot be achieved. In accordance with the NPPF the Plan does not propose to release Green Belt to meet housing needs.	NA
0571	Home Builders Federation	S2	Plan fails to meet NPPF requirements as ignores growth needs, fails to positively plan for future of area and deliver housing numbers required, and fails to address challenges (associated with housing crisis) Constraints-based approach based on policy-based evidence-making to justify policy originally sought. Previous work on Dorset Local Plan (Reg 18) included over-provision/surplus of 8,804 homes and recognised role of wider Dorset area in helping meet BCP area's needs. Environmental factors do not justify artificial reduction of housing requirement to avoid conversations regarding meeting BCP's unmet need – not how duty to co-operate intended to work. BCP's need should be assessed using standard method, consideration given to if any factors need to be considered, and then housing requirement set – only then should constraints be considered (in location of development), and if need cannot be accommodated unmet need declared and neighbouring authorities approached to help. No exceptional circumstances shown to justify alternative approach given government housing delivery ambitions. Plan should acknowledge role and location within wider geography and housing market area and support growth and development in region, requiring plan for higher number of homes. This includes range of housing types needed to attract younger working people to support economy as population ages. Exceptional circumstances exist for residential allocations in green belt to meet housing requirement. Comprehensive green belt review, and greenfield/green belt release within and beyond BCP area needed. Constraints-based approach to setting housing requirement not appropriate, justified, supported by evidence or consistent with national policy. Evidence indicates housing crisis, affordability, affordable housing need and ageing population worsening. Standard method should be starting point for considering housing requirement, with higher requirement figure in light of viability considerations and need to support economic growth, range/choice of sites, small/medium housebuilders, flexibility and provision of higher levels of market housing to support affordable housing delivery and economic growth. Fundamental review of strategy and consequential changes to policies required. Constraints provide justification for green belt review and seeking unmet need to be met in neighbouring authorities. Logical settlement hierarchy and allocation of wide range of deliverable and developable sites required across area to provide	Objection	Yes	No action	The BCP area has significant constraints which mean the level of growth set out in the standard methodology cannot be achieved. In accordance with the NPPF the Plan does not propose to release Green Belt to meet housing needs.	NA
0579	Richard Terry	S2	Figures calculated using selective and outdated migration figures/documents. Identification of housing supply inaccurate (such as in Poole Town and Hamworthy) due to environmental, technical and availability issues on sites (particularly H.1 which is part of existing ecological network (not shown on plan). Extremely unlikely to meet low requirement figure set. Significant amount of allocated homes unlikely to come forward. Should consider green belt north of town should be considered for housing after study.	Objection	No	No action	The BCP area has significant constraints which mean the level of growth set out in the standard methodology cannot be achieved. In accordance with the NPPF the Plan does not propose to release Green Belt to meet housing needs.	NA

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0195	Christchurch Town Council Neighbourhood Plan Working Group	S3	Dental surgeries and allotments should be referenced	Support with changes		Modification	Add reference to dentists. Local food growing already referenced.	Add reference to dentists in Para 4.39. Add new para about dentists services after Para 4.43.
0220	LGIM Real Assets	S3	Supports principle of supporting health and wellbeing and reducing inequalities but objects to policy as considers a definition for 'Unhealthy food options' is required to support (i)	Objection	No	Modification	Agree clarity is needed.	Add where relevant to intro of Policy S3 and alter reference to unhealthy foods in (i)
0223	Fortitudo Ltd	S3	Not possible for all development proposals to accord with S3 requirements through wording of 'must contribute'. Concerns of how factors would be assessed, and policy is unsound.	Objection		Modification	Agree clarity is needed.	Add where relevant to intro of Policy S3.
0040	Natural England	S3	Natural England support the objectives for sustainable transport and a modal shift towards less combustion based transport which will increase the quality of air by reducing pollutants harmful to both people and biodiversity.	Support		No action	Support noted.	NA
0245	Miller Homes and Bellway Homes (Wessex)	S3	Green Belt shown as unsustainable in sustainable neighbourhoods heatmap. Kinson Manor Farm offers opportunity to meet objectives of this policy given location next to Kinson District Centre and Pelhams Community and Leisure Centre. See comments on Transport Modelling Report - ideal location for development, and on LCWIP regarding opportunity for Kinson Manor Farm to support delivery of LCWIP proposals. Development could enable aspirations in Policies T1 and P17 rather than addressing traffic issues.	Objection	Yes	No action	In accordance with the NPPF the Plan does not propose to release Green Belt to meet housing needs.	NA
0351	Sport England	S3	Support policy but should adopt Sport England Active Design Guidance to create more active environments and support active travel. Guidance has been improved	Support with changes	No	No action	The principles of the Sport England Active Design Guidance are cross cutting across the Local Plan. We have referred to the National Design Guide which also embodies these principles.	NA
0250	East Dorset Friends of the Earth	S3	Support - should apply to all development	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0268	Talbot Village Trust	S3	Support. Proposals for Talbot Quarter and historic Talbot Village will positively contribute to policy objectives.	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0271	Highwood Group	S3	Should be revised to ensure effective and relevant	Objection	Yes	No action	Support noted	NA
0595	Public Health Dorset	S3	Support policy and framing of health and wellbeing as cross cutting theme. Must be reinforced by appropriate detail in subsequent policies. Clear standards for development must be retained to meet this policy's objectives. Reference to "people's lifestyle choices" on page 6 undermines preceding text for supported objective to "Improve health and wellbeing and reduce health inequalities" and should be revised. Objective to "Improve our town centres and build strong and inclusive communities" needs to be expanded to include meeting needs of older population in line with national policy. The Dorset Integrated Care Partnership (ICP) Strategy Working Better Together and NHS Dorset's Joint Forward Plan should be referenced in the evidence base supporting S3 and S4 (plan policies can support delivery of these).	Support with changes	No	Modification	Amend to provide clarity between supporting text and the policy	Remove reference to lifestyle choices and add reference to the needs of older people to para 3.6.
0614	National Trust	S3	Support. Need to set out partnerships in health and wellbeing arena and how BCP Council is pursuing new partnerships to provide health and green infrastructure. More work needed to build partnerships specifically for health and wellbeing of individuals and local communities. Policy and supporting text could highlight this.	Support with changes	No	Modification	Agree partnership working for health should be mentioned.	Add reference to partnership working provide new and improved health infrastructure and facilities.
0292	WH White	S3	Support policy, further guidance needed.	Support	Yes	No action	Support noted	NA
0424	NHS Property Services	S3	Supports the inclusion of policies that support healthy lifestyles. Policy should also include the requirement for proposals to consider local health outcomes, and include a Health Impact Assessment.	Support with changes		No action	The requirement for health impact assessments is set out in policy S4.	NA
0473	Judy Windwood	S3	Supports policy as important for healthy lives and being active and creation of welcoming spaces.	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0571	Home Builders Federation	S3	Plan should recognise role of good housing in providing positive health outcomes.	Objection	Yes	No action	The provision of new homes in contributing to healthy communities is recognised in policy S3.	NA
0595	Public Health Dorset	Para. 4.38	Support use of HIAs. Para. 4.38 link doesn't work. Need to clarify which document is referred to in policy. Support suicide risk assessments/prevention measures required. 'Preventing suicides in public places A practice resource' (Public Health England, 2015) provides evidence and examples of design measures that can prevent suicide - should be referenced. Also see City of London Corporation's Environment Department and Public Health Team Preventing suicides in high rise buildings and structures	Support with changes		Modification	Support for HIAs noted. Agree to provide clarity on document test.	Reference Public Health England document and replace broken link to HIAs in para 4.46. Clarify use of HUDU HIA model in Policy S4 1b and add requirement for applicants to mitigate any adverse impacts from HIA.



ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0195	Christchurch Town Council Neighbourhood Plan Working Group	Para 4.39	Should mention dental surgeries	Support with changes		Modification	Agree to reference dental surgeries	Add new para about dentists services after Para 4.43.
0211	Susan Suliman	Para 4.40	New housing is not necessarily for existing residents or children, but for new families moving in to the area. There is no evidence of new development providing funding for local surgeries, for example redevelopment of Christchurch Police Station.	Objection	No	No action	New development pays CIL which can be utilised to support the expansion of local surgeries	NA
0160	Sandstone Ltd	S4	Suicide prevention text repeats Building Regulations safety measure and is unnecessary. Submitting additional documents adds costs to development.	Objection		Modification	Suicide prevention measures go beyond just preventing falls from height. Expand supporting text to provide clarification.	Explain about holistic design approach to suicide prevention in Para 4.46 Add requirement in Policy S4 3 to identify the suicide prevention measures.
0223	Fortitudo Ltd	S4	Not reasonable to require developments of over 100 dwellings and 5ha to provide a Health Impact Assessment. Council has failed own health impact assessment by not meeting its housing need. Plan should have a health impact assessment. Not clear what is expected of a suicide prevention risk assessment. Not clear what mitigation measures should be. Building regulations deal with issues raised by tall buildings.	Objection		Modification	Local Plan is supported by a health impact assessment (see SD5 Sustainability Appraisal). HIA requirement is considered justified in the interests of good planning. Suicide prevention measures go beyond just preventing falls from height.	Explain about holistic design approach to suicide prevention in Para 4.46 Add requirement in Policy S4 3 to identify the suicide prevention measures.
0235	Wyatt Homes	S4	Unclear how development (beyond 'taller buildings' and waterside developments) should comply with policy. Should provide clearer advice on how to comply or focus only on greater risk development.	Objection	Yes	Modification	Suicide prevention measures go beyond just preventing falls from height. Expand supporting text to provide clarification.	Explain about holistic design approach to suicide prevention in Para 4.46 Add requirement in Policy S4 3 to identify the suicide prevention measures.
0270	McLaren Property	S4	Wording of policy unclear as to its application - conflicts between supporting text and policy text. Unclear as to whether other types of development such as PBSA or co-living would need to provide health impact assessment. Support S1 part 3, but it is unclear on what detail would be required in a suicide prevention risk assessment, and this should be included in policy. No information on level of detail required for application, and whether any details could follow as discharge of condition due to measures being considered more at post-planning stage of works.	Support with changes		Modification	Agree it is not clear which developments over 100 dwellings are included and can be improved.	Reference 100 or more bed spaces for purpose built student accommodation, specialist accommodation or build to rent in Para 4.38 and Policy S4.
0271	Highwood Group	S4	Unclear what suicide prevent measures are (not identified in Suicide Prevention Plan) and may make development unviable. Reference to specific types of measures that will be sought.	Objection	Yes	Modification	Agree the supporting text and Policy S4 (3) needs clarification.	Amend Policy S4 3 and para 4.46 to provide clarity on suicide prevention measures.
0571	Home Builders Federation	S4	Policy needs to allow for potential successor or update to NHS Rapid Health Impact Assessment to be used. Agree HIAs must be proportionate.	Objection	Yes	Modification	Amend to reference successor arrangements	Refer to any successor to HUDU HIA in para 4.38
0250	East Dorset Friends of the Earth	S4	Support	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0292	WH White	S4	New health infrastructure should be prioritised rather than privately run surgeries. Support policy S4, information should be proportionate, align threshold for additional info for validation.	Support	Yes	No action	Support noted. Surgeries are run by the NHS.	NA
0540	McCarthy Stone	S4	Housing for older people does not place additional burden on healthcare infrastructure, therefore policy should recognise wellbeing/quality of life benefits of older people's housing for individuals (due to increased independence, safety, and state of repair of accommodation vs older homes). Should also recognise reduced demands on social services and other care facilities (including more efficient/effective use of public resources). Should not require proposals to demonstrate they will not have a health impact through impact assessments.	Objection	No	No action	The provision of different types of new homes in contributing to healthy communities is recognised in policy S3. Health impact assessment would add to the consideration of the health impact at the application stage	NA
0020	RSPB	Para 5.1-5.11	Welcome intention to prepare a Climate Action Strategy. Need robust and transparent accounting system including whole-life cycle evaluation of development to ensure achieving net zero by 2050.	Support with changes		No action	Ensuring the BCP area is carbon neutral by 2050 will include many actions, the draft Plan seeks to ensure development contributes towards carbon reduction but some actions to address the climate emergency sit outside the scope of the Local Plan. The progress towards carbon neutrality will be assessed and monitored through other mechanisms in conjunction with the Council's Energy Plan.	NA
0020	RSPB	C1	Policy welcomed. Particularly part (c) which seeks to maximise carbon storage and sequestration in natural habitats.	Support		No Action	Support noted	NA
0040	Natural England	C1	Supports the policy, specifically sections a(i), b(11), (iv) and c(i) which seek to encourage modal transport shifts, sustainable drainage schemes, water efficiency and biodiversity conservation and enhancement.	Support		No Action	Support noted	NA
0079	The Society for Poole	C1	Policy C1 is sound and effective in serving the public interest. Under vision and objectives it is suggested that conservation and enhancement of natural environment should include areas that could be considered less than outstanding.	Support with changes		No Action	Support noted	NA

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0164	Environment Agency	C1	Policy should not reference managing flood risk, as areas at risk should be avoided and this indicates interventions in areas where they are not planned.	Support with changes		Modification	Agree.	Amend Policy C1 2a to direct developments into areas of lowest flood risk.
0096	Go South Coast	C1	There is no way for decision makers or developers to assess compliance with a.i, policy is ineffective and unsound	Objection	No	No action	Part 'a' aims to provide a strategic approach that is important to combating climate change with details set out across the other policies within the chapter.	NA
0112	Dorset Ramblers Countryside	C1	Welcome recognition of the role of walking and sustainable forms of transport in reducing carbon emissions.	Support		No Action	Support noted	NA
0148	FCERM	C1	Support policy text	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0158	New Forest National Park Authority	C1	Supports Strategic Policy C1 which identifies how proposed new development should address the climate emergency through various criteria including incorporating and improving sustainable travel.	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0169	Malmesbury Estate	C1	Supports policy	Support	No	No Action	Support noted	NA
0183	Evans and Traves	C1	C1 a.i. is unsound. Whole of BCP is a built up area that is sustainable and accessible and no areas are remote from services. Do not need to direct to specific areas. Restricting location of development will not deliver housing. C1 a.ii. requirement to prioritise re-use of structures is unnecessary and not justified. If viable, the market would do this. Remainder of para sufficient to ensure buildings reduce carbon emissions. C1.a.iii unnecessary as already requirement of Part L of Building Regs C1.a.vii unnecessary as already requirement of Part S of Building Regs C1.b.iv unnecessary as already requirement of Part G of Building Regs Requiring this information upfront as part of planning application is burdensome, not justified and contrary to para 16(f) of NPPF	Objection	Yes	No action	Directing development to sustainable locations is an important element of tackling climate change, there are parts of BCP which are not within the existing built up area which are less sustainable. Prioritising the re use of existing structures could help to reduce car bon emissions and promote innovative conversion or reuse schemes. Policy C1 seeks to set out the overall approach to a range of actions that will address climate change with the details set out in other policies in the chapter. The wording is more general and potentially covers a wider range of issues than Building Regulations.	NA
0226	Bournemouth Water / South West Water	C1	Supportive of C1, particularly (b) (iv) & (v). To maximise water efficiency measures within policies C1 and C3, measures for minimising demand are critical. Supports aim for increasing the volume of retained water for reuse via water harvesting/recycling systems/SuDd and through proposed measures for mitigating the urban heat island effect, including the increase in tree canopy cover.	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0235	Wyatt Homes	C1	Not deliverable for new employment development as inadequate family housing provision will require workers to use motor vehicles to travel from further afield. Need to exempt employment development from part i. or plan for more family homes. Ignores relationship with larger sustainable settlements just beyond BCP boundary - development on proximity to these would meet expectations of this policy. Strategy also does not support part c. as greenfield sites offer best opportunities to deliver green open space as part of scheme to contribute to carbon storage. Also would sustainably improve countryside access, biodiversity, and carbon and water storage opportunities. Strategy does not support part d. as lower density greenfield development can deliver low-carbon and renewable energy generation (better than urban due to space constraints, amenity, noise and vibration considerations). Policy therefore not effective, justified or aspirational.	Objection	Yes	No action	Employment development should still be directed to sustainable locations within the urban area that reduce the need to travel. The policy would apply to new development and the contribution that the release of Green Belt would or would not make to the aspirations of this policy do not impact on the policy itself, the strategy and reasonable alternatives to it are assessed within the Sustainability Appraisal.	NA
0245	Miller Homes and Bellway Homes (Wessex)	C1	Support. Kinson Manor Farm would meet policy objectives.	Objection	Yes	No Action	Support noted	NA
0250	East Dorset Friends of the Earth	C1	Endorse concept of strong policy. However, development will have adverse impacts unless requirements are met. Prevention of impacts should be preferred to mitigation and adaptation. Development should only be permitted where there is a specific need, and at a negative carbon (and biodiversity cost). Any costs need to be borne by the developer. Existing development needs to be upgraded to reduce carbon emissions. Policies and enforcement must require set of specific measures to reduce negative impacts [see comment for list]	Objection		No action	The policy supports the prevention of impacts through sustainably locating development. Council have a duty to plan to meet development needs and determine applications applications submitted to us. The chapter and Policy C2 support the retrofitting of existing properties but it is not the role of the Local Plan to insist on upgrading of existing properties.	NA
0258	Royal London Mutual Insurance Society Ltd	C1	Supports principles of policy	Objection	No	No Action	Support noted	NA
0273	Churchill Retirement Living	C1	Part bi. at odds with strategy focusing development within areas at risk of flooding (as indicated by BCPLP ST/ET) and will encourage development on unsustainable greenfield/green belt edge of settlement locations. Therefore revisions required	Support with changes		Modification	Development should be directed towards lowest flood risk areas so policy needs amendment. But disagree that necessitates Green Belt release.	Amend Policy C1 2a to direct developments into areas of lowest flood risk.

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0260	Dorset Lake Community	C1	Plan does not set targets to tackle carbon emissions.	Objection	Yes	No action	It is not considered appropriate for the Local Plan to set a specific target, many actions identified in the Council's 153 climate change actions go beyond the scope of planning policy. The Council is working on an Energy Plan which will consider the range of actions and their deliverability.	NA
0280	Dorset CPRE	C1	C1. Not sound as does not go far enough and doesn't fully meet para 157 of NPPF. The policy should include measures to encourage installation of solar panels on both domestic and commercial rooftops and car parks. All new buildings should be fitted with thermal panels as standard.	Objection	Yes	No Action	The policy supports development to provide renewable energy but it not considered necessary to specify specific technology as the most appropriate solution could vary on a site by site basis.	NA
0447	Poole Quays Forum	C1	The local plan should respect local needs.	Support		No action	Comment noted	NA
0473	Judy Windwood	C1	Supports policy as reducing carbon emissions will help address climate change and particularly support ai and aviii on the use of cargo bikes for last mile deliveries	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0511	Dorset Local Nature Partnership	C1	Support the benefit of trees, but planting and green roofs go further in reducing heat island effect and mitigate CO2 emissions and flooding, and should be recognised in text.	Objection	No	No action	Support noted. Nature based solutions are referenced in part b.v of the policy including trees, planting and green roofs.	NA
0614	National Trust	C1	Support. Must ensure developments meet expectations and applications demonstrate how this will be achieved	Support with changes	No	No action	Support noted	NA
0269	South West Housing and Planning Consortium	C1	Rigid climate change and sustainable construction policies should be avoided. Welcomes the reference to December 2023 Written Ministerial Statement. Avoid duplication and any potential inconsistencies with Building Regs. With the introduction of Building Regulations Part O (overheating), parts of draft Policy C1 overlap with statutory requirements and are unnecessary.	Objection	No	No action	The draft Plan has been prepared in readiness for the introduction of the Future Homes Standard in 2025.	NA
0270	McLaren Property	C1	Support for ambition to reduce carbon emissions but reusing structures and demolition materials is not always feasible and may not always represent most sustainable option or be suitable for reuse. This requirement is likely to affect viability and deliverability of development. Wording should be amended to recognise flexibility needs to be applied.	Support with changes		No action	The policy seeks developers to prioritise use of existing structures but it isn't a rigid requirement as there will be instances where this is not appropriate.	NA
0271	Highwood Group	C1	Should be revised to align with Future Homes Standard and so criteria only apply where relevant and feasible and to provide flexibility and allow for viability considerations to not hinder development. References to low carbon materials and embodied energy in construction unnecessary and unjustified as issues should be addressed through building regulations when updated. Identification of sustainably located sites, such as 21/01 and 21/04, required to address climate change.	Objection	Yes	No action	The draft Plan has been prepared in readiness for the introduction of the Future Homes Standard in 2025.	NA
0292	WH White	C1	Support Policy C1 and believe that Canford Garden Village could present an exemplar community, well placed to use renewable energy and recycled aggregates. Important to avoid duplication with Building Regs, given Future Homes Standard further metrics cumbersome. Need definition of 'zero carbon ready'. BREEAM not always suitable, optimising the rating at pre-assessment stage rather than requiring excellent or very good. BREEAM can be expensive and certificates take months to obtain.	Support	Yes	No action	The draft Plan has been prepared in readiness for the introduction of the Future Homes Standard in 2025. Noted feedback regarding BREEAM. Zero Carbon Ready is defined in Para 5.14.	NA
0031	S Moore	Para 5.14	General support and support reduction in operational carbon emissions.	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0079	The Society for Poole	C2	Policy C2 is sound and likely effective in serving the public interest	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0020	RSPB	C2	Policy supported as worded	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0250	East Dorset Friends of the Earth	C2	Support, but more specific requirements (council's checklist) needs to be added to policy	Support with changes		No action	Council checklists will be provided post adoption to assist with validation of planning applications.	NA
0258	Royal London Mutual Insurance Society Ltd	C2	Royal London note that the priorities outlined in the policy can be delivered on site at the Former Belvedere Hotel.	Objection	No	No action	Support noted	NA
0304	Sovereign Network Group SNG	C2	Support C2	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0447	Poole Quays Forum	C2	The local plan should respect local needs.	Support		No action	Comment noted	NA

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0464	Jonathan Dowty	C2	Policy demonstrates a lack of urgency on net zero, therefore plan is unsound in accordance with schedule 7 (15C) of the Levelling up and Regeneration Act 2023. fails to meet commitment made by Council when they declared a climate emergency in 2019 and prepared a climate change action plan. No energy metric in C2 to guide residential development, and so provides no certainty of meeting net zero by 2050 no contribution to the 2035 carbon budget requirements of the Climate Change Act 2008. Disappointing that no standards have been set beyond those required under Building Regulations. Policy is not fit for purpose, not positively prepared and no guarantee aim of policy will be effective.	Objection	Yes	No action	As set out in ministerial guidance the plan can not go beyond building regulations. The draft Plan does not seek to go beyond proposed Building Regulations but has been prepared before the Future Homes Standard 2025 has been introduced and therefore seeks to ensure those intended measures are introduced should they be subject to delay.	NA
0528	Michael Brooke	C2	Considers plan to be legally compliant, sound and complying with duty to cooperate but in terms of tackling climate change plan lacks emphasis on domestic energy production to achieve net zero and suggests more innovative ways to incorporate solar panels to balconies.	Support with changes	No	No action	Plan supports domestic energy production to an appropriate level of detail	NA
0571	Home Builders Federation	C2	Support promotion of sustainable construction and low carbon energy, but should not set own standards, as adds complexity to existing policy, regulations and standards, undermines economies of scale, and could undermine objectives. Requires rewording as unclear how compliancy would be demonstrated. References to 'checklist' ambiguous. Unclear whether national or local standards are required to be met or whether they are different. Overly long and complex. Attempts to address matters better addressed elsewhere. Unclear how compliancy would be demonstrated, therefore rewording required. Ambiguity and any confusion between policy/supporting text must be resolved.	Objection	Yes	No action	Applicants are required by the policy to set out how they have addressed the requirements within the Design and Access Statement or through completing a checklist.	NA
0282	Historic England	C2	Measures to increase energy efficiency in buildings of traditional construction can be harmful to the built fabric. Suggest additional text	Objection		Modification	Agree.	Add new para after 5.15 to ensure clarity surrounding buildings of traditional construction.
0159	Morrish Homes	C2	Any requirements beyond building regulations must be well reasoned and costed.	Objection		No action	The draft Plan has been prepared in readiness for the introduction of the Future Homes Standard in 2025. Noted feedback regarding BREEAM. Zero Carbon Ready is defined in Para 5.14.	NA
0220	LGIM Real Assets	C2	Supports use of the energy hierarchy to tackle climate change, but draws attention of BCP to the Written Ministerial Statement dated 13th December 2023 stating Building Regulations were the Government's preferred approach to deliver energy efficient development.	Support		No action	The draft Plan has been prepared in readiness for the introduction of the Future Homes Standard in 2025.	NA
0223	Fortitudo Ltd	C2	Net zero should be supported through central government and building regulations, not through policies in Local Plan. Not viable to require BREEAM 'Excellent' rating on non-residential buildings. Council viability report confirms this for majority of typologies.	Objection		No action	The draft Plan has been prepared in readiness for the introduction of the Future Homes Standard in 2025. BREEAM excellent is achievable.	NA
0235	Wyatt Homes	C2	Part 1a. conflicts with requirement to reflect national technical standards (Building Regulations) as they do not require the measures sought. No evidence to justify approach or of impact on viability. Not justified or sound.	Objection	Yes	No action	The draft Plan has been prepared in readiness for the introduction of the Future Homes Standard in 2025.	NA
0259	Arts University Bournemouth	C2	Support policy intent. AUB committed to reducing carbon emissions. Concerned that BREEAM is specified with no alternative, this is not justified and is overly restrictive for new non-residential developments. There are other accredited assessment methods such as LEED or Passivhaus Certification. No rationale for preferring BREEAM and does not allow for flexibility for the emerging forms of sustainability assessments.	Objection	No	No action	Councils preferred approach is BREEAM which has been used through Poole Local Plan (2018).	NA
0271	Highwood Group	C2	Policy should rely on Building Regulations and 2025 Future Homes Standard rather than relying on own policy approaches regarding energy efficiency to enable economies of scale. Requiring information in design and access statement or council checklist unnecessarily specific and onerous, and reference to checklist unclear and confusing.	Objection	Yes	No action	The draft Plan has been prepared in readiness for the introduction of the Future Homes Standard in 2025. The checklist provides clear way for people to understand how policy requirements have been met.	NA
0273	Churchill Retirement Living	C2	Should not mandate standards above building regulations. Government's preparation of enhanced standards through new Building Regulations and Future Homes Standards already considerable challenge for housebuilding industry - need to be factored into viability appraisal.	Objection		No action	The draft Plan has been prepared in readiness for the introduction of the Future Homes Standard in 2025.	NA
0292	WH White	C2	Endorse intent of C2, BREEAM can be a difficult tool to engage with. Optimising the rating could be preferable.	Support with changes	Yes	No action	Councils preferred approach is BREEAM which has been used through Poole Local Plan (2018).	NA
0020	RSPB	C3	Policy supported as worded	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0040	Natural England	C3	In the absence of an approved Water Resources Management Plan for the water suppliers there is uncertainty about the supply of water for public consumption. Abstraction is already leading to the River Avon SAC failing to meet its water flow objectives so propose a local plan standard of 85 litres per person. Plan should acknowledge need to regularly review water usage restrictions to avoid harm to habitats sites and SSSIs.	Support with changes		Modification	Agree, there is a particular issue in the River Avon catchment.	Amend policy C3b and supporting text to include reference to water resource management plan and tighter water restrictions for the River Avon catchment.

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0226	Bournemouth Water / South West Water	C3	Supportive of C3. To maximise water efficiency measures within policies C1 and C3, measures for minimising demand are critical. Supports aim for increasing the volume of retained water for reuse via water harvesting/recycling systems/SuDs and through proposed measures for mitigating the urban heat island effect, including the increase in tree canopy cover.	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0250	East Dorset Friends of the Earth	C3	Support, but needs to address onsite capture and storage effects can be negated by increases in hard cover. Need to plan for increased rainfall. Roof storage systems should be encouraged, where appropriate.	Support with changes		No action	Policy C7 on Sustainable Drainage seeks to address these issues.	NA
0258	Royal London Mutual Insurance Society Ltd	C3	Supports principles of policy	Objection	No	No action	Support noted	NA
0271	Highwood Group	C3	Not all applications require a design and access statement and unclear what checklist is being referred to - there ineffective and reference should be removed.	Objection		No action	Council checklists will be provided post adoption to assist with validation of planning applications	NA
0447	Poole Quays Forum	C3	The local plan should respect local needs.	Support		No action	Comment noted	NA
0571	Home Builders Federation	C3	Oppose requirement to assess/demonstrate water company's capacity to connect development to water services and/or demonstrate water neutrality – managed by separate statutory regime and legal responsibility falls on water companies. No need for policy to address water efficiency as addressed by Building Regulations which require greater efficiency than most existing stock. Efficiency lower than 100 litres per dwelling can give rise to issues for customers (odour, air quality, human health).	Objection	Yes	No action	Policy considered appropriate due to the fact the area is one of known water stress	NA
0292	WH White	C3	'Support policy. It would be helpful if the 'recognised methodology for calculating water efficiency;' outlined in Policy C3 could be signposted.	Support	Yes	Modification	Support noted. Agree signposting would help.	Provide signposting to The Building Regulations in para 5.17.
0148	FCERM	Para 5.2	Expand to refer to NPPF requirement to steer development away from flood and coastal change risk.	Support with changes		Modification	Agree that it is beneficial to refer to coastal change within this paragraph. However, consider that additional wording should better relate to the wording in the NPPF, which refers to plans reducing "risk from coastal change by avoiding inappropriate development in vulnerable areas and not exacerbating the impacts of physical changes to the coast", rather than development being steered away from areas at risk from coastal change.	Add coastal change to para 5.2.
0020	RSPB	C4	Policy supported as worded, especially part 1b and para 5.18 in relation to consideration of environmental constraints and impact on protected habitats and species.	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0040	Natural England	C4	Support sections b and f	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0079	The Society for Poole	C4	Policy C4 could be made sound and is likely effective in serving the public interest. Reference to ground mounted solar installations unsound due to need to protect environment and public interest. Under vision and objectives it is noted: - omission of reference to solar panels on roofs and car parks is surprising	Support with changes		No action	Reference to solar above car parks too detailed for objectives. Criteria in C4 seek to protect the public interest through the consideration of a range of criteria.	NA
0169	Malmesbury Estate	C4	Supports policy but some wording onerous	Objection	Yes	No action	Support noted	NA
0250	East Dorset Friends of the Earth	C4	Support, but needs to be more proactive by more positive encouragement of community schemes [sets out how could be achieved] and local storage hubs to provide a back-up to generation schemes.	Support with changes		No action	The policy supports community led energy schemes under part 2.	NA
0288	Meyrick Estate Solar Management	C4	Policy should include battery storage facilities. Extent of criteria places uncertainty as to how and where proposals will be acceptable and will be challenging given physical constraints in BCP. Suggested amendments to wording included in suggested modification. Also specific allocations would be preferred for renewable energy development which includes overarching positive criteria based policy. Area east of Christchurch is suggested as its a flexible area for renewable energy including solar and bioenergy.	Support with changes		No action	Policy already refers to ancillary development which would include battery storage facilities.	NA
0351	Sport England	C4	Should consider using existing playing fields for district heating purposes (possible to while supporting continued use as pitches).	Support with changes	No	No action	The policy would support district heating, how this is achieved is an issue that goes beyond the local plan and detailed feasibility studies would need to be completed.	NA
0371	Clifford Morse	C4	The list of caveats is so restrictive that applications are unlikely to be forthcoming. Criteria a) and h) are subjective and particularly difficult for potential developers to manage.	Objection	No	No action	Criteria are required to effectively manage installations. Landscape character assessment exists to support criteria a and h and further information and/or visualisations would be required at application stage.	NA
0447	Poole Quays Forum	C4	The local plan should respect local needs.	Support		No action	Comment noted	NA
0078	Hurn Parish Council	C4	Split part f of policy C4 into two parts	Support with changes		Modification	Agree.	Split Policy C4 (f) into two parts.

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0158	New Forest National Park Authority	C4	1a is unclear/ambiguous, additional clarification needed and cross referencing to NE6 and New Forest National Park	Support with changes		Modification	Agree.	Amend para 5.20 to provide clarity on national landscapes and the national park.
0162	Bournemouth Airport	C4	Concerned that large scale sustainable energy schemes can impact upon aviation activity and considers a criteria should be included to safeguarding Bournemouth Airport	Objection	Yes	Modification	Agree.	Add Bournemouth Airport to Policy C4 (d).
0282	Historic England	C4	Unclear how the policy relates to applications for wind energy, any potential areas should consider heritage impacts.	Objection		Modification	Agree.	Modify para 5.19 and Policy C4 to provide clarification that large scale onshore wind is not supported.
0292	WH White	C4	Suggest that paragraph 5.22 be adjusted to reflect the specific reference to renewables at paragraph 156 of the NPPF. Criteria (a)-(h) are supported. Criteria (i) presupposes that proposals would sterilise or conflict with the best and most versatile ["BMV"] agricultural land. Suggest that criteria (i) be adjusted to require proposals to avoid BMV agricultural land or otherwise demonstrate that the land would not be sterilised.	Support with changes	Yes	Modification	Support noted. Type of agricultural land should reflect NPPF.	Modify wording of criteria i to reflect NPPF in relation to agricultural land.
0614	National Trust	C4	Support, but landscape sensitivity (in light of Dorset National Landscape) and designated and non-designated heritage assets to be taken into account in location and design of renewable energy schemes.	Support with changes	No	Modification	Support noted. Agree to reference National Landscape.	Amend para 5.20 to provide clarity on national landscapes and the national park.
0148	FCERM	Para 5.26	Shoreline Management Plan is not under review (it is a live document). Corrections and clarifications required.	Support with changes		Modification	Agree with recommended changes.	Remove SMP being under review from Para 5.26 and be clearer on coastal erosion
0371	Clifford Morse	Para 5.30	Coastal Vulnerability Zone Drainage from inland areas can be a significant risk.	Objection	No	No action	Policy C5 addresses coastal zone vulnerability	NA
0040	Natural England	C5	Supports 1 b, 2 b and e. Council as landowner should ensure Rockely Park adheres to policy as units are increasingly being occupied on a residential basis.	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0082	Christchurch Harbour Ornithological Group	C5	Policy required to ensure no additional beach huts are permitted on Mudeford Spit and alternations to existing huts do not risk harm from coastal flooding erosion. Cross reference to Policy NE5.	Support with changes		No action	It is not considered that it is appropriate to impose a flat ban on beach huts in this policy, and it is considered that the requirement for no unacceptable impacts on coastal change is sufficiently dealt with. The policy includes that proposals for development will be determined in accordance with national policies and guidance within the coastal change management areas. Furthermore, Policy C5 states that proposals may be time limited, and Policy NE2 requires no net gain in tourist accommodation within 400m of heathland (some parts of the spit are more than 400m from heathland, but can only be accessed via the 400m zone so would be considered inappropriate for new tourist accommodation). The plan will be read as a whole, therefore no cross reference to Policy NE5 required.	NA
0164	Environment Agency	C5	Support policy. Expect wording of policy to be led by Council's Flood and Coastal Risk Management team.	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0200	Meyrick Estate	C5	Should define what inappropriate development is in defined vulnerable areas and set out the specific vulnerabilities that exist. lacks preciseness and certainty. Does not address neglect of the vulnerable cliff areas. Need clear proposals, part funded by development, to address. Need regular inspections for cliff stability, erosion and vegetation health. Cliffs are a key asset for the area.	Objection	Yes	No action	Inappropriate development would be that that is not in compliance with Policy C5. Further definition is not considered appropriate, as proposals that are not in clear contradiction to the policy will need to be considered on a case-by-case basis. Any concerns regarding what would be appropriate development could be addressed through the pre-application process. Management of cliffs falls under the remit of other plans and strategies.	NA
0250	East Dorset Friends of the Earth	C5	Sensible criteria for management. Needs to be more consistent with recreation and tourist proposals which add problems to coast. Quicker carbon emissions reduced and carbon sequestered, easier it will be to manage coastal impacts.	Support with changes		No action	The Draft BCP Local Plan takes a proactive approach in seeking to address the climate emergency. It is considered the plan's support for appropriate tourism and recreation development is fundamentally important to support the local economy and wellbeing of residents. It is not considered that this policy is in conflict with the plan's objectives or other policies.	NA

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0284	Gervis Properties Ltd / Hinton Admiral Estate	C5	Policy C5 appropriate but needs to define what constitutes as appropriate and inappropriate development. Policy imposes constraints on future development along cliffs but doesn't include safeguarding/protective measures or improvements/enhancements. Management and maintenance is required to address structural integrity. Pop up concessions on beach should enhance visitor experience. Development should recognise ecological and environmental significance of coastal areas (habitats, wildlife and natural processes). Appropriate assessment needed for developments relating to climate change (sea level rises, storms, and erosion). Evaluation needed for development impact upon coastal landscape and views. Public access to the beach is important to enhance connectivity. Effective monitoring and enforcement needed. Coastal Management Strategies should include integrated approach; natural defences; adaptive planning; community engagement and Sustainable Development Goals SDG14 (Life Below Water) and SDG11 (Sustainable Cities and Communities). Council commitment to sustainable development and environmental stewardship commendable but plan lacks proposals for improvement, inspection and maintenance needed to safeguard and reverse the decline in essential local assets (partly funded by new development).	Support with changes		No action	Inappropriate development would be that that is not in compliance with Policy C5. Further definition is not considered appropriate, as proposals that are not in clear contradiction to the policy will need to be considered on a case-by-case basis. Any concerns regarding what would be appropriate development could be addressed through the pre-application process. Management of cliffs falls under the remit of other plans and strategies. The Draft BCP Local Plan includes enhanced design policies (Policies BE1 and BE2) that apply to all development; these alongside Policy NE5 (Coastline) will ensure development along the coast is of a high quality, including with regard to impacts on the landscape. Impacts on habitats and wildlife are addressed in the relevant natural environment policies. The requirement for a Coastal Vulnerability Assessment (see template in Appendix A of Flooding & Coastal Change Background Paper) and flood risk assessment ensures there will be an appropriate assessment of how proposed developments account for rising sea levels, storm surges and erosion due to climate change. It is considered that the plan strikes an appropriate balance between development along the coastline enhancing the local economy while minimising harm. By identifying coastal vulnerability areas/zones in the local plan it provides a clear policy approach that can be monitored and enforced where necessary.	NA
0287	Network Rail	C5	Holes Bay an area being assessed in Network Railway Climate Change Study. Flooding events and coastal erosion generating cause for concern. NRIL supports the draft Policy in its intent to limit development within areas of significant coastal vulnerability. Essential infrastructure noted, Network Rail preparing plan and will work with the Council to protect the rail network.	Support	Yes	No action	Support noted	NA
0292	WH White	C5	No comment	Comment	Yes	No action	No comment	NA
0334	Peter Fenning	C5	Policy does not address coastal landfill erosion by rising sea levels e.g. landfill underneath edge of Two Riversmeet SANG which could be subject to erosion given location, and could lead to polluted water in the marsh and the River Avon.	Objection	Yes	No action	The policy seeks to manage change in relation to the coast arising from development, the supporting text acknowledges the potential impacts from climate change. Wider impacts are being considered by the Christchurch Bay and Harbour FCERM Strategy	NA
0447	Poole Quays Forum	C5	The local plan should respect local needs.	Support		No action	Comment noted	NA
0614	National Trust	C5	Support - in line with SMP and Trust's publications and strategies	Support	No	No action	Support noted	NA
0282	Historic England	C5	Impacts on heritage assets, particularly Upton Country Park and Hengistbury head scheduled monument need to be considered in determining a strategy and ensuring mitigation is in place. These assets will impact appropriateness of new infrastructure	Objection		Modification	Agree, the supporting text could refer to sensitive historic locations	Add new para at 5.28 to include Upton House and Hengistbury Head CCMA.
0164	Environment Agency	Para 5.33-5.37	Have worked with council to secure necessary evidence. Agreed approach reflects historic development and growth in Christchurch and Poole that we have been in dialogues since 2009. Previously worked with council to take proactive approach by supporting the relocation of highly vulnerable development at risk of flooding to lower risk areas - flood risk policy should support this. This should be included in supporting text and preferably Policy C6.	Support with changes		Modification	Agree that text regarding the council supporting the relocation of highly vulnerable into areas at lower risk of flooding should be included in the plan.	Add potential to work with vulnerable uses to relocate from flood risk areas in Para 5.37 and Policy C6 2€.
0164	Environment Agency	Para 5.38-5.40	Environment Agency working with council to secure evidence to understand flood risk in these locations. While SFRA L2 will not be complete until after examination, Environment Agency require the SFRA L2 to be completed to ensure inappropriate development does not occur during plan period. Approach can work due to information in SFRA L1 and historic involvement of the flood and coastal risk management authorities over the last 15 years.	Support		No action	Support noted. The Council will attempt to have a completed updated Poole SFRA L2 during the examination.	NA
0148	FCERM	Figure 5.5	Revise to reflect finalised SFRA L1	Support with changes		Modification	Agree Figure 5.5 should be revised to reflect the most recent version in Final BCP SFRA L1.	Figure 5.5 to be revised to reflect the most recent version in BCP SFRA L1.
0148	FCERM	Para 5.38-5.40	Need to explain how sequential test has been applied in Poole and Christchurch in absence of SFRA L2. Suggest should state all development within these areas required to meet housing needs.	Support with changes		Modification	Agree that it would be beneficial to briefly explain how the sequential test was passed for development in the Poole and Christchurch SFRA L2 study areas for clarity in future, although it is important text more broadly relates to development needs (rather than only housing needs). Further detail can be found in the ward policies and the plan's sequential and exception test document.	Add to para. 5.40 that Stony Lane and Poole Town Centre have passed the sequential test.
0164	Environment Agency	Para 5.40-5.44	Sites meet the sequential test and no issue with flood risk assessment being required at application stage as part of exception test. SFRA L2 and flood risk management strategies may determine it is not possible for these sites to meet part 2 of the exception test, particularly where flood risk management infrastructure improvements required to make development (including access) safe for its lifetime are not viable.	Support		No action	Support and uncertainty regarding viability of funding strategies noted.	NA

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0148	FCERM	Figure 5.7	Improve resolution of image	Support with changes		Modification	Will seek to improve resolution. However, should it be difficult to improve resolution, it is considered that the table is readable in the current resolution.	Improve resolution of Figure 5.7.
0148	FCERM	5.41	Para 5.41 line 1 - Does not explain how need for development in town centres has been balanced against flood risk/availability of lower risk areas (including town centre areas outside BCP under duty to co-operate). Para 5.41 line 7 - Only the second part of the exception test will need to be passed, and part 1 is considered passed unless substantial changes occur post plan adoption. Para 5.41 line 10 - Lack of clarification regarding difference between Poole and Christchurch town centres will cause confusion.	Support with changes		Modification	Para 5.41 line 1 - Agree that additional text clarifying that development needs within the town centres cannot be accommodated elsewhere and that public benefits outweigh flood risk. Para 5.41 line 7 - Agree that text should be revised to only refer to part 2 of the exception test. Para 5.41 line 10 - Agree that clarification on why the Christchurch Sequential Test area only covers the Stony Lane area would be beneficial and should be added.	Amend para 5.41 to add clarification
0148	FCERM	Para 5.43	Case law regarding disaggregated approach when considering alternative sites should be incorporated into the planned sequential test/flood risk guidance note	Comment		Modification	Agree that the sequential test should pay due regard to the case law referenced. Supporting text to be revised to clarify that <i>applicants</i> should apply the disaggregated approach <i>where appropriate</i> ...	Clarify that disaggregation will 'normally' be applied in para 5.43
0164	Environment Agency	C6	Plan is sound and legally compliant, subject to use of the Publication Draft Sequential Test and Exception Test; publication of finalised SFRA L1; and completion of SFRA L2 and associated infrastructure funding strategies for areas required in line with stated timeframes/prior to applications being determined in areas restricted.	Support		No action	Support of the proposed approach noted.	NA
0250	East Dorset Friends of the Earth	C6	Focuses on mitigation and adaption rather than prevention. Would be less of an issue if plan achieved reductions in carbon emissions, combined with natural carbon sequestration.	Support with changes		No action	Consider no change required. The plan needs to support mitigation and adaption in case it is not possible to fully prevent the impacts of climate change.	NA
0258	Royal London Mutual Insurance Society Ltd	C6	Supports principles of policy	Objection	No	No action	Support noted.	NA
0271	Highwood Group	C6	Should only require maximisation of opportunities to reduce overall flood risk where feasible.	Objection	Yes	No action	Disagree with recommended change. It is considered that the current wording provides sufficient flexibility - 'maximisation' suggests proposals should reduce flood risk as far as possible, taking any limitations into account. The suggested 'where feasible' wording would inappropriately water down the policy.	NA
0273	Churchill Retirement Living	C6	Support sequential test not required again for allocations. Future Flood Zone 3b unpredictable where defences present. Reliability of River Avon/tidal modelling not tested. Delays to SFRA L2 significant and fundamentally impacting local housing need. No commitment to deliver SFRA L2 or FCERM Strategy in timely manner. Concerned about delays holding up delivery of otherwise suitable brownfield sites. Unclear what stage funding strategy is at. Likely defences to be funded by new development but can't come forward unless certainty provided will be approved and costs tested through viability appraisal. SFRA L2 and funding strategy need to progressed with some urgency prior to plan adoption to demonstrate identified need can be met. Otherwise at risk of speculative greenfield development.	Objection		No action	Agree that there is a need to deliver a SFRA L2 and FCERM strategy for the Christchurch area given the significant uncertainties regarding flood risk, and can understand concerns. However, it is not possible to complete these before adoption of the plan due to resourcing issues and the need to adopt a local plan for the BCP area. Given the uncertainty regarding their deliverability, the Stony Lane area allocations are not counted towards the local plan's housing supply figures.	NA
0287	Network Rail	C6	Concerned SFRA Level 2 not complete, areas left vulnerable. Rail network in Poole vulnerable. New developments need full flood risk assessment. Increased surface water could impact rail infrastructure. Policy should address impact on the railway.	Objection	Yes	No action	Development within areas at risk from flooding will need to be informed by a flood risk assessment considering all sources (including surface water flood risk) as required by policy. We have commissioned SFRA L2 aiming to complete and publish it during the examination. This will provide the necessary protections to the railway from new development and can also be applied to any developments that come forward before adoption. Recognise that if this is delayed the policy wording for P26 Poole Town may need amending to highlight issue of ensuring that flood risk to the railway is avoided. Action: Prepare SFRA L2.	NA
0447	Poole Quays Forum	C6	The local plan should respect local needs.	Support		No action	Comment noted	NA
0571	Home Builders Federation	C6	Should explicitly development of sites for BNG net gain, including if appropriate in certain flood zones, what evidence required etc.	Objection	Yes	No action	Sites for nature recovery and biodiversity net gain will be considered as part of separate strategies.	NA



ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0148	FCERM	C6	Part 1c; Part d; Part e - No explanation or reference to evidence that provides justification for approach supported in supporting text. Part 2 - Previous policy text recommended by Environment Agency regarding relocating highly vulnerable development at risk of flooding to more suitable locations removed. Should be reinstated or justification for removal should be provided. Part 3a Support inclusion of this, but view defending communities for serious flood risk should be given greater weight than other policy areas. Unclear whether reduced weight can be given to other policy areas to enable defences (clarification may be required), and clarification required on what is meant by 'accepted'. Part 3b - Minor formatting issue with indentation. Appendix 1, Policy C6 (3) Should have targets to ensure compliance with policy.	Support with changes		Modification	Part 1c; Part d; Part e - Agree that clarification on the justification for the sequential test areas, and not requiring proposals for replacement dwellings to apply the sequential test (where a sequential approach is taken within the site and appropriate measures to improve flood resilience and resistance are incorporated) should be added to supporting text. Part 2 - Also agree that reference to BCP SFRA L1 can be added in relation to justification for considering the sequential test to be passed when a sequential approach has been taken to the layout of the proposal, so that each type of development proposed is located entirely within Flood Risk Areas where the sequential test is passed for that type of development in accordance with Figure 5.6. Part 3a This criterion is primarily included to ensure defences are designed so that they have acceptable impacts on flood risk and coastal change etc. - agree clarification regarding this, and that pre-application advice should be sought, would be beneficial. Consider that while the benefits of defending communities against flood risk will be given great weight by the local planning authority when determining applications, it is important that they are of a good quality design and limit impacts on heritage where possible. Therefore, consider it to be inappropriate for the plan to suggest other policies would be given reduced weight. Part 3b - Correct formatting. Appendix 1 - The suggested monitoring targets would be too detailed and onerous to monitor.	Amend paras 5.36, 5.37, 5.40 (both instances) and Policy C6 to address FCERM comments.
0164	Environment Agency	C6	Policy is sound. However reference to exception test in title of Part 1 should be removed. Part 2bi should reflect need for development to be safe rather than just referencing resistant and resiliency measures. Part 3f - Reference to development being made safe for its lifetime should include unaided access/egress.	Support with changes		Modification	This part of the policy addresses the exception test (i.e. it states "The sequential test and exception test will be applied to planning applications in accordance with national policy, the SFRA Level 1, and our flood risk guidance note". Therefore do not view that reference to the exception test should be removed from title. Agree, reference to the need to ensure development is safe to be included. Agree reference to the need for safe access/egress to be made safe for its lifetime would be beneficial.	Clarify in Policy C6 (2)bi that development should be safe and C6 (3)f about unaided access and egress.
0292	WH White	C6	Support text and figures 5.5-5.7 helpful. Impacts of Christchurch Level 2 SFRA needs to be reflected in the trajectory with considerable contingency. Reservations about disaggregated approach to alternative sites. Note that provision 2(d) has potential for significant delay in regeneration and housing delivery	Comment	Yes	Modification	Support for supporting text and figures noted. Uncertainty regarding deliverability of sites within the Christchurch area have been reflected in the trajectory. As set out in para 5.43 our flood risk guidance note will provide further information on requirements for the application of the sequential test. There is potential to modify the text to clarify that the council will seek to apply a disaggregated approach in most cases and this should typically consider delivery on a series of smaller sites and/or part of a larger site The Poole SFRA L2 is expected to be completed during the local plan examination and is required to support successful regeneration of the area. It is accepted that there will be a delay in securing housing delivery and regeneration in some parts of the Christchurch area.	Clarify that disaggregation will 'normally' be applied in para 5.43
0148	FCERM	C7	Should have target ensuring no major applications determined against LLFA advice, and all applications supported by drainage strategy.	Support with changes		No action	The suggested monitoring targets would be too detailed and onerous to monitor.	NA
0195	Christchurch Town Council Neighbourhood Plan Working Group	C7	Part 1b Should caveat that green roofs only appropriate where in keeping with area character Part 3 SuDS guidance may need to be adopted as a supplementary plan and therefore be included in the Local Development Scheme	Support with changes		No action	As the policy does not require provision of green roofs (rather it sets out an order in which SuDS options should be considered) it is not considered necessary to include that they are only appropriate when in keeping with area character. We will prepare new SuDS guidance and once drafted will present it to the examination. No decisions have been made regarding whether it will be adopted as an supplementary planning document or supplementary plan. Townscape character will be a relevant consideration, under policy BE2, along with other considerations, that will factored in when considering what SuDS solution for a development.	NA
0211	Susan Suliman	C7	[Water] Infrastructure is not able to cope with new housing. Water companies not investing in infrastructure, leading to homes in Christchurch not being able to be connected. Significant surface water flooding in Christchurch Town Centre due to increase in rainfall each year. Numerous roads in Christchurch have suffered with surface water flooding since September. New homes contributing to hug problems in the future.	Objection	No	No action	Surface water flooding is now mapped and we will work closely with utility providers to resolve any capacity issues. The flood risk policy will prevent inappropriate development being located in areas of surface water flooding. Furthermore, SuDS policy sets out requirements for SuDS that will reduce/manage water flowing into drainage systems.	NA

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0226	Bournemouth Water / South West Water	C7	Supportive of C7, particularly 1.a, b and c. Supports aim for increasing the volume of retained water for reuse via water harvesting/recycling systems/SuDs and through proposed measures for mitigating the urban heat island effect, including the increase in tree canopy cover.	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0250	East Dorset Friends of the Earth	C7	Should cover all forms of development which may reduce infiltration, notably increasing hard surface area within existing properties. Encouragement of permeable surfaces (not plastic) should be standard. Development exclusion zones may have to be identified due to increased rainfall and limited mains drainage capacity.	Support with changes		No action	Unfortunately the policy can only control development that requires a planning application. It should be noted that the plan promotes use of permeable surfaces; Policy BE2 (Townscape) states "...development must ...use attractive and permeable surfacing that incorporates varied planting and landscaping". In addition, para. 7.28 states "Where hard surfacing is required, attractive, hardwearing and permeable surfaces should be used, with consideration given to the management arrangements, lifetime costs, sustainability and availability of materials." Surface water flooding is now mapped and we will work closely with utility providers to resolve any capacity issues. The flood risk policy will prevent inappropriate development being located in areas of surface water flooding. Furthermore, SuDS policy sets out requirements for SuDS that will reduce/manage water flowing into drainage systems. There is <del>therefore no requirement for development exclusion zones.</del>	NA
0258	Royal London Mutual Insurance Society Ltd	C7	Supports principles of policy	Objection	No	No action	Support noted.	NA
0334	Peter Fenning	C7	No solution offered for issue of raw sewerage being discharged in to Christchurch Harbour. This is unacceptable as a hazard to nature of river and health of users of the river e.g. swimmers.	Objection	No	No action	Storm overflows can result in sewage overflows, managing rainwater run off through the implementation of Sustainable Urban Drainage systems as required by policy C7 can help reduce overflows. Water Companies are also required to implement plans to reduce overflows.	NA
0447	Poole Quays Forum	C7	The local plan should respect local needs.	Support		No action	Comment noted	NA
0040	Natural England	C7	Support. Add that SuDs in Poole Harbour and the River Avon catchments may also be designed to reduce nutrient loads from new developments.	Support with changes		Modification	Agree for River Avon only as there isn't a catchment for Poole Harbour in the BCP area.	Refer to SuDs impact on River Avon SAC in Policy C7 and add a para to the supporting text.
0271	Highwood Group	C7	Delivery and implementation arrangements might not yet be formally secured at application submission so should be revised accordingly. BCP SuDs guidance should be incorporated into evidence base (also existing guidance from 2003 so should be updated).	Objection	Yes	Modification	BCP Council has prepared new SuDS guidance (see Section 6 of TCC9 FCERM background paper). At application stage an indication of how this policy requirement would be met is important in providing confidence that the proposal will be managed. Further detail would be appropriate for a planning condition. The SUDs guidance note makes it clear what is needed at what stage. Agree modification required to ensure details or <del>future maintenance are considered appropriately.</del>	Add future maintenance of SuDs to Policy C7 2.
0292	WH White	C7	Typo - two paragraph 5.44's. Would welcome clarification on feasibility / compatibility of green roofs with the forthcoming mandatory Future Homes / Buildings Standards and any assessment of associated costs of incorporating Green Roofs as part of whole plan viability.	Support	Yes	Modification	Support noted. Agree typo needs to be addressed. Green roofs are only one option in the policy and should be considered. However if they are not viable or appropriate the applicant can state this and move to the next criterion down. Development viability is generic and only takes into account essential policy requirements, of which this is not.	Correct paragraph numbering from 5.40 onwards.
0572	Ray Hince	C7	Clarification required on what SuDs are. Should use full wording for abbreviations/acronyms or add abbreviations/acronyms list.	Support with changes	No	Modification	Agree to full title. Note SuDs are also included in the glossary.	Refer to full title on SuDS in Policy C7 title and supporting text.
0280	Dorset CPRE	Para 5.8	Para 5.8 wording is ambiguous – should be amended to include specific targets to meet NPPF chapter 3 requirements. Also doesn't go far enough to meet para 160 of NPPF requirements to increase the use and supply of renewable and low carbon energy. Policy should contain provision for mandatory rooftop solar and thermal panels on new buildings.	Objection	Yes	No action	It should be noted that para. 5.8 is supporting text, not policy text. Policy C2 provides policy regarding sustainable construction and low carbon energy. The Council is working on an energy plan, but this is too late for inclusion in this local plan and will need to be picked up by future local plan reviews. The policy allows flexibility for developers to meet the sustainable homes requirements without necessarily using panels, e.g. by increasing <del>insulation instead.</del>	NA
0020	RSPB	Chapter 6	The positive approach taken to the natural environment, despite the constraints this puts on future development, is welcomed.	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0040	Natural England	Chapter 6	The Plan is generally of a high standard and sets out policy approaches consistent with national policy and legal requirements for the natural environment. Multiple benefits such as health, biodiversity and environmental improvements are well embedded increasing the likelihood of successful delivery.	Support		No action	Support noted	NA

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0292	WH White	Para 6.2-6.34	Para 6.8 should refer to net increase in overnight accommodation including homes, not just new homes and be more definitive. Para 6.19 will need updating as the facts change. Requiring the purchase of credits is regressive. No benefit in interim arrangements and a change of approach affecting committed development impacts delivery. Issues surrounding nutrients add to the argument for strategic scale allocations on Canford garden Village. Any costs need to be factored into viability. Boundary of Poole Harbour Recreation Zone is poorly drawn. Positive that legacy approaches will be aligned. Bespoke CIL rate required for urban extensions and this should be considered in viability testing and CIL rates.	Objection	Yes	No action	Tourism accommodation is covered in para 6.9. Para 6.19 will be updated. Change to nutrients process aligns with national best practice. Mitigation is factored into the local plan viability assessment. No green belt releases are proposed and so CIL rates reflect this.	NA
0020	RSPB	Para 6.4	Reference should be made to NPPF when referring to 'Habitat Sites' and use capital letters as in HRA	Support		No action	No need to refer to cross refer to NPPF. The NPPF uses lower case for habitat sites.	NA
0020	RSPB	NE1	Policy as worded supported, although note some overlap with NE2 regarding protected habitats and species. New Forest zone of influence and use of SAMMS is supported.	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0040	Natural England	NE1	Support.	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0079	The Society for Poole	NE1	Policy NE1 could be made sound and is likely effective in serving the public interest. Support all developments being required to achieve biodiversity net gain. View policy should refer to 'at least 10% net gain'.	Support with changes		No action	Policy NE3 specifically deals with biodiversity net gain	NA
0082	Christchurch Harbour Ornithological Group	NE1	Support NE1	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0175	Asda Stores Ltd	NE1	Requirements within policies too onerous on certain sites, adverse impact on viability. Urban Greening Design Guide and Green Infrastructure Map not available in evidence base.	Objection	Yes	No action	Urban greening approach has numerous positives and work completed shows how this can be achieved. A draft of the urban greening design guide has been prepared and follows the principles established in the Natural England guidance.	NA
0176	Friends of the Elderly	NE1	Concerned policy too onerous in viability terms.. NE1 d. refers to protecting trees and increasing canopy cover. The Urban Greening Design Guide and Green Infrastructure Focus Map are not available for scrutiny as part of the evidence base. Not clear how the 10% canopy cover requirement has been derived or is justified - the GI strategy refers to existing canopy cover of 19% and a target of 23%. The term "trees of value" is also not defined.	Objection	Yes	No action	Details will be considered in response to objection to Policy NE4	NA
0190	John Dymott	NE1	Take into account Talbot Heath as special area of conservation and monuments/pre roman remains.	Support with changes	Yes	No action	Policy NE1 is a strategic policy and the request is too detailed.	NA
0226	Bournemouth Water / South West Water	NE1	Supportive of NE1, particularly (d). Supports aim for increasing the volume of retained water for reuse via water harvesting/recycling systems/SuDs and through proposed measures for mitigating the urban heat island effect, including the increase in tree canopy cover.	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0245	Miller Homes and Bellway Homes (Wessex)	NE1	Support. Importantly recognises role of development in protecting and enhancing green infrastructure and ecological networks	Objection	Yes	No action	Support noted	NA
0250	East Dorset Friends of the Earth	NE1	Support - should apply to all significant applications (not just new development)	Support with changes		No action	Support noted	NA
0268	Talbot Village Trust	NE1	Support	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0270	McLaren Property	NE1	It would be useful if NE1 made reference Policy NE4 for clarity.	Support with changes		No action	Plan has been written to avoid a large amount of cross referencing.	NA
0112	Dorset Ramblers Countryside	NE1	Welcome recognition of high quality natural environment. Policy NE1 should refer to the importance of 15 minute to green space or water access to promote health/wellbeing.	Support with changes		Modification	Include reference to access to open space within Policy NE1. Details about standards such as distances are set out in policy NE7.	Add public accessibility to Policy NE1.
0271	Highwood Group	NE1	Not all trees are of significance or high quality, and policy for all trees unnecessarily onerous and may prevent sites coming forward, so revision required.	Objection	Yes	No action	The current wording does not say protect all trees.	NA
0272	Christchurch Harbour & Marine Society	NE1	Habitats Regulations Assessment fails to deal with Christchurch Harbour by failing to note its functional linkage with River Avon SAC, the impact of nutrients on the feeding ground for terns protected by the Solent and Dorset Coast SPA, nor the SSSI status. Suggest adding criterion to Policy NE1(h) to state 'conserving and enhancing areas of functional linkage with the UK's national site network'. In the supporting text add: 'Christchurch Harbour and the associated salt marsh habitat is recognised as functionally linked to the Avon Valley'.	Objection	Yes	No action	Following discussion with Natural England the suggestions are not necessary.	NA

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0274	Christchurch Environmetal Management	NE1	Support ecological mitigation and Policies S1 and NE1 of the draft Local Plan. No detail of how achieved in practice, no details about River Avon or mitigation at a strategic scale. Strategy could be improved, consideration should be given to privately private SANGs, clear governance, guidance and publication of agreed standards. Private land owners should be referenced. The Plan should create a SANG network. SANG sites have been put forward but weren't consulted upon. Missed opportunity. Doubtful meet Habs Regs requirements without additional SANG provision. CEM is well placed to provide SANG, mitigation credits for Phosphate impacts on the River Avon and strategic provision of biodiversity net gain.	Objection		No action	Support noted. Welcome the opportunity to discuss potential mitigation options with any private landowner as highlighted by para 4.21 of the ONE1a Dorset Heathlands Planning Framework SPD. However allocating mitigation sites in a local plan does not work as it raises the hope value of land making development unviable. Promoted SANGs are accompanied by large scale housing development requiring Green Belt release which is not the strategy taken by this Draft Local Plan.	NA
0280	Dorset CPRE	NE1	The enhancement of protected and promotion of conservation of watercourses welcomed. Glover review of landscapes suggest enhancing natural assets of the three towns would be important for developing a 'sense of place'. Local plan will need to respect 'bigger picture' (involving both DC and BCP councils) to ensure development in both areas are symbiotic not parasitic both commuting and urban sprawl not being deliberate features of planning.	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0292	WH White	NE1	Support NE1	Support	Yes	No action	Support noted	NA
0307	Trustees of the Meyrick 1970 Settlement	NE1	Not legally compliant with Reg 63(1) of Habs Regs. Functional linkage of Christchurch Harbour to River Avon SAC not considered. Sustainability Appraisal fails to deal with Christchurch Harbour from Habitats perspective and the Habs Reg Assessment fails to note its functional linkage River Avon SAC Nothing in the plan analyses impact of development on Christchurch Harbour SSSI which comprises the estuary of the Stour and Avon and the Hengistbury Head peninsula, has varied habitats including saltmarsh, wet meadows, grassland, heath, sand dune, woodland and scrub and is of great ornithological interest. This a highly relevant in terms of the Solent and Dorset Coast SPA, degradation of salt marsh in Christchurch Harbour and its functional linkage to tern habitats. Not properly considered for screening in respect of 'in-combination' effects. Accordingly, until screening is undertaken, the precautionary principle indicates it is appropriate for the Local Plan to introduce a protective policy for Christchurch Harbour analogous to that for Poole Harbour. Precautionary principle not applied. HRA screened out further assessment of the SPA but reasons given do not address issue of tern's ability to forage in algae-filled water. The failure to address the functional linkage of Christchurch Harbour with national site network (including River Avon SAC, Solent and Dorset Coast SPA). Therefore, the HRA Report is defective and the plan is not sound No policy to address implications of development for Christchurch Harbour. Any examination of the environmental health of the harbour and its functionable linkage to the River Avon SAC and SPA should also include River Stour. The Harbour is a transit, habitat and feeding site. Policy fails as no Christchurch Harbour policy to take strategic approach to maintaining habitat networks; and failure to safeguard or promote net gains for linked functional habitat.	Objection	Yes	No action	Christchurch Harbour is not a habitat site and therefore not covered by the Habitats Regulations. The River Avon SAC is designated for its freshwater habitat where nutrient enrichment has an adverse impact and so differs markedly from the harbour saltwater environs. Natural England has not provided advice that there is a potential adverse impact upon terns feeding in the Solent and Dorset Coast SPA.	NA
0456	Highcliffe & Walkford Parish Council	NE1	Support	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0511	Dorset Local Nature Partnership	NE1	Policy does not highlight the urgency of the climate and ecological emergency - need to restore and recover first, and then enhance.	Objection	No	No action	The current wording aligns with the NPPF. Opportunities to restore sites will of course be sought.	NA
0539	Dorset Local Access Forum	NE1	Support requirements for developers to demonstrate a positive impact on the environment as laid out in Strategic Policy NE1: Natural Environment.	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0571	Home Builders Federation	NE1	Will be unclear how developers to know what is required to comply with policy. Conflict with national legislation, guidance and advice as some development is exempt from BNG. No need for plan to repeat national BNG guidance.	Objection	Yes	No action	Policy is an overarching strategic policy with details within other policies. BNG policy to be modified to reflect evolving national requirements	NA
0614	National Trust	NE1	Support. Could go further to ensure developments have a long lasting positive impact on natural environment and not just short term gains required.	Support with changes	No	No action	Support noted, time frames for elements of the policy addressed in more detail as part of the policies within the chapter	NA
0511	Dorset Local Nature Partnership	Para 6.12	Organisation name incorrect.	Support with changes	No	Modification	Amend Urban Heaths Partnership to 'Dorset Heaths Partnership' following recent rebranding.	Amend to 'Dorset Heaths Partnership' in para 6.12.
0158	New Forest National Park Authority	Para 6.13-6.16	New Forest District Council open to working with BCP and Natural England to monitor air quality impacts.	Comment		No action	Welcome the support for joint working on this issue.	NA

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0254	New Forest District Council NFDC	Para 6.13-6.16	Questions why specific air quality and habitat monitoring is not required. Taking the Strategic Transport Assessment as the basis for gauging impacts on the integrity of the Dorset heathlands could possibly insufficient. NFDC happy to share discuss methodology for monitoring and support monitoring mitigation measures.	Support with changes		No action	Support noted. As part of the HRA work for the Draft Local Plan we need to prepare an air quality model to enable developers to input their data and ensure mitigation is effectively delivered. We will engage with NFDC when we review and update the current Dorset Heathlands Air Quality Strategy 2020-2025 later in the year. The proposed model will provide baseline data and we will meet to discuss next steps with NFDC shortly.	NA
0040	Natural England	Para 6.15	Change will to may in first sentence as not all applicants will need such an assessment. Could add an indicative threshold.	Support with changes		Modification	Make amendments to address air quality	Change will to 'may' in Para 6.15 regarding project level assessments and update paras 6.14-6.15 about air quality modelling work currently in progress.
0280	Dorset CPRE	Para 6.18	6.18 not sound strategy and doesn't go far enough – need to ensure no additional waste water pollution	Objection	Yes	No action	The local plan goes as far as required under the habitats regulations in ensuring new development in the Poole Harbour catchment is nitrogen neutral.	NA
0040	Natural England	Para 6.18	Update after anticipated Government announcement on nutrient neutrality requirements.	Support with changes		Modification	The government announcement on 24 May 2024 and subsequent letter from Natural England confirmed that development will not be required to provide phosphorous mitigation in Poole Harbour. Para 6.18 will be amended.	Update Para 6.19 with new information from government about nutrient neutrality.
0164	Environment Agency	Para 6.18 – 6.21	Suggest revisions to text regarding nutrients	Support with changes		Modification	The government announcement on 24 May 2024 and subsequent letter from Natural England confirmed that development will not be required to provide phosphorous mitigation in Poole Harbour. Para 6.18 will be amended.	Update Para 6.19 with new information from government about nutrient neutrality.
0020	RSPB	Para 6.19	Typo. Should read 'the adverse..'	Support		Modification	Correct typo	Correct typo of 'the' in para 6.19.
0254	New Forest District Council NFDC	Para 6.27-6.28	This section will need to be updated once the secondary legislation in April (2024) provides clarity on whether the Christchurch treatment works are named in the latest nutrient calculator updates/guidance.	Support with changes		Modification	Agree. Text requires updating to reflect the government announcement on 24 May 2024 confirming that Christchurch Waste Water Treatment works will be required to install phosphate stripping measures from 2030 to reduce the limit to 0.25mg/l. The current operation assumption of 5.1mg/l has now been confirmed formally by Natural England as the current requirement to 2030.	Update para 6.29 with new information from government about nutrient neutrality.
0040	Natural England	Para 6.29	Update after anticipated Government announcement on nutrient neutrality requirements.	Support with changes		Modification	Support noted. Para 6.29 requires updating to reflect the government announcement on 24 May 2024 confirming that Christchurch Waste Water Treatment works will be required to install phosphate stripping measures from 2030 to reduce the limit to 0.25mg/l. The current operation assumption of 5.1mg/l has now been confirmed formally by Natural England as the current requirement to 2030.	Update para 6.29 with new information from government about nutrient neutrality.
0158	New Forest National Park Authority	Para 6.30-6.32	Supports the inclusion of wording in the Plan setting out the requirement for new residential development within the 13.8km 'zone of influence' of the New Forest's internationally designated sites to mitigate recreational impacts. Suggest other forms of new overnight accommodation are referenced in addition to residential.	Support		Modification	Agree, tourism accommodation should be added.	Para 6.32 amended to reference tourism accommodation
0020	RSPB	Para 6.35	Highlights paragraphs need renumbering.	Support		Modification	Agree. Correct para number errors.	Update paragraph numbering to ensure it reads 6.35, 6.36 and 6.37
0040	Natural England	NE2	Support, subject to reference to New Forest SAC and certainty provided that current mitigation strategies will be updated.	Support with changes		No action	Support noted. New Forest SAC is covered in detail in the policy. We are committed to updating the SPDs during 2024/25 and include text to this effect in paras 6.7, 6.16, 6.21 and 6.23.	NA
0079	The Society for Poole	NE2	Reference to mitigation is unsound as disregards need to reduce nutrient loadings in Poole Harbour. Under vision and objectives it is suggested that: Reference to nutrient 'neutrality' regarding protection of Poole Harbour protected sites is regretted, Nutrient reduction now necessary to halt continuing growth of de-oxygenating algal mats.	Support with changes		No action	The Council has operated a successful nutrient mitigation strategy for Poole Harbour since 2017 and the issue is well known. Neutral neutrality is already included in the Local Plan objectives.	NA
0082	Christchurch Harbour Ornithological Group	NE2	Concern current mitigation strategies about to run out, lack of clarity if mitigation and SANGS can be put in place.	Objection		No action	The mitigation strategies will be updated in 2024/25 but remain relevant even if they expire otherwise development would not take place. The HRA has not identified any concerns with the growth proposed and mitigation currently available or that can be delivered through the mitigation strategy.	NA
0158	New Forest National Park Authority	NE2	Support NE2. Footprint Ecology research reports (2020 – 2024) into the recreational impacts from new development on the New Forest's designated sites represent the best available evidence for HRA purposes and therefore we consider Policy NE2 and supporting text to be fully justified for legal compliance.	Support		No action	Support noted.	NA
0225	Dorset Council	NE2	The Councils operate a joint nutrient mitigation strategy for Poole Harbour catchment. To align with Natural England's advice, the approach needs to change to shift the onus onto developers to secure mitigation rather than to rely on the councils to deliver.	Support	Yes	No action	Support noted. The joint strategy to date has been very successful, but to align with the rest of the country requires a change in approach as set out in para 6.21.	NA

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0245	Miller Homes and Bellway Homes (Wessex)	NE2	Support, but supporting text should be modified to encourage delivery of bespoke HIPS, and, where possible, integrate these with SANGs and strategic HIPS.	Objection	Yes	No action	Bespoke HIPs are welcomed with new development, but not a requirement due to land ownership issues within the urban area. Greenfield sites would be expected to provide bespoke HIPs and this would be set out in the policy as omission sites around the BCP area will have complex habitats regulations issues to avoid or mitigate. Bespoke HIPs are encouraged by para 4.21 of the ONE1a Dorset Heathlands Planning Framework SPD but as stated are not required within this urban focussed Local Plan.	NA
0250	East Dorset Friends of the Earth	NE2	Generally support policy. It is not acknowledged that any net increase in residential development within plan area will have an adverse impact on the Dorset Heathlands when setting housing targets. Other uses (not just housing tourism) should be included in heathlands policy given impacts. Mitigation (such as SAMMs) are a poor substitute for a robust policy of protection. "Exceptional circumstances" (B b.) are rare - should be specified in the policy.	Support with changes		No action	The policy reflects the main uses that cause adverse impacts. The SPD provides additional detail of specific housing and tourism uses and any exceptions.	NA
0251	Bloor Homes Southern	NE2	Lack of clarity about the quantity of mitigation required to support delivery. Large strategic sites in single ownership such as Bere Farm / Lychett Minster in Dorset Council area can offer mitigation.	Objection	yes	No action	Heathland mitigation cannot be quantified as the strategy is to change behaviour over generations and a strategic Council led approach helps direct development to the least sensitive areas and provide mitigation to avoid adverse effects. CIL is used to provide mitigation on urban sites so there is no cost to the developer. Allocating mitigation sites in a local plan does not work as it raises the hope value of land making development unviable. We welcome the opportunity to discuss potential mitigation options with any private landowner as highlighted by para 4.21 of the ONE1a Dorset Heathlands Planning Framework SPD. However promoted SANGs are invariably accompanied by large scale housing development requiring Green Belt release which is not the strategy taken by this Draft Local Plan.	NA
0001	Cranborne Chase National Landscape	NE2	Highlight the duty to further the statutory purposes of Protected Landscapes and this includes maintaining the darkness of skies in Cranborne Chase, the Local Plan should mitigate and reduce light pollution in BCP and more detail needed on how this should be achieved.	Comment		Modification	Agree, a new paragraph is needed to highlight the national landscapes.	Add new para after 6.78 about national landscapes.
0020	RSPB	NE2	Policy supported although unclear why not identified as a strategic policy given the importance of the natural environment within BCP. Part Ba should include reference to irreplaceable habitats (including those listed e.g. ancient woodland).	Support with changes		Modification	Agree. Identifying NE2 as a strategic policy. Irreplaceable habitats should already be included in the list of sites in B(a) without need for specific reference.	Rename Policy NE2 as a Strategic Policy.
0038	PO4	NE2	Policy and explanatory text needs amending to be sound and reflect issues identified by Natural England regarding nutrient neutrality issues. Para 6.29 unnecessary and likely to be out of date by adoption and suggests deleting. Suggests amending para 6.28 to include wording "within BCP" as there may be more opportunity for mitigation upstream outside of BCP. NE2(3) does not reflect advice by Natural England. Other developments may impact Poole Harbour or other protected sites and need to demonstrate nutrient neutrality. Suggest deleting "for any net increase in residential dwellings, tourist accommodation or a tourist attraction" from the policy.	Objection	Yes	Modification	Agree to suggested clarification to para 6.28. Para 6.29 requires updating to reflect the government announcement on 24 May 2024 confirming that Christchurch Waste Water Treatment works will be required to install phosphate stripping measures from 2030 to reduce the limit to 0.25mg/l. The current operation assumption of 5.1mg/l has now been confirmed formally by Natural England as the current requirement to 2030. Reference to types of use is critical to ensure applicants understand mitigation is necessary.	Update para 6.29 with new information from government about nutrient neutrality.
0254	New Forest District Council NFDC	NE2	Welcome section on habitat sites and New Forest Habitats. Policy NE2 is positive and sets out a clear need for mitigation. NFDC reiterates that it will be happy to continue with and expand upon cross boundary working on this issue.	Support		No action	Support noted. BCP Council will continue to engage with NFDC to ensure our mitigation strategies and projects align.	NA
0258	Royal London Mutual Insurance Society Ltd	NE2	Royal London notes that the proposed development on the Former Belvedere site would comply criteria 1 and 4 of the policy via a unilateral undertaking or S106.	Objection	No	No action	Support noted	NA
0268	Talbot Village Trust	NE2	Support	Support		No action	Support noted	NA

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0271	Highwood Group	NE2	No calculation of quantity of mitigation necessary to mitigate impacts provided, and lack of certainty regarding strategic delivery as no sites allocated for this - policy unsound. Not clear what 'other mitigation measures' are - could have significant impact on development viability and reduce deliverability. The water recycling centre will be upgraded and how this will be funded needs to be set out. Revision also required as mitigation on per developer basis not required if Government position updated. Further plan level assessment recommended prior to adoption to confirm plan will not adversely effect Habitats sites due to air quality. Strategic mitigation should be outlined in next iteration of existing Dorset Heathlands Interim Air Quality Strategy. Any future SPD regarding air quality should set out requirements for reduction in emissions and mitigation. Urban Greening Design Guide referenced should be clearly identified so can determine whether policy justified. Food growing criterion to be revised to ensure development is feasible and policy is not too onerous.	Objection	Yes	No action	Heathland mitigation cannot be quantified as the strategy is to change behaviour over generations and a strategic Council led approach helps direct development to the least sensitive areas and provide mitigation to avoid adverse effects. CIL is used to provide mitigation on urban sites so there is no cost to the developer. Allocating mitigation sites in a local plan does not work as it raises the hope value of land making development unviable. The Council will shortly provide an update to the examination and propose updates to the local plan text to around water quality measures following the government announcement on 24 May 2024. Air Quality issues are also being modelled as follow on work to the CAT1c 2022 Transport Modelling Report and will be presented to the examination. An update to the HRA will be necessary before adoption. The Urban Greening Design Guide is currently in draft form and can be provided to the examination to provide confidence that the policy is justified and not onerous. The requirement for food growing is a 'should' not a must, so there will be circumstances where it may not be feasible.	NA
0272	Christchurch Harbour & Marine Society	NE2	Habitats Regulations Assessment fails to deal with Christchurch Harbour by failing to note its functional linkage with River Avon SAC, the impact of nutrients on the feeding ground for terns protected by the Solent and Dorset Coast SPA, nor the SSSI status. River Avon - Add text to policy to say that avoidance/mitigation measures should also consider the functional linkage of the River Avon SAC with Christchurch Harbour. Provision of Mitigation – add text to say some development will be required to mitigate adverse impact on Christchurch Harbour and its functional relationship with the UK national site network and its status as SSSI.	Objection	Yes	No action	Following discussion with Natural England the suggestions are not necessary.	NA
0274	Christchurch Environmental Management	NE2	Approach to Dorset Heathlands is enshrined in Local Plans and in the Dorset Heathlands Planning Framework SPD. The strategy is complex, and its interpretation has varied. Support a co-ordinated and conurbation-wide approach to SANG provision and heathland mitigation. Welcome commitment to protecting Dorset Heaths and environmental objectives of the Plan. The issue remains however as to the robustness of the local plan strategy and policy which underpins this objective. Concerns with the effectiveness and lawfulness of the heathland mitigation strategy. These concerns around aspirations and approach, governance, lack of consistency in standards, in-perpetuity provision, funding, prompt provision, monitoring and accountability, local authority monopoly and consequent unmanaged conflicts of interest, the fragility of the program, its vulnerability to legal challenge. Confusion as to the thresholds upon which SANG will be required, with a "policy threshold" of 50 dwellings, but variable application requirements. Broad range of projects which have fallen within Heathland Infrastructure Projects (HIP). No evidence of monitoring strategy.	Objection		No action	The Dorset Heathland mitigation strategy is highly effective since its 2007 inception enabling development to take place with suitable avoidance / mitigation measures in place. The strategy focuses on changing behaviour over generations. A long term analysis of the strategy was completed in 2022 (see doc ref ONE2) highlighting the successful approach adopted that includes a combination of public and private sector mitigation. Mechanisms may best be addressed as part of the update to the ONE1a Dorset Heathlands Planning Framework SPD in 2024/25, including the threshold. The Council is of the view that only developments requiring the release of greenfield land with a wider land ownership should have to provide HIPs owing to the built up nature of the BCP area.	NA
0235	Wyatt Homes	NE2	Reserve right to be heard if council do not provide/support appropriate main modification to reflect changed government/natural England position on Christchurch WwTW catchment. Supporting text not consistent with policy regarding as seeks necessary mitigation secured before validation - unjustified unnecessary financial burden at early stage.	Objection	Yes	Modification	Para 6.29 requires updating to reflect the government announcement on 24 May 2024 confirming that Christchurch Waste Water Treatment works will be required to install phosphate stripping measures from 2030 to reduce the limit to 0.25mg/l. The current operation assumption of 5.1mg/l has now been confirmed formally by Natural England as the current requirement to 2030.	Update para 6.29 with new information from government about nutrient neutrality.
0280	Dorset CPRE	NE2	NE2.2. Poole Harbour – does not go far enough the policy needs to do more to ensure no additional pollution is generated by development. Policy should be more ambitious and seek to improve the precious marine environment through policies aimed at reducing all current pollution levels.	Objection	Yes	No action	Development is only required by the habitat regulations to be nutrient neutral and thereby not undermine other measures outside of planning that aim to bring habitat sites back to favourable status.	NA
0290	Meyrick Estate Management	NE2	Council has monopoly on heathland related mitigation functions. HRA stage 1 and 2 don't establish whether current/previous mitigation has been effective and MEM considers current mitigation is not effective yet needs to be proven by Council. Housing delivery vulnerable to challenge and raised number of issues regarding mitigation. Mitigation not fit for purpose and needs reform. Should not be used as alternative means to fund countryside.	Objection	Yes	No action	The Dorset Heathland mitigation strategy is highly effective since its 2007 inception enabling development to take place with suitable avoidance / mitigation measures in place. The strategy focuses on changing behaviour over generations. A long term analysis of the strategy was completed in 2022 (see doc ref ONE2) highlighting the successful approach adopted that includes a combination of public and private sector mitigation. Mechanisms may best be addressed as part of the update to the ONE1a Dorset Heathlands Planning Framework SPD in 2024/25, including the threshold.	NA
0292	WH White	NE2	Features of nature conservation/biodiversity interest are poorly defined, overly prohibitive.	Objection	Yes	No action	With mandatory requirements to deliver 10% biodiversity net gain, retaining interest features on site must be the priority and unnecessary loss avoided except in exceptional circumstances.	NA

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0297	Sir Christopher Chope MP	NE2	Considers the plan is silent of phosphate issues in the River Avon and suggests Council should override Natural England advice to proceed with building new housing development. No current proposals to reduce levels acceptable to Natural England and most emanate from upstream and cannot be reduced by Council.	Objection		No action	Phosphates issues are addressed in policy NE2.	NA
0304	Sovereign Network Group SNG	NE2	SNG request more flexibility within the 400m heathland consultation area to update existing stock, which may involve a slight increase in units, yet maintain the same number of habitable rooms.	Objection		No action	The strategy of managing development within 400m of the heathland is well established (since 2007) and necessary to avoid adverse impacts on the heathland.	NA
0307	Trustees of the Meyrick 1970 Settlement	NE2	A3. River Avon - Add text to policy to say that avoidance/mitigation measures should also consider the functional linkage of the River Avon SAC with Christchurch Harbour. A5. Provision of Mitigation – add text to say some development will be required to mitigate adverse impact on Christchurch Harbour and its functional relationship with the UK national site network and its status as SSSI	Objection	Yes	No action	Following discussion with Natural England the suggestions are not necessary.	NA
0456	Highcliffe & Walkford Parish Council	NE2	Support	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0511	Dorset Local Nature Partnership	NE2	Local authorities have strengthened biodiversity duty through The Environment Act 2021. Policy wording not strong enough in requiring net gain in biodiversity, and open to interpretation. Recommend removing 'where relevant' and replace with 'all' new development.	Objection	No	No action	We use 'where relevant' as some development such as change of use or new windows would not be relevant.	NA
0539	Dorset Local Access Forum	NE2	Support the protection of habitats and species in Policy NE2: Habitats sites and wildlife sites.	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0614	National Trust	NE2	Support Dorset Heathland Planning Framework SPD, Nitrogen Reduction in Poole Harbour SPD and the Poole Harbour Recreation SPD and their application. Policy should cross-refer to Local Nature Recovery Strategy to ensure that proposed developments contribute or make improvements to sites and habitats identified.	Objection	No	No action	Local Nature Recovery Strategy discussed in the supporting text	NA
0447	Poole Quays Forum	NE2	Para 5d - typo's, contribution should be secured by 106 planning condition to cover this	Comment		Modification	Correct typos. Criteria 5d already sets out that contributions can be secured to provide for mitigation where CIL is exempt.	Amend typos in NE2 (5)d.
0071	Goadsby on behalf of various clients	NE2	Ecological networks not based on evidence, the DLNP maps has been misapplied to the process, includes almost all land not developed, not allocated and in agricultural use	Objection	Yes	No action	BCP Council have used the DLNP work to inform the ecological networks defined in the local plan. Any review will be informed by the forthcoming LNRS mapping.	NA
0292	WH White	Para 6.38-6.49	Stour valley park should be highlighted. Interim arrangements are welcome.	Comment	Yes	No action	There could be a number of projects relevant to the LNRS and it is not considered necessary to highlight the Stour Valley Park. This initiative is covered by a separate policy.	NA
0195	Christchurch Town Council Neighbourhood Plan Working Group	Para 6.39	Local communities can highlight potential mitigation areas through neighbourhood plans which could be referenced here.	Support with changes		No action	It is not considered necessary to highlight potential neighbourhood plan activities in every relevant section, although this does not preclude neighbourhood plans exploring these issues.	NA
0511	Dorset Local Nature Partnership	Para 6.42	Reference could be made to the Stour Valley river corridor project area as an example.	Support with changes	No	No action	Not necessary to mention here, the project is discussed in detail later in the chapter.	NA
0511	Dorset Local Nature Partnership	NE3	Support principle of policy, but separate action required for specific species such as swifts and bats as part of delivering BNG - these things are not delivered through BNG itself.	Objection	No	Modification	Amend text of policy and supporting text to reflect need for biodiversity enhancements for all development	Amend NE3 2 to read "All applications for development, including those that are exempt from mandatory Biodiversity Net Gain, should provide onsite habitats and species enhancements in accordance with the biodiversity guidance note" to make it clear that biodiversity habitat and species enhancements outside of statutory BNG will be required. Additional supporting text added at para 6.49 to specify the types of biodiversity enhancements including swift bricks/boxes "This can be achieved through measures such as the incorporation of bird and bat bricks or boxes and bee bricks into the design of buildings and sites, and through leaving small holes in fences to create hedgehog highways"



ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0020	RSPB	NE3	Para 6.47 habitat created/enhanced should be secured/maintained for lifetime of development, not minimum 30 years. Otherwise, no certainty new habitat areas will offset habitat impact of development. Policy is welcomed and supported, especially requirement to align with LNRS.	Support with changes		No action	Support noted	NA
0040	Natural England	NE3	Support	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0079	The Society for Poole	NE3	Policy NE3 is sound and effective in serving the public interest.	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0082	Christchurch Harbour Ornithological Group	NE3	Support NE3	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0195	Christchurch Town Council Neighbourhood Plan Working Group	NE3	Add neighbourhood plans to policy as they can have a role in this subject area.	Support with changes		No action	It is not considered necessary to highlight potential neighbourhood plan activities in every relevant section, although this does not preclude neighbourhood plans exploring these issues.	NA
0225	Dorset Council	NE3	Dorset Council is working to put in place an off site mechanism to deliver BNG in Dorset, which could be offered to BCP urban sites.	Support	Yes	No action	Support noted. We are working on our own off-site BNG arrangements within the BCP area, but note Dorset Council's offer.	NA
0258	Royal London Mutual Insurance Society Ltd	NE3	Support principle of policy. For clarity 10 net gain should align with national policy. 10% net gain can be provided on the Belvedere site.	Objection	No	No action	Support noted	NA
0268	Talbot Village Trust	NE3	Support	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0292	WH White	NE3	Support policy NE3	Support	Yes	No action	Support noted	NA
0304	Sovereign Network Group SNG	NE3	Support BNG, further guidance needed on achieving site habitat creation and enhancement where this will impact on housing numbers and densities.	Support with changes		No action	Support noted	NA
0456	Highcliffe & Walkford Parish Council	NE3	Support	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0539	Dorset Local Access Forum	NE3	Support 10% net gain in biodiversity in Policy NE3: Biodiversity.	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0245	Miller Homes and Bellway Homes (Wessex)	NE3	Basis of policy supported, but biodiversity hierarchy to be set out more clearly - avoid, mitigate and, as last resort, compensate, and then enhance. This should set the structure of the Policy. Support requirement for development 'to link into the existing ecological network where appropriate and take opportunities to expand and connect with existing wildlife sites'	Objection	Yes	Modification	Consider modification in the context of a policy update to reflect latest BNG guidance and experience of implementation, and to more clearly reference the biodiversity hierarchy.	Add changes to biodiversity gain hierarchy in para 6.43 and Policy NE3 (1).
0358	Wiltshire Swifts, & Salisbury & Wilton Swifts	NE3	Ecological enhancements for birds on larger sites are not included in BNG, and therefore not covered in policy or accounted for in any instance. A separate policy is needed to ensure BCP biodiversity guidance is taken in to account for all development sizes. 10% net biodiversity gain is too low, should be more ambitious.	Objection	No	Modification	Agree, need for biodiversity enhancements for all development.	Amend NE3 2 and 6.49 to reflect need for biodiversity enhancements for all development.
0363	Hampshire Swifts	NE3	Support Policy NE3, but it does not cover biodiversity enhancements that fall outside BNG. BCP biodiversity guidance note covers these, but it would only apply to developments exempt from BNG. Policy to ensure swift bricks in all development, in line with NPPG Natural Environment para 019.	Objection	No	Modification	Agree, need for biodiversity enhancements for all development.	Amend NE3 2 and 6.49 to reflect need for biodiversity enhancements for all development.
0532	Swifts Local Network: Swifts & Planning Group	NE3	Considers NE3 to be unsound as does not consider NPPG para 23 and swift bricks which are excluded from DEFRA Biodiversity Net Gain Metric.	Objection	Yes	Modification	Agree, need for biodiversity enhancements for all development.	Amend NE3 2 and 6.49 to reflect need for biodiversity enhancements for all development.
0544	Nicholas Windibank	NE3	Welcome policy but ineffective and inconsistent with national policy as does not consider biodiversity or enhancements outside scope of BNG - building-dependent species and swift bricks, which BCP Biodiversity Guidance Note considers but only applies to BNG exempt development. Urgently need to protect endangered/rapidly declining red listed species through national policy implementation.	Objection	No	Modification	Agree, need for biodiversity enhancements for all development.	Amend NE3 2 and 6.49 to reflect need for biodiversity enhancements for all development.

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0571	Home Builders Federation	NE3	Plan should clarify applications for development on large sites before 12.02.24, on small sites 02.04.24, and subsequential detailed applications relating to already approved outlines not required to deliver mandatory BNG. Significantly more information, assessments and analysis around BNG and viability required to support plan (particularly allocations). Council should not deviate from fixed 10% BNG requirement set out in Environment Act (opposed to referring to "at least 10%"). Clarity required that 10% must be delivered at the end of development, not for each phase (in a phased development on large, complex sites). Significant costs of BNG, some of which are unknown and relate to financial and land take, must be considered as part of whole plan viability assessment (rather than combined into generic S106 costs item), using most up-to-date costs available. Must not prevent, delay or reduce housing delivery. May impact achievable densities if required to provide on site. Costs figures must be kept under review as BNG implementation progresses, as is new policy area and off site provision market and statutory credits unknown. Policy needs to say more about Local Nature Reserve Strategies (LNRS) – plan to be kept under review and public consultation on interaction between two documents may be required. BNG requirements should be considered in relation to allocations, involving a baseline assessment to understand BNG requirements and implications on viability and other policy requirements and considerations (such as affordable housing and S106 asks). Clarification required in policy and supporting text to avoid confusion between established mitigation hierarchy and BNG hierarchy and to explain how they work. Plan could reference small sites metric. Requirement for on-site to be on land not used for housing may impact suitable densities and require allocation of larger sites.	Objection	Yes	Modification	The details of BNG implementation and processes, and how they differ depending on the type and scale of application, are set out within legislation and government guidance so does not need to be repeated within the local plan. Local Biodiversity Guidance will be updated to reflect changes in legislation. Amend para 6.43 to provide better clarity of relationship between mitigation hierarchy and biodiversity gain hierarchy. The reference to 'at least 10%' does not conflict with the mandatory minimum requirement of 10% net gain in biodiversity. Where developers wish to and are able to provide more than 10% gain, this should not be discouraged. The role and relationship of the Local Nature Recovery Strategy with the local plan will be reviewed and amendments to policy/guidance made to reflect this as appropriate. The BNG figures used for the viability assessment were taken from the government's 'Biodiversity Net Gain and Local Nature Recovery Strategies: Impact Assessment'. This is the most up to date information that was available due to BNG only recently becoming mandatory. More detailed assessment in relation to BNG for allocated sites will form part of planning applications as the sites come forward.	Add changes to biodiversity gain hierarchy in para 6.43 and Policy NE3 (1).
0250	East Dorset Friends of the Earth	NE3	Adequate, but insufficiently ambitious to ensure existing habitats/species sufficiently protected. Lacks criteria to enable measurement of impacts of development or set enhancement goals. Does not appear to consider the impacts on species/habitats generated by proximate development (noise, air pollution etc.)	Objection		No action	Criteria to protect habitats and species set out in policy NE2. BNG is mandatory and the 10% uplift in biodiversity must be met. The Council is required to report back to government on the number of BNG sites and their success at regular intervals so this will be monitored.	NA
0225	Dorset Council	Fig 6.6	Support Stour Valley Park project. Suggest adding wording to local plan that the boundaries in Dorset have not been defined and agreed in respect of Figure 6.6 and the Policies Map, or alternatively remove park from the Dorset area.	Support with changes		Modification	Support noted. Amend to reference boundaries are illustrative.	Clarify boundaries of the Stour Valley Park project are illustrative in Para 6.79 and Figure 6.6.
0195	Christchurch Town Council Neighbourhood Plan Working Group	Para 6.61	Can neighbourhood plans contribute to the focus map? Where is it?	Comment		No action	The map has been prepared as part of the Green Infrastructure Strategy	NA
0040	Natural England	Para 6.63	Refer to the priority to plant native locally sourced species which are appropriate to the local conditions and in particular the Right Tree in the Right Place approach.	Support with changes		Modification	Amend to reference locally sourced species	Reference locally sourced species in para 6.65.
0511	Dorset Local Nature Partnership	Para 6.63	Support reference to tree value, but need to enhance with importance in mitigating climate change, and importance as a corridor and stepping stone, as per para 136 of NPPF.	Objection	No	Modification	Amend paragraph 6.63 to include reference to the contribution that trees make to mitigating climate change and forming ecological corridors	Add importance of trees to para 6.63.
0195	Christchurch Town Council Neighbourhood Plan Working Group	Para 6.66	Can neighbourhood plans help identify projects for off-site urban greening mitigation opportunities	Comment		No action	This section is discussing on site tree planting and urban greening	NA
0258	Royal London Mutual Insurance Society Ltd	NE4	Belvedere site can be delivered in accordance with GI principles. Consider that P.NE4 sub-section 4 for tree canopy cover is in many cases is unrealistic due to site constraints and caveats are needed to ensure the policy can be found sound.	Objection	No	No action	NE4 4.iii. provides an option to agree an alternative canopy cover percentage where there are ecological, historical, landscape or operational reasons that justify not meeting the canopy requirements to account for the fact that 10% may not always be appropriate to account for the fact that 10% may not always be appropriate or feasible.	NA
0020	RSPB	NE4	Welcome and support 'Green Net' proposals to enable visitors and local people have access to green spaces and protect and enhance the green network and Green Net Plan (Fig 6.5) Welcome para 6.57 which recognises the importance of the green network for wildlife and mitigating recreational disturbance on habitats. Also welcome recognition of need to build urban greening into site design.	Support		No action	Support noted	NA

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0039	Ropemaker properties	NE4	More detail needed on how urban greening factor calculated, the Urban Greening Guide needs to be viewed to allow comment on the policy. Flexibility needed to allow for increased urban greening as appose to tree canopy cover in some instances.	Support with changes		No action	Further guidance is being prepared and this follows the process set out in the Natural England guidance.	NA
0040	Natural England	NE4	Support	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0079	The Society for Poole	NE4	Policy NE4 is sound and effective in serving the public interest.	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0082	Christchurch Harbour Ornithological Group	NE4	Support NE4	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0112	Dorset Ramblers Countryside	NE4	Welcome recognition of cycle, wheeling, walking and public rights of way in Policy NE4.	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0222	Lok'nStore	NE4	Supports efforts to deliver improvements in natural capital via urban greening but consider a flexible approach might be appropriate in some locations such as Wessex Fields. Potential prospect of unintended tensions arising between intensification of site and respecting green infrastructure route adjacent.	Support with changes		No action	Support noted	NA
0226	Bournemouth Water / South West Water	NE4	Supportive of NE4, particularly paras 3 and 4. Supports aim for increasing the volume of retained water for reuse via water harvesting/recycling systems/SuDs and through proposed measures for mitigating the urban heat island effect, including the increase in tree canopy cover.	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0245	Miller Homes and Bellway Homes (Wessex)	NE4	Support	Objection	Yes	No action	Support noted	NA
0250	East Dorset Friends of the Earth	NE4	Not confident policy will be successful in light of planned growth and associated impacts. Alternative plan strategy required [see other comments]	Objection		No action	Comment noted	NA
0268	Talbot Village Trust	NE4	Support	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0273	Churchill Retirement Living	NE4	Costs of residential development achieving 0.4 urban greening factor not fully accounted for in viability assessment. Nominal amount included for each dwelling not sufficient. Will require green roofs and green walls - currently costly. Greater allowance required in viability appraisal. Not all trees can be retained - pragmatic approach required for brownfield development to enable optimal density/efficient use of land, and already addressed by BNG and green infrastructure requirements. 10% increase in tree cover will constrain sites, more flexibility required.	Objection		No action	Further guidance is being prepared and this follows the process set out in the Natural England guidance. Consider amendments to tree cover requirements to provide additional clarity.	NA
0292	WH White	NE4	Support approach, consider urban extensions such as Canford Garden Village would lend itself to the approach. Tension between smaller sites and the policy, density and viability.	Support	Yes	No action	Support noted	NA
0456	Highcliffe & Walkford Parish Council	NE4	Support	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0539	Dorset Local Access Forum	NE4	Supports Policy NE4: Green infrastructure but suggests amendments to ensuring that the improvements to routes.	Support with changes		No action	It is considered that the criteria is already clear and the extra provisions suggested are not required to add any further clarity.	NA
0614	National Trust	NE4	Support provision of infrastructure - inclusive access to nature/greenspace vital.	Support	No	No action	Support noted	NA
0175	Asda Stores Ltd	NE4	Source of 10% tree cover not apparent. Tree value not defined. More justification and clarity needed.	Objection		Modification	Supporting text amended at para 6.64 which refers to trees and woodland of value. 10% canopy cover target is from Urban Forest Strategy.	Refer to value of trees and woodland in para 6.64.
0176	Friends of the Elderly	NE4	Concerned requirements of policy could be too onerous in viability terms. NE 4-4 appears to protect all trees and increase tree cover. The Urban Greening Design Guide and Green Infrastructure Focus Map are not available for scrutiny as part of the evidence base. It is not clear how the 10% canopy cover requirement has been derived or is justified - the GI strategy refers to existing canopy cover of 19% and a target of 23%. The term "trees of value" is also not defined.	Objection	Yes	Modification	NE4 4.iii. provides an option to agree an alternative canopy cover percentage where there are ecological, historical, landscape or operational reasons that justify not meeting the canopy requirements to account for the fact that 10% may not always be appropriate to account for the fact that 10% may not always be appropriate or feasible. A draft urban greening design guide has been prepared and follows the principles of the the Natural England Green Infrastructure Framework. Suggested amendment to paragraph 6.64 to provide context for what could be considered to be a tree of value.	Refer to value of trees and woodland in para 6.64.

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0195	Christchurch Town Council Neighbourhood Plan Working Group	NE4	4.b. for street trees, may be helpful to add reference to not conflicting with adopted design guides/codes 5. not clear if the intention that the requirement for allotments should apply to all major developments	Support with changes		Modification	Amendments to 4b not considered necessary but amend wording to "5. Food growing" to clarify it relates to all new major developments	Clarify it is new major developments in Policy NE4 (5) for food growing.
0220	LGIM Real Assets	NE4	Supports principles of urban greening but objects to policy as consider 10% tree cover to be unrealistic for many brownfield sites whilst biodiversity net gain and planting may help to achieve similar benefits. Also considers local food growing opportunities is not realistic for brownfield and suggests food growing is enhanced through Council-led schemes.	Objection	No	Modification	The policy wording includes an option to agree an alternative percentage tree canopy cover where there are existing ecological, historical, landscape or operational reasons that justify not meeting the canopy requirements to account for the fact that 10% may not always be appropriate. The word 'existing' should be removed to reflect that there may also be new reasons for 10% canopy cover not being appropriate relevant to the proposed development. such as BNG requirements. It is not considered that seeking opportunities local food growing opportunities on brownfield sites is unrealistic.	Remove 'existing' from Trees section of Policy NE4.
0257	AFC Bournemouth	NE4	Support that training ground pitches and athletics stadium and associated running track are not shown within an Existing Ecological Network on the proposal maps. Concerned that the athletics field to the east of the track remains within the Existing Ecological Network, likely to be of limited ecological value. Could restrict ability to deliver new stadium facilities	Objection	Yes	Follow up	Will be discussed through a statement of common ground	
0071	Goadsby on behalf of various clients	NE4	Ecological network is identified without any evaluation as to its contribution to the network, there is no coherent approach, not underpinned by ecological surveys or appraisals, north Bournemouth is open grazed grassland not directly related to any nature conservation sites and should not be part of the network	Objection	Yes	No action	BCP Council have used the DLNP work to inform the ecological networks defined in the local plan. Any review will be informed by the forthcoming LNRS mapping.	NA
0223	Fortitudo Ltd	NE4	Unclear how urban greening requirement is assessed. Concerns for reducing housing to prioritise greening. Requiring a minimum of 10% tree canopy cover on urban site is not practical. Some sites could not provide this. Incorporating local food growing opportunities not practical in town centre, dense urban development.	Objection		No action	NE4 4.iii. provides an option to agree an alternative canopy cover percentage where there are ecological, historical, landscape or operational reasons that justify not meeting the canopy requirements to account for the fact that 10% may not always be appropriate to account for the fact that 10% may not always be appropriate or feasible.	NA
0233	University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust	NE4	Policy is too prescriptive in requiring a minimum of 10% tree canopy cover or a 10% uplift. May not be feasible in all circumstances, focus should be on quality green infrastructure.	Objection	Yes	No action	NE4 4.iii. provides an option to agree an alternative canopy cover percentage where there are ecological, historical, landscape or operational reasons that justify not meeting the canopy requirements to account for the fact that 10% may not always be appropriate to account for the fact that 10% may not always be appropriate or feasible.	NA
0270	McLaren Property	NE4	Supporting text should clarify which category (residential or non residential) purpose built student accommodation and co-living schemes would fall under when calculating the Urban Greening Factor Score.	Comment		No action	The draft Urban Greening Design Guide sets out the type of development that would be classed as predominantly residential. The list includes both student accommodation and co-living.	NA
0540	McCarthy Stone	NE4	10% tree canopy cover, particularly on small brownfield sites, undeliverable, unrealistic and compromises sustainable development contrary to NPPF. Any requirement would need to be fully evidenced and incorporated into viability study.	Objection	No	No action	NE4 4.iii. provides an option to agree an alternative canopy cover percentage where there are ecological, historical, landscape or operational reasons that justify not meeting the canopy requirements to account for the fact that 10% may not always be appropriate to account for the fact that 10% may not always be appropriate or feasible.	NA
0579	Richard Terry	NE4	Issues with existing ecological network - including at a early and incomplete stage, inconsistencies [examples at Muscliffe Lane, Careys Road and Holdenhurst area provided], appears to be due to table top examination without on site evaluation - prejudicing sites and potential additional sites. Many sites lost if higher potential network used. References to existing ecological network should be removed. Difficult to compare BCP plans and Dorset Local Network Partnership (DLNP) mapping. However, there are inconsistencies between them. Site H.1 falls within existing ecological network on DLNP mapping but not on BCP mapping - wider site unused for 30 years and is covered by vegetation, and must have function as part of ecological network so should not be a proposed housing site. Unclear why Poole Park and Harbourside Park not included in ecological network - must have function as part of ecological network	Objection	No	No action	BCP Council have used the DLNP work to inform the ecological networks defined in the local plan. Any review will be informed by the forthcoming LNRS mapping.	NA
0148	FCERM	Para 6.72	Spelling error	Support with changes		No action	Correct typo	NA
0148	FCERM	Para 6.73	Support statement	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0148	FCERM	NE5	Support references to flood and coastal risk policies and FCERM guidance note	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0250	East Dorset Friends of the Earth	NE5	Tourism growth not compatible with protection of coastline. Development likely to be short term as coastline will recede and beaches disappear, but will add to long term problems. Policy and tourism policies require revisiting.	Objection		No action	Beaches and coastline protected through current shoreline management plan	NA

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0272	Christchurch Harbour & Marine Society	NE5	Habitats Regulations Assessment fails to deal with Christchurch Harbour by failing to note its functional linkage with River Avon SAC, the impact of nutrients on the feeding ground for terns protected by the Solent and Dorset Coast SPA, nor the SSSI status. Suggest amending NE5 Coastline 1. to add new criterion, "e. demonstrate preserves and enhance the habitat, flora and fauna inhabiting or transiting Christchurch Harbour"	Objection		No action	Following discussion with Natural England the suggestions are not necessary.	NA
0292	WH White	NE5	No comment	Comment	Yes	No action	No comment	NA
0307	Trustees of the Meyrick 1970 Settlement	NE5	The policy fails to address the functional linkage of Christchurch Harbour with the national site network (including River Avon SAC, Solent and Dorset Coast SPA) and the implications of development for Christchurch Harbour. NE5 Coastline 1. should add after d., "e. demonstrate preserves and enhance the habitat, flora and fauna inhabiting or transiting Christchurch Harbour"	Objection		No action	Following discussion with Natural England the suggestions are not necessary.	NA
0334	Peter Fenning	NE5	No mention of important geological site which is Highcliffe to Milford Cliffs SSSI, as per info from Natural England. Friars Cliff is a key tertiary site.	Objection	No	No action	SSSIs are discussed in para 6.35 under other local wildlife sites and considered by policy NE2 and are mapped on the interactive mapping	NA
0447	Poole Quays Forum	NE5	Poole Quay and Harbour should be considered to be part of the Coastline	Objection		No action	The Quay and Harbour would be considered as part of the coastline and the harbour is specifically referenced in the supporting text.	NA
0456	Highcliffe & Walkford Parish Council	NE5	Support	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0020	RSPB	NE5	Part 3c not consistent with NE2. Any proposed boating, mooring or jetty needs to be assessed a) in relation to the National Sites Network through Habitats Regs tests which include test for adverse (and cumulative) impacts (not 'harm'), as well as mitigation test IROPI etc. ad b) in relation to qualifying SSSI features, as well as other features of local importance (as set out in NE2). Therefore objection to part 3c of the draft policy as worded	Objection		Modification	Agree, wording should be changed from "cause harm" to "lead to any adverse effects upon the integrity of habitats sites, either alone or in combination with other plans or projects" and "National Network Sites should be replaced by 'habitat sites' for consistency in terminology.	Update NE5 3c to refer to habitats sites
0040	Natural England	NE5	Refer to need to protect National Coast Path.	Support with changes		Modification	Agree add reference to the National Coast Path.	Refer to National Coast Path in Policy NE5 1.d
0112	Dorset Ramblers Countryside	NE5	Refer to protecting and enhancing Coast Path.	Support with changes		Modification	Agree add reference to the National Coast Path.	Refer to National Coast Path in Policy NE5 1.d
0282	Historic England	NE5	Policy should reference coastal heritage, heritage assets, archaeology and buried peat deposits.	Objection		Modification	Amend to reference coastal heritage	Refer to coastal heritage in Policy NE5 1.d
0614	National Trust	NE5	Support reference to protection of shoreline within Poole Harbour and at Sandbanks. No mention of Brownsea in supporting text (despite importance for harbour's setting, character and identity). Previously provided setting study to BCP Council. Experience/journey through Poole through to Island important for local economy, tourism and natural environment. Should set out relationships/links between various coastline sites and how they can benefit one another. Support protection of jetties and moorings (due to ownership of one, Brownsea Island operation, and support community access to nature). Continued support for this needed alongside consideration of any harm and or mitigation required.	Objection	No	Modification	Support noted. Agree text would benefit from modification to explain about islands in the harbour outside of the BCP area.	Amend para 6.69 to include the islands in Poole Harbour.
0292	WH White	Para 6.77-6.81	Spatial and visual characteristics of an area are relevant to the consideration of Green Belt openness but Green Belt does not bestow landscape quality. Concerned that Para 6.77 may be misinterpreted and suggest separating out references to Landscape Character Area Assessment and Green Belt into distinct paragraphs which could also reinforce paras 147 and 150 of the NPPF. Stour Valley Way more aspirational in absence of deliver mechanism needing links to emerging Dorset Nature Recovery Strategy and allocation of omission sites such as Canford Garden Village for joining up fragmented sections.	Support with changes	Yes	No action	The reference to Green Belt is simply to indicate that all proposals in the countryside will also have to meet NPPF Green Belt policy, even though it isn't a landscape quality policy.	NA
0511	Dorset Local Nature Partnership	Para 6.77	Green Belt designation does not bestow landscape quality. References to landscape character assessments alongside Green Belt may confuse this. Elements should be separated to reflect NPPF.	Objection	No	No action	The reference to Green Belt is simply to indicate that all proposals in the countryside will also have to meet NPPF Green Belt policy, even though it isn't a landscape quality policy.	NA
0614	National Trust	Para 6.77	Para. 6.77 should refer to Dorset National Landscape. Proposals that could impact setting of Dorset National Landscape need to be explored/assessed. Welcome NE6 part 2, but minor modifications required. Para. 6.79 to 6.81 could refer to funding and delivery mechanisms to clarify how Stour Valley Strategy is being developed and implemented.	Objection	No	Modification	Para 6.77 is about landscape in the BCP area, but agree greater reference should be made in supporting text to the national landscapes so a new paragraph will be added.	Add new para after 6.78 about national landscapes.
0020	RSPB	NE6	Support policy as worded	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0040	Natural England	NE6	Support	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0164	Environment Agency	NE6	Support policy	Support		No action	Support noted	NA

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0195	Christchurch Town Council Neighbourhood Plan Working Group	NE6	Could add reference to local landscape features and views identified through neighbourhood plans.	Support with changes		No action	It is not considered necessary to highlight potential neighbourhood plan activities in every relevant section, although this does not preclude neighbourhood plans exploring these issues.	NA
0245	Miller Homes and Bellway Homes (Wessex)	NE6	Support - objectives would be delivered by Kinson Manor Farm	Objection	Yes	No action	Support noted	NA
0250	East Dorset Friends of the Earth	NE6	Policy weak and ineffective given growth pressures. Having "regard to the landscape setting" lacks clarity - development should sympathetically reflect and enhance existing landscape. "Open character of the Dorset Heathlands" - denser, more polluting development should not impinge. Developers should pay full costs for required active management, enhancing and restoring species, soil and groundwater conditions, air quality, noise levels etc.. Increasing access can cause more erosion, fires and species loss.	Objection		No action	Policy is related to coast and countryside, specific impacts and mitigation for Dorset heathlands considered in policy NE2	NA
0267	Richborough Estates	NE6	Land proposed for SANG/open space/parkland partially falls within Land North of Townsend, which would positively contribute to Stour Valley project objectives.	Comment		No action	Comment noted	NA
0271	Highwood Group	NE6	Deliverability and associated costs for Stour Valley proposals unknown.	Objection	Yes	No action	Stour Valley business plan being prepared	NA
0292	WH White	NE6	Support the intent of policy but need to establish clear delivery mechanism for Stour Valley Park.	Support with changes	Yes	No action	Stour Valley business plan being prepared	NA
0456	Highcliffe & Walkford Parish Council	NE6	Support	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0473	Judy Windwood	NE6	Supports Stour Valley proposals as important green space. Supports greater access for cycling but should retain natural character and enhancement of biodiversity as per policy	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0539	Dorset Local Access Forum	NE6	Support reference to Stour Valley River Corridor and Policy NE6: Countryside. Question the suitability of the Stour Valley for SANG as not accessible for some parts of the year.	Objection		No action	Natural England have supported SANG within the Stour Valley and consider the times of year at risk of flooding coincide with the time periods where the heathlands are less sensitive to disturbance.	NA
0001	Cranborne Chase National Landscape	NE6	The term AONB remains in use in policy and legislation. Natural England provide advice for duty and avoiding harm to statutory purposes of protected landscapes, and further conservation and enhancement including avoiding and mitigating effects of development.	Comment		Modification	Make amendment to para 6.69 to include the term AONB alongside National Landscapes.	Clarify in para 6.69 and the Glossary that national landscape was formerly AONB.
0082	Christchurch Harbour Ornithological Group	NE6	Criteria in relation to Stour Valley Park Corridor Project are not aligned to the Stour Valley Strategy not reflecting the landscape led placemaking approach advocated. Section needs rewriting to reflect the strategy to explain the different approach. Policy approach is too narrow compared to the strategy. Unclear if application to whole river corridor, inappropriate to consider areas in Dorset Council. Clarity needed on the relationship with Dorset Council and the SANG approach.	Support with changes		Modification	Amend supporting text and policy to provide additional clarification	Expand para 6.81 and Policy NE5 about the Stour Valley Strategy.
0148	FCERM	NE6	Salt marsh should be referenced in relation to Stour Valley to support efforts to restore in Christchurch Harbour. Query whether evidence supporting previous applications relating to the Stour Valley will form part of the evidence base for this policy.	Support with changes		Modification	Amend 2.d. to reference salt marsh. The policy is supported by the Council's work on the Stour Valley Park Strategy.	Add salt marsh to Policy NE6 2(d).
0158	New Forest National Park Authority	NE6	Suggest that criteria d is strengthened to reference duties in relation to National Parks.	Support with changes		Modification	Agree the reference to the national park can be strengthened.	Amend reference to National Park in Policy NE6 1(d).
0225	Dorset Council	NE6	Support Stour Valley Park project. Suggest adding wording to local plan that the boundaries in Dorset have not been defined and agreed in respect of Figure 6.6 and the Policies Map, or alternatively remove park from the Dorset area.	Support with changes	Yes	Modification	Support noted. Add reference to the illustrative nature of the park boundaries	Clarify boundaries of the Stour Valley Park project are illustrative in Para 6.79 and Figure 6.6.
0257	AFC Bournemouth	NE6	Concerned the proposal map shows the Stour Valley River Corridor crossing the north east part of the AFCB training ground facility at Canford Magna. The training ground is a private facility which is not accessible to the public.	Objection	Yes	Modification	Agree the mapping can be amended	Amend boundary of Stour Valley River Corridor Project to remove AFCB Bournemouth.
0112	Dorset Ramblers Countryside	NE6	Welcome recognition of improvements to Stour Valley Way, Avon valley Way should be recognised.	Support with changes		No action	Stour Valley is referenced in policy due to the strategic project underway. No need to refer to Avon Valley Way.	NA
0292	WH White	Para 6.82-6.88	Difficult to see how the subregional greenspace and district greenspace requirements can be met without delivery of Stour Valley Park.	Comment	Yes	No action	There are no district/sub-regional greenspace requirements set for the BCP area. May be confusing this with Natural England's greenspace standards.	NA

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0195	Christchurch Town Council Neighbourhood Plan Working Group	Para 6.83	6.83 could include reference to green spaces identified and allocated as local green spaces in neighbourhood plans and whether this provides better protection (NE7b may not be sufficient).	Support with changes		Modification	Amend 6.83 to highlight some additional important open space/green spaces may be identified through neighbourhood plans	Clarify that neighbourhood plans can identify open/green spaces in para 6.83.
0595	Public Health Dorset	Para 6.84	Para. 6.84: add public toilets to list. Open space needs to be designed to accommodate needs of whole population (e.g. different age groups, ethnic groups etc) to comply with Policy S3 (d.).	Support with changes		Modification	Amend to list toilets in supporting text. Policy NE6 criterion 2(c) makes reference to all users which would include those with any specific needs.	Add toilets to para 6.84.
0257	AFC Bournemouth	NE7	Disagrees with the requirement under NE7.2.b. for new development to "provide publicly accessible open space in accordance with site-specific allocations or BCP's Open Space Standards" as would not be appropriate for new stadium.	Objection	Yes	No action	The policy wording is flexible to allow individual applications to be considered on a case by case basis as to the type of open space that would be applicable. NE7.2.b refers to specific site allocation policies and the open space standards. The supporting text at paras 6.84 to 6.87 provides explanation on how open space requirements will be considered when assessing applications. No change is considered necessary.	NA
0020	RSPB	NE7	Support requirement to provide open space in accordance with the Green Infrastructure Strategy.	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0040	Natural England	NE7	Support	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0079	The Society for Poole	NE7	Policy NE7 is sound and effective in serving the public interest.	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0195	Christchurch Town Council Neighbourhood Plan Working Group	NE7	NE7.1. could refer to 'important' rather than 'public' as the policy relates to both public and private open space. NE1.a. should this refer to the 'sustainable neighbourhood' rather than 'community'? – would define what is meant by community.	Support with changes		No action	It is important to highlight the contribution from private open space and that is why both public and private opens spaces are referred to in the policy intro. There is limited opportunity within the small sustainable neighbourhoods for new open space, in particular large scale spaces such as playing fields, so reference to community may be more pragmatic and less restrictive.	NA
0210	Luke Derry	NE7	Highlights the importance of preserving green spaces for biodiversity, recreational and mitigation. Green spaces are vital and they should not be developed.	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0250	East Dorset Friends of the Earth	NE7	Policy weak and requires revisiting. Impossible to meet policy requirements for providing replacement open space if existing lost due to development/growth pressures.	Objection		No action	If replacement open space cannot be provided and the other criteria not met then the open space would be protected	NA
0271	Highwood Group	NE7	Uncertainty regarding deliverability of strategic SANG without sites being allocated to achieve this.	Objection	Yes	No action	Allocating mitigation sites in a local plan does not work as it raises the hope value of land making development unviable.	NA
0282	Historic England	NE7	Policy should signal that some open spaces are heritage assets and protected from development which would adversely impact the heritage asset.	Objection		No action	The plan is to be read as a whole with specific policies protecting heritage assets, it is not considered necessary to repeat those requirements here as the policy is focused on protecting open space.	NA
0286	Bournemouth University	NE7	Site designated as existing open space in Christchurch Core Strategy 2014 but not shown as existing open space in proposed draft Local Plan. If correct (and not a proposal map drafting error), BU welcomes change and enhanced flexibility for future projects at Chapel Gate. If mapping error, site should be included with an open space designation, BU objects to NE7.1 because not all of BU Sports Campus at Chapel Gate should be designated as public open space.	Objection	Yes	No action	Site is correctly not shown as publicly accessible open space. It is a key leisure/community facility and would considered under the relevant policy.	NA
0292	WH White	NE7	Comfortable with policy	Support	Yes	No action		NA
0351	Sport England	NE7	Sport England consider the evidence in the Playing Pitch Strategy to be out of date from November 2024, and therefore is not robust after this date as it will be more than 5 years old. Other outdoor sports were not included in the assessment, and so table should be renamed as Outdoor Playing Pitches. Needs to be a more comprehensive outdoor sports assessment, and indoor assessment is encouraged.	Comment	No	No action	The study is considered robust evidence to inform this local plan. The study can then be updated and reviewed but a pragmatic view is needed considering the costs involved.	NA
0447	Poole Quays Forum	NE7	(1) and (2) The local plan should respect local needs.	Objection		No action	Support noted	NA
0456	Highcliffe & Walkford Parish Council	NE7	Support	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0511	Dorset Local Nature Partnership	NE7	Supports reference to health benefits but the value to climate change should also be made.	Support with changes	No	No action	Food growing areas are referenced in policy NE4. Benefits of green infrastructure on climate change are referenced in para 6.50	NA
0539	Dorset Local Access Forum	NE7	Supports the protection of Open Spaces in Policy NE7: Open space. Omission to reference of Local Nature Reserves throughout the local plan. Plan should reference Natural England's standards.	Support with changes		No action	Local nature reserves are discussed in para 6.35 under other local wildlife sites and considered by policy NE2	NA

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0540	McCarthy Stone	NE7	Welcome Policy H4 criterion b. Policy NE7 should be amended for consistency with H4b, as NE7 sets higher requirements (open space needs for older people less than mainstream housing, and accessible quality open space for passive recreation more important than formal open space).	Objection	No	No action	Policy H4 considers the private outdoor space for residential accommodation, policy NE7 is considering public open space provision.	NA
0292	WH White	Para 7.1-7.11	Support design vision and description of tools to realise it. Highlighted tensions under paras 7.9-7.10 between development potential, context and viability. Long term vision is required for neighbourhood to enable incremental change whereas proposed vision more gentle densification and prioritising existing character preservation over future needs. Areas of opportunity and neighbourhood allocation formalise planning consents or windfall. Plan fails to inspire or create step change and effect use of land resulting more unmet housing need and reliance on strategic urban extensions. Need contingency of reserve sites to be removed from Green Belt and make efficient use of land such as Canford Garden Village omission site.	Support with changes	Yes	No action	In accordance with the NPPF the Plan does not propose to release Green Belt to meet housing needs.	NA
0350	Bob Lord	Para 7.1; Para 7.8	Additional text required to require spaces built-in for wildlife in designs for residential and commercial premises (specifically Swift (or universal) bricks).	Objection	No	No action	Policy BE1 a.vii. considers that development should optimise nature, further requirements are set out in Chapter 6 Natural Environment.	NA
0195	Christchurch Town Council Neighbourhood Plan Working Group	Para 7.7	Should the policy refer to 'supplementary plans' not SPDs (as per LURA)	Support with changes		Modification	Agree. While the draft Local Plan has been prepared under the current planning system and some SPDs are required to support the Plan a reference to supplementary plans could also be added.	Amend para 7.7 to reference supplementary plans
0195	Christchurch Town Council Neighbourhood Plan Working Group	Para 7.10	Unclear if paragraph means the use of unused roof space for green roofs, gardens, solar panels etc would take precedence over character considerations. Could also add explanation of neighbourhood plan/design code in this.	Support with changes		No action	Para 7.10 sets out that single use retail development should provide residential or employment on upper floors and use any unused roof space for roof gardens, green roofs or solar PV panels, which is considered clear. The use of neighbourhood design codes is already referenced in para 7.7	NA
0245	Miller Homes and Bellway Homes (Wessex)	Figure 7.1	This figure highlights the proximity of Kinson Manor Farm to district centre, and accessibility of its local facilities, services and public transport by walking show it is the most sustainable location in Green Belt for housing development	Objection	Yes	No action	Comment noted, the location of Kinson Manor Farm is not relevant to the Built Environment Chapter. As set out above in accordance with the NPPF the Plan does not propose to release Green Belt.	NA
0040	Natural England	BE1	Support vii and viii	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0079	The Society for Poole	BE1	Policy BE1 could be made sound and is likely effective in serving the public interest, as plan to enhance involvement of communities in shaping character and appearance of their localities. This will require improvements to due consultation techniques with Parish/ Town Councils, Neighbourhood Forums, Residents Associations, Civic Societies and other concerned charities. Under vision and objectives it is noted design codes for good quality design and sustainable accommodation are supported	Support with changes		No action	Support noted	NA
0250	East Dorset Friends of the Earth	BE1	To be effective needs to be more clearly defined and prescriptive (in some cases other policies in plan more effective). Specific references to features increasing sustainability required, with caveats applied to areas that are visually sensitive to such features.	Objection		No action	The policy is a high level strategic policy and therefore some detail about how to meet the criteria is set out more comprehensively in other policies within the chapter.	NA
0258	Royal London Mutual Insurance Society Ltd	BE1	Support principles of policy, making effective use of land is essential.	Objection	No	No action	Support noted	NA
0282	Historic England	BE1	Welcome policy	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0287	Network Rail	BE1	Any development that interacts with level crossings must consider suitable mitigation. Supports encouraging walking and cycling to railway stations by addition of text to criteria vi.	Support with changes	Yes	No action	Support noted. Criteria vi is a generic policy and will also refer to access for walking and cycling to services and facilities. Therefore providing specific mention of the railway stations would require adding several other destinations for consistency and is considered unnecessary. More detail about specific transport details are set out in Chapter 10 and the level crossing is referenced in Policy P26 Poole Town.	NA
0292	WH White	BE1	Support intent and wording of policy.	Support	Yes	No action	Support noted	NA
0405	Elizabeth Strange	BE1	The 2003 Christchurch Borough-Wide Character Assessment (CBWCA) remains valid but is not being used and poor quality applications are approved. Local character is being adversely impacted. Local Plan does not ensure good design. Design is non strategic and should be the responsibility of Christchurch Town Council, the Neighbourhood Plan and a Christchurch Design Code.	Objection	No	No action	CBWCA is over twenty years old and has no formal status as an SPD. Townscape policy BE2 in the Local Plan supports good design. Design is considered a strategic issue and policy is required for development across the BCP area. Design Codes can provide further detail for some areas where the Codes comply with the strategic policies within the local plan.	NA



ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0473	Judy Windwood	BE1	Supports policy as encourages other modes of transport as per previous policies.	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0571	Home Builders Federation	BE1	Design policies are too restrictive and prevent housing delivery. Some duplication between BE1 and BE2. Design vision should be better highlighted in the text. Clarity needed about the design material and presentation expected.	Objection		No action	The design policies seek to set expectations for well designed development within the BCP area. Policy BE1 sets the overall strategy with more detail provided in other policies throughout the chapter. The draft plan specifies various requirements and these will be supported through validation requirements at planning application stage.	NA
0175	Asda Stores Ltd	BE1	Object to 'c'. Development of public significance is not defined, lacks clarity, design review also applicable to smaller sites and/or more modern proposals.	Objection	Yes	Modification	Agree	Amend para 7.8 to provide clarification in supporting text and policy about when design review may be required.
0176	Friends of the Elderly	BE1	Objection to criterion (c) including the wording 'development of public significance' as there is no definition of what this means, so not clear when this requirement would be relevant. Design review is not mandatory and not a requirement of the NPPF or PPG and could also be just as applicable for smaller proposals. Therefore criterion (c) should be deleted.	Objection	Yes	Modification	Agree	Amend para 7.8 to provide clarification in supporting text and policy about when design review may be required.
0195	Christchurch Town Council Neighbourhood Plan Working Group	BE1	BE1.b. Having this in a strategic policy is problematic as it would give greater status to existing adopted design guidance than a neighbourhood plan and the neighbourhood plan could not conflict with the guidance. This should be part of a non-strategic policy. BE1.c. not clear what 'development with public significance' means or how it is judged.	Objection		Modification	Design Codes can provide useful further guidance for implementing the development strategy and design vision in specific areas, Neighbourhood Plans should consider any adopted codes in their preparation to conform with the overall strategy, this will avoid conflicting approaches for the same area. Agree to provide clarification in the supporting text about when design review may be required.	Amend para 7.8 to provide clarification in supporting text and policy about when design review may be required.
0220	LGIM Real Assets	BE1	Objects as seeks further clarity over meaning of 'development with public significance'	Objection		Modification	Agree	Amend para 7.8 to provide clarification in supporting text and policy about when design review may be required.
0233	University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust	BE1	Unclear when design review required and what constitutes development with public significance.	Objection	Yes	Modification	Agree	Amend para 7.8 to provide clarification in supporting text and policy about when design review may be required.
0447	Poole Quays Forum	BE1	(b)References made to Design Codes but these are not prepared/adopted yet so policy is ineffective. De-sign codes will take time to prepare. Council should identify which codes are needed and prepare them in 2 years.	Objection		No action	Some Design Codes are already in draft form e.g. Lansdowne, the adoption of Design Codes will follow the adoption of the Local Plan. The Council will discuss and identify Design Code priorities depending on development pressures.	NA
0292	WH White	Para 7.12-7.31	Supports para 7.17 and consider this opportunity exists at Canford Garden Village omission site which should be given greater consideration given failure to plan for objectively assessed housing need. In para 7.22 considers nature of windfall unsurprising due to complexities of land assembly and lack of creativity in previous legacy policies. Concur with para 7.24. Supports commentary relating to landscape and external areas though basement parking is frequently unviable.	Support	Yes	No action	Comment noted, the site at Canford Garden Village is not relevant to the Built Environment Chapter. As set out above in accordance with the NPPF the Plan does not propose to release Green Belt.	NA
0195	Christchurch Town Council Neighbourhood Plan Working Group	Para 7.16	Would be useful to explain role of neighbourhood plan in assessing and setting out design codes/requirements.	Support with changes		No action	The ability of Neighbourhood Forums to bring forward Design Codes is already referenced in para 7.7. Any Codes produced would need to conform with the overall strategic approach set out in the draft Local Plan.	NA
0195	Christchurch Town Council Neighbourhood Plan Working Group	Para 7.18	Views through a site also important when from public space to locally important landmark.	Support with changes		Modification	Agree	Amend para 7.18 to reference views through the site
0040	Natural England	BE2	Support section 3	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0223	Fortitudo Ltd	BE2	Policy needs to acknowledge that character of some areas may change.	Objection		No action	It is considered that in some instances the character of an place may need to evolve, the suitability of this will depend on the consistency of the existing character, the size and qualities of the site and the proposed. The supporting text already acknowledges this.	NA
0250	East Dorset Friends of the Earth	BE2	Generally useful criteria, but no reference to energy and water conservation features. Must retain existing soft/permeable surfaces in current properties.	Objection		No action	Energy, water features and permeable surfaces considered in Chapter 5 of the Plan.	NA
0258	Royal London Mutual Insurance Society Ltd	BE2	Planning application on the Belvedere site would be high quality and respond to design policy.	Objection	No	No action	Support noted	NA

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0282	Historic England	BE2	Welcome policy	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0292	WH White	BE2	Support policy design principles.	Objection	Yes	No action	Support noted	NA
0302	Branksome Park & Canford Cliffs Residents Association	BE2	Plan could be stricter to retain the character of the area and align with sustainability agenda	Support with changes		No action	It is considered that in some instances the character of an place may need to evolve, the suitability of this will depend on the consistency of the existing character, the size and qualities of the site and the proposed. Consider amendment to supporting text to provide clarity.	NA
0473	Judy Windwood	BE2	Supports policy as contributes to health through active travel reducing pollution and climate change.	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0271	Highwood Group	BE2	Requires additional flexibility to ensure viability/deliverability.	Objection	Yes	Modification	The policy needs to ensure good design outcomes but agree that not all criteria will be relevant to all proposals.	Amend introductory sentence to BE2 to ensure the criteria are applied where relevant
0273	Churchill Retirement Living	BE2	Greater flexibility required to enable balance range of issues on brownfield sites and not affect deliverability.	Objection		Modification	The policy needs to ensure good design outcomes but agree that not all criteria will be relevant to all proposals.	Amend introductory sentence to BE2 ensure the criteria are applied where relevant
0571	Home Builders Federation	BE2	Policy is too prescriptive. Not possible for instance smaller scale infill development to provide tree lined streets. Duplication of boundary treatment criteria (b. and f.) unless there is meant to be a distinction between front and other boundaries. Rewording suggested.	Objection		Modification	Agree that not all criteria will be relevant to all proposals. All boundaries need to be attractive as required by 5.f and specifically the front boundary need to be provided as required by 5.b.	Amend introductory sentence to BE2 ensure the criteria are applied where relevant
0292	WH White	Para 7.32-7.34	Supports flexibility in separation distances in para 7.33 and ref to compatibility of uses in para 7.34.	Support	Yes	No action	Support noted	NA
0195	Christchurch Town Council Neighbourhood Plan Working Group	Para 7.33	The national model Design Code provides guidance and examples on how privacy distances might be specified locally and how this could be considered through local or neighbourhood plan design codes, and that they are not a suggested minimum distance.	Comment		No action	The Local Plan takes the opportunity to set distances to help ensure a good standard of amenity is provided.	NA
0183	Evans and Traves	BE3	criterion a. is not precise and could be used to prevent mixed use development and undermine delivery of much needed sustainable development	Objection	Yes	No action	The policy is clear development must be compatible with surrounding uses, this could include development being made compatible, it reflects the agent of change principle and is not considered to impact on the potential to bring forward mixed used development.	NA
0250	East Dorset Friends of the Earth	BE3	Must apply to alterations to existing development subject to significant alterations requiring permission - not clear from policy.	Support with changes		No action	Support noted	NA
0258	Royal London Mutual Insurance Society Ltd	BE3	Supports principles of policy, development on the Belvedere site will accord with the policy.	Objection	No	No action	Support noted	NA
0292	WH White	BE3	Support policy design principles.	Support	Yes	No action	Support noted	NA
0183	Evans and Traves	Para 7.35	Example building in fig 7.3 will restrict visual interest of proposed new buildings. Height should exclude architectural flares or flourishes or will have bland skyline as in existing Lansdowne Tall Building zone. Height should exclude non-habitable features. Also contrary to BE4:3.e seeking elegant proportions and attractive silhouette.	Objection	Yes	No action	Figure 7.3 is taken from the Building Heights Study which provides evidence to support the building height text	NA
0292	WH White	Para 7.35	Para 7.36 recognises the tensions/challenges with taller buildings. Para 7.38 explains that locations capable of gentle increases in height are identified are set out as allocations, local opportunity areas and local opportunity streets and assumption that buildings are structurally capable of supporting additional storeys and fragmented ownership will allow for it but could be done as PD. Assumption that gentle densification is a viable and attractive proposition. Allocations/opportunity areas replicate committed developments formalising windfall so unclear how policies will significantly increase housing delivery. Jump in scale to a tall building in para 7.39 and in definition in between. Approach to building heights too conservative and fails to make efficient use of land resulting in more unmet housing need. Contingency should be made in the form of reserve sites. <u>with additional land removed from the Green Belt.</u>	Objection	Yes	No action	The approach to building heights seeks to balance the need for urban intensification with the need to ensure good design. In accordance with the NPPF the Plan does not propose to release Green Belt to meet housing needs.	NA
0195	Christchurch Town Council Neighbourhood Plan Working Group	Para 7.38	Locations suitable for gentle increases in height may also be identified in neighbourhood plans, as well as design codes.	Support with changes		No action	This issue can be picked up in neighbourhood plans but it is not considered that this needs to be specifically referenced. Previous references set out the neighbourhood groups can considered design codes.	NA

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0211	Susan Suliman	BE4	Conflict with Policy P10, as P10 supports up to 4 storeys in Christchurch (taller than prevailing and tallest heights) in numerous locations, while BE4 states increases in height will be concentrated in Bournemouth and Poole town centres. Also in conflict with Policy P10 as BE4 suggests heights must be reflective of neighbourhood plan, but draft Christchurch Neighbourhood Plan sets max of 3 storeys. Max 3 storeys requested by majority of public at consultation events, so conflict with public's wishes. Concerned about limited opportunity to influence.	Objection	Yes	No action	The policy is clear that the specific heights in the ward policies should be considered in the first instance and the tallest buildings focused in Poole and Bournemouth town centre. It is considered that parts of Christchurch town centre could accommodate four storey buildings, some sites/areas where this is appropriate are required to support the overall strategy of urban intensification. The draft Neighbourhood Plan is draft and has not been taken forward through a formal process, the Council have consistently highlight concerns with some elements of the Neighbourhood Plan and the accompanying design work where it is not likely to be consistent with the emerging Local Plan.	NA
0267	Richborough Estates	BE4	Concentration of heights in some locations sensible, but there is a limit to height and therefore density achievable on brownfield sites. Increased flexibility for tall buildings will not alone meet needs. More land required, such as Land north of Townsend.	Comment		No action	Comment noted. It is considered that scope exists for urban intensification. In accordance with the NPPF the Plan does not propose to release Green Belt to meet housing needs.	NA
0287	Network Rail	BE4	Support town centres as areas for tall buildings. Improved pedestrian and cycle links to rail stations should be a priority. Funding contributions needed to secure these improvements.	Support	Yes	No action	Support noted. Developments will need to provide appropriate infrastructure and CIL will also be used to fund off site improvements, which could include active travel infrastructure.	NA
0292	WH White	BE4	Support policy design principles.	Support	Yes	No action	Support noted	NA
0436	Ian Blackhurst	BE4	Building heights in Highcliffe & Walkford should not rise by more than 1 storey. Strategic Policy BE4 should state building heights should not be out of keeping with the built scene and character.	Support with changes		No action	Policy BE2 Townscape supports development that reflects the character of an area, urban intensification is however required to support the overall strategy.	NA
0615	Friars Cliff Residents Association	BE4	Reference to gentle increases in height in out of town centres too generic (should be specific to individual areas) and unsound. Character and design of existing homes (including height) in historic/mature residential areas in Christchurch (particularly areas of bungalows) must be preserved. Allocations do not address how surrounding heights should be deciding factor (rather than nominated limit). Preferable for neighbourhood plans to set where height increases may be suitable through design codes.	Objection	Yes	No action	Policy BE2 Townscape supports development that reflects the character of an area, urban intensification is however required to support the overall strategy and many properties now benefit from permitted development rights to increase scale. Design Codes can be used for specific areas.	NA
0150	Ken Parke on behalf of various clients 3	BE4	Objects that building heights in certain areas should be consistent with prevailing heights in local context. To be viable development often requires a greater quantum only achieved through increasing height. Heights are a site specific matter. Policy restrictive and controlling, will restrict new development. Government supports upwards extensions. Variations in height add interest to the townscape.	Objection	Yes	Modification	Agree that in combination with other responses more clarity could be provided. In some areas additions of height can be harmful to the character of the area, particularly in areas of highly consistent townscape.	Amend supporting text in building heights subsection and policy BE4 to provide further clarification.
0166	Troika Developments Ltd	BE4	Objects to BE4 as some text overly prescriptive, wording will inhibit good design. Revised wording suggested	Objection	Yes	Modification	Agree that in combination with other responses more clarity could be provided.	Amend supporting text in building heights subsection and policy BE4 to provide further clarification.
0175	Asda Stores Ltd	BE4	Lack of clarity of term prevailing base height - ambiguous, complexity of BHS, object to 3(d) - too detailed	Objection	Yes	Modification	Agree that in combination with other responses more clarity could be provided.	Amend supporting text in building heights subsection and policy BE4 to provide further clarification.
0183	Evans and Traves	BE4	Height restriction is obtuse and not justified. Many examples of variety of heights including in conservation areas. The restriction is contrary to NPPF para 124(e) which supports use of air space above existing residential and commercial premises. Policy conflicts with BE2(g) which relates to design of buildings that terminate/mark corners – often done through increased height. Contrary to government direction of travel with Permitted Development. Will inhibit making most efficient use of land and contrary to para 129(c) of NPPF. Assuming anything above existing building height would be harmful represents lack of creative thinking, does not comply with national policy and is unsound.	Objection		Modification	Agree that in combination with other responses more clarity could be provided. In some areas additions of height can be harmful to the character of the area, particularly in areas of highly consistent townscape.	Amend supporting text in building heights subsection and policy BE4 to provide further clarification.
0195	Christchurch Town Council Neighbourhood Plan Working Group	BE4	Wording of first part of policy that refers to (building heights) being identified within neighbourhood plans could be included in a similar way in other policies within the plan	Support with changes		Modification	Agree that in combination with other responses more clarity could be provided.	Amend supporting text in building heights subsection and policy BE4 to provide further clarification.
0220	LGIM Real Assets	BE4	Supports policy requirements as preferred location for tall buildings but considers 2(c) regarding glazing or reflective panels is too prescriptive and 'prevailing height' of neighbouring buildings is not clear.	Support with changes		Modification	Agree that in combination with other responses more clarity could be provided.	Amend supporting text in building heights subsection and policy BE4 to provide further clarification.
0223	Fortitudo Ltd	BE4	Restrictive policy preventing Council from meeting housing need. Unreasonable to introduce ban on taller buildings outside of specified areas when it could be demonstrated it could be accommodated successfully. Restricts ability for areas to density through gentle density. Will not allow development industry to optimise potential of each site.	Objection		Modification	Agree that in combination with other responses more clarity could be provided. In some areas additions of height can be harmful to the character of the area, particularly in areas of highly consistent townscape.	Amend supporting text in building heights subsection and policy BE4 to provide further clarification.

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0250	East Dorset Friends of the Earth	BE4	Must apply to both new build and alterations to existing development. There should be a general policy supporting upward extension of bungalows to provide additional storey with conditional requirements (see suggested mods).	Objection		Modification	Agree	Amend supporting text to highlight permitted development rights surrounding upward extensions.
0258	Royal London Mutual Insurance Society Ltd	BE4	Royal London supports the identification of Bournemouth town centre as an area suitable for increased building heights. Extant consent on site (7-2016-5940-S) is for up to 12 storeys, allocation BC.11 notes an appropriate building height of up to 7 storeys. Royal London object to the restricted building height set out in BC.11. Building Heights Study (2024) confirms site is in an area 'somewhat sensitive' to tall buildings'. Royal London consider that the site can accommodate a building of up to 13 storeys or a district scale tall building as per the evidence base and extant consent. Supports the requirement to ensure tall buildings are well-designed, however consider that some of the requirements set out in P.BE4 are too prescriptive.	Objection	Yes	Modification	Agree that in combination with other responses more clarity could be provided.	Amend supporting text in building heights subsection and policy BE4 to provide further clarification.
0282	Historic England	BE4	Policy lack sufficient clarity. Status of building heights study needs to be clarified as does its roll within the policy. Definition of tall building differs between the Plan and the study and within the policy and the text, clarification needed. Reference in supporting text to tall building statement not carried forward within the policy. Clarification required surrounding status of heights set out in the plan. Further wording required to ensure building heights step down to adjacent areas. The status of views identified need to be clarified. Adjustments are required to move forward outputs of the tall buildings study into policy.	Objection		Modification	Agree	Amend supporting text to highlight the Building Heights Study is evidence to support the plan and reference stepping down in height. Amend supporting text in building heights subsection and policy BE4 to provide further clarification.
0237	Toklon Ltd	BE4	Support for tall building in town centres, lower level scheme should be able to come forward if this is more viable.	Objection	No	No action	Policy does not prevent lower scale schemes coming forward if they are more viable.	NA
0195	Christchurch Town Council Neighbourhood Plan Working Group	Para 7.48	Shop front guidance could also be found in neighbourhood plan or design codes/guidance documents	Support with changes		No action	This issue can be picked up in neighbourhood plans but it does not need to be specified.	NA
0250	East Dorset Friends of the Earth	BE5	Support. Consider encouraging additions of well-designed awnings and overhangs, for climate adaption, environmental and visual benefits	Support with changes		No action	Support noted. Awnings already referred to in supporting text.	NA
0220	LGIM Real Assets	BE5	Objects to (d) as considers signage and shopfronts which are appropriate for town centre locations does not necessarily mean 'sensitive design' if the proposed signage or shopfront is not adversely affecting safety	Objection	No	Modification	Agree	Amend BE5 criteria d to remove reference to sensitive design
0292	WH White	Para 7.49-7.79	Support overview of range of heritage assets and reflections on heritage led initiatives.	Support	Yes	No action	Support noted	NA
0195	Christchurch Town Council Neighbourhood Plan Working Group	Para 7.57	Non-designated heritage assets could also be identified within neighbourhood plans.	Support with changes		No action	It is suggested that neighbourhood plan groups put forward any potential non designated heritage assets for consideration for inclusion on the Local List.	NA
0282	Historic England	Para 7.73	Amend wording to avoid misinterpretation in relation to archaeological assets.	Objection		Modification	Agree	Remove the following text from paragraph 7.73 relating to references in part 2 of the Plan
0078	Hurn Parish Council	BE6	Amendments to BE6 to keep signage to a minimum and prevent development with a negative effect on conversation areas	Support with changes		No action	Shopfronts and signage are covered by policy BE5 and the relevant supporting text	NA
0079	The Society for Poole	BE6	Policy BE6 is sound and effective in serving the public interest.	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0091	Dorset Gardens Trust	BE6	Support paragraph 7.72 and Policy BE6.2, 7.77/8 and Policy BE6.5	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0183	Evans and Traves	BE6	BE6 3.b.i. is too restrictive. Does not account for conservation areas designated for their landscape setting (e.g. Canford Cliffs) with variety of building types, orientations, heights etc. Does not acknowledge para 203 (a), (b) and (c) of NPPF and desirability of putting heritage assets to viable uses. Wording prohibits change rather than managing shape of change.	Objection	Yes	No action	Part b.i is seeking to preserve to enhance the positive characteristics of built form, part ii refers to other positive characteristics such as landscaping	NA
0200	Meyrick Estate	BE6	Policy should encourage adaptive reuse, restoration and sympathetic development around heritage assets. Regular monitoring of heritage assets essential. Alterations and development should comply with conservation guidelines. East Cliff Conservation Area should remain legally protected.	Objection	Yes	No action	Consider that the policy supports reuse, restoration and sympathetic development of heritage assets	NA

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0250	East Dorset Friends of the Earth	BE6	Support, but clarification required regarding how will work with measures required to reduce carbon emissions, mitigate climate change impacts, and enhance biodiversity (i.e. insulation, solar panels, heat pumps, rainwater storage or flood defences)	Support with changes		No action	The need to consider the relationship of measures to reduce carbon emissions on heritage assets is set out in chapter 5. Historic England have specific guidance on this issue.	NA
0258	Royal London Mutual Insurance Society Ltd	BE6	Royal London appreciates the recognition of non-designated heritage assets, however, objects to policy BE6 and consider that greater flexibility should be provided to developments in their proximity as opposed to designated heritage assets.	Objection	No	No action	Section 5 is focused on non designated heritage assets and are focused on the asset. General principles in 1a discuss the need for an assessment of the special interest of the asset, for non designated asset the setting may not be an issue depending on the asset and its significance, this can be set out in the assessment.	NA
0260	Dorset Lake Community	BE6	Conservation Areas need to be reviewed and updated. Local List needs to be updated with stronger presumptions against their demolition.	Objection	Yes	No action	This work needs to be completed separately to the local plan	NA
0268	Talbot Village Trust	BE6	Support, but needs to acknowledge council's own responsibilities	Support with changes		No action	Work on council assets is separate to the local plan but would need to accord with the policy requirements set out	NA
0284	Gervis Properties Ltd / Hinton Admiral Estate	BE6	Considers BE6 to be significant in shaping future development in the area and should explicitly recognise the importance of heritage assets (including local heritage assets) and emphasise their conservation, protection and sustainable use with provisions to encourage adaptive use, restoration and sympathetic development. Supports joint project with Dorset Council to create Local Heritage List.	Support with changes		No action	Support noted	NA
0301	Sandbanks Neighbourhood Forum	BE6	In agreement and support the comments made by Dorset Lake Community re; Draft Local Plan Part 1 Policies 4, 6, and 7	Objection		No action	Support noted	NA
0302	Branksome Park & Canford Cliffs Residents Association	BE6	Conservation Area Appraisals need to be reviewed and updated and timeframe should be given. Concerned regarding site-splitting in the Branksome Park Conservation Area. Permeable paving required within Conservation Area.	Comment		No action	This work needs to be completed separately to the local plan	NA
0271	Highwood Group	BE6	Goes beyond national policy due to use of phrasing 'overriding public benefits'	Objection	Yes	Modification	Agree	Amend criteria 3c to ensure text relating to public benefits is consistent with the NPPF
0282	Historic England	BE6	Largely supportive but a number of adjustments sort. Suggest instead of preserve or enhance, conserve and enhance heritage assets and their settings is used.BE6 should be a strategic policy. Review wording surrounding less than substantial harm.	Support with changes		Modification	Agree	Amend to a strategic policy and amend criteria 3c to ensure text relating to public benefits is consistent with the NPPF
0292	WH White	BE6	3(c)(i) - Questionable whether alternative options are technically feasible. Emphasis on avoidance is consistent with NPPF.	Objection	Yes	Modification	Agree	Amend criteria 3c to ensure text relating to public benefits is consistent with the NPPF
0220	LGIM Real Assets	BE6	Objects as considers less weight should be given to non-designated assets which should not be afforded the same protection as listed buildings.	Objection	No	No action	Non-designated heritage assets are an important part of the historic environment within the BCP area. Our policy seeks to clarify the steps that should be taken before significant harm or the loss of heritage assets is proposed.	NA
0110	Watkin Jones Group	Chapter 8	Company delivers build to rent (BTR), student and co-living, operates in Bournemouth, BTR can deliver housing needs, generally support approach to BTR but should be not be restricted to town centres, flexible approach needed as some forms of BTR are family homes.	Support with changes		No action	The Plan does not restrict build to rent to town centres. The housing mix policy makes exceptions for build to rent schemes within Bournemouth and Poole town centre. If BTR schemes come forward elsewhere they would need to confirm with the general policies within the Plan, including other parts of the housing mix policy.	NA
0158	New Forest National Park Authority	Chapter 8	BCP Council has not made a formal request to the New Forest National Park Authority to meet any unmet housing need. National Parks are unlikely to be suitable areas to meet unmet need from neighbouring areas.	Comment		No action	Duty to cooperate arrangements are set out in the duty to cooperate compliance statement. A formal request has now been made to follow up of previous meetings and discussions.	NA
0245	Miller Homes and Bellway Homes (Wessex)	Chapter 8	Endorse objections made by Developer Consortium. Plan is unsound as objectively assessed housing need figure erroneously equates to only 58% of standard method figure. 'Exceptional circumstances' relied upon neither exceptional, nor based on up-to-date evidence, so departure from delivering at least the standard method figure unjustified. Council has not engaged with neighbouring authorities to meet unmet needs - fails duty to co-operate and not legally compliant. SA fails to consider all reasonable options and consequences of not meeting true housing needs. Not positively prepared, justified, or effective. Must be addressed prior to submission. Third of housing projected to be through windfall - largely small sites that do not provide affordable housing.	Objection	Yes	No action	The BCP area has significant constraints which mean the level of growth set out in the standard methodology cannot be achieved. Duty to cooperate arrangements are set out in the duty to cooperate compliance statement. There area has a strong and consistent level of windfall but site availability not currently known, the HELAA identifies potential locations that illustrates a large number of windfall sites remain.	NA
0195	Christchurch Town Council Neighbourhood Plan Working Group	Chapter 8	Should include housing targets for designated NP areas and the expectations on NPs to help deliver the targets. Need to split truly strategic polices from non-strategic to allow local communities to influence development. The underpinning requirement being that changes do not undermine overall housing numbers or delivery of strategic sites and infrastructure.	Objection		Modification	Agree housing requirements for neighbourhood plans required. The Council has identified policies that they consider strategic to provide a consistent strategy and approach to development across the BCP area. Through the examination it could be determined that further policies are strategic.	Insert new paragraph after 8.5 to reference neighbourhood plans. Update policy H2 to include a table to provide housing requirements for neighbourhood plan areas.

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0292	WH White	Para 8.1-8.10	Legacy authorities systematically failed to demonstrate 5 year housing land supply nor update figures annually. Strongly objects to proposed spatial strategy and housing requirement of 24,000 net homes over plan period as significantly below standard method and no exceptional reasons justifying departure. Will reduce access to appropriate housing , affordability and social mobility, suppress household formation and aging population, impact on housing inequality. See other specific policies. Paras 8.1 and 8.2 illustrate sources of supply but none are new. To some extent housing delivery suppressed by legacy plans but issues with reviews and BCP unambitious for meeting housing need and aimed at rationalising legal plan with difficult decisions like Green Belt release reviewed in the future. Not the purpose of local plan and should meet genuine housing needs of area. Contrary to para 8.7 considers Publication Plan does not "support house building by identifying more land for development and a positive policy approach". In relation to para 8.9 considers Green Belt to be only meaningful option but issues with lead time. Publication plan doomed to fail hence very special circumstances for reserve sites.	Objection	Yes	No action	The BCP area has significant constraints which mean the level of growth set out in the standard methodology cannot be achieved. In accordance with the NPPF the Plan does not propose to release Green Belt to meet housing needs.	NA
0419	Geoff Bantock	Para 8.2	Outstanding permissions with high numbers of 1 and 2 beds illustrate the need to have a better mix of unit sizes.	Support	No	No action	Support noted	NA
0235	Wyatt Homes	Figure 8.1	Approach set out in HELAA does not appear to have been taken for housing supply, as discrepancy between HELAA and para 8.2 and figure 8.1. Not clear to what extent extant planning permissions can be categorised as 'deliverable sites', and some may be outline, and therefore not comply with completions beginning on site within 5 years, as per NPPF. Council's total figure for sites with planning permission is unreliable at this stage. The windfall allowance is considered by Council to be reasonable and conservative, but given heavy reliance on windfall, HELAA assessment considered weak and unreliable approach of assessing future windfall delivery. Some anticipated sources of windfall highlighted have not been assessed. Windfall will come forward at significantly slower rate in the future compared to previously. Available sites will decline, and larger brownfield sites which would previously have been windfall are now allocated in Plan. BNG will prevent sites coming forward. Reduction in viability of schemes will also have an effect on windfall development.	Objection	Yes	No action	The HELAA considers the land suitable and available for development. This includes sites with existing planning permission, at the time of writing the plan that figure was 9,110 homes which is referenced in para 8.2 and figure 8.1. The HELAA also references this figure and applies a discount of 10% for non implementation. The HELAA provides an over trajectory for the Plan period, a more detailed consideration of Five Year Supply post adoption is set out separately in the evidence. There is no evidence to suggest that windfall will come forward at a slower rate than previously, this has been argued previously by the development industry but the the supply over 15 years has remained consistent. The HELAA has identified significant sources of windfall remain.	NA
0195	Christchurch Town Council Neighbourhood Plan Working Group	Para 8.5	Sites >15 but <1ha should be on brownfield register so no need to allocate in local plan where a neighbourhood plan is being prepared.	Objection		No action	The Plan seeks to allocate a range of sites including small sites and all these sites contribute towards the housing requirement. Neighbourhood Plans have the potential to identify additional sites. Not all parts of the BCP area are covered by neighbourhood plans are suitable and available land has been assessed consistently across the area through the HELAA process.	NA
0260	Dorset Lake Community	Para 8.05	Small sites target contravenes NPPF and results in excessive windfall sites, pressure on Council to allow infilling and overdevelopment. Need ambitious regeneration strategies in town centres.	Objection	Yes	No action	Windfall is a consistent part of supply in the BCP area, accounting for over 85% of development. The plan includes policies to support town centre regeneration	NA
0096	Go South Coast	Figure 8.3 Housing Trajectory	Not clear how the permission and allocations are attributed to the trajectory. Relies on existing allocations coming forward in first six years. Lack of data on deliverable housing land and 5-year supply. Low levels of five year supply from previous data, many sites are stalled, long allocated sites have not come forward, future supply is over estimated, housing delivery will not be realised, trajectory demonstrates the plan is ineffective and unsound.	Objection	No	No action	Details about the five year housing land supply are set out in the evidence document - Five Year Land Supply for the Local Plan.	NA
0235	Wyatt Homes	Figure 8.3 Housing Trajectory	Housing trajectory should extend to 2040, given likely plan adoption in 2025 to comply with national policy. No detail provided on anticipated buildout of allocated sites, therefore not possible to know if Council has based its housing trajectory on robust evidence in terms of timing and profile of delivery for each site. Housing trajectory cannot be relied upon at present.	Objection	Yes	Modification	Agree	Amend trajectory in figure 8.1 and update details about the housing supply and five year housing land supply.
0082	Christchurch Harbour Ornithological Group	Para 8.9	Questions if sites in Christchurch should be allocated given flood risk constraints.	Objection		No action	Sites within the flood risk area are allocated subject to the resolution of flood risk issues and work remains ongoing to resolve these issues. Sites within the flood risk area in Christchurch have not counted towards the total number of homes allocated.	NA
0258	Royal London Mutual Insurance Society Ltd	H1	Housing requirement significantly different to standard method. A middle ground is needed to avoid worsening affordability crisis, loss of graduates/young professional. More homes could be delivered through increasing densities on urban brownfield sites such as Belvedere site	Objection	No	No action	The BCP area has significant constraints which mean the level of growth set out in the standard methodology cannot be achieved.	NA

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0036	Southwood Partners	H1	Woeful delivery of housing due to continued reliance on windfall sites and directing development to locations that are unable to support family housing. Windfall development unlikely to continue at same pace. No evidence that development has or will succeed in inner urban locations. Strategy relies on sites that may never come forward e.g. Christchurch and others have constraints. Green Belt boundaries should be reviewed to assist in meeting housing needs.	Objection	Yes	No action	There is over 15 years of windfall delivery at a high rate and no evidence to show this is reducing, a large number of windfall sites have been identified through the HELAA. Sustainable locations in the urban area remain the best locations to direct development due to wider sustainability benefits. Some Christchurch sites in areas at risk of flooding are not included within our housing delivery figures due to uncertainties surrounding delivery. A Green Belt review has been completed but the NPPF is clear Green Belt sites do not need to be considered to meet housing needs.	NA
0046	John Lambon	H1	Housing must support genuine needs, population is declining, green areas have depleted to provide homes, valuable green land should not be lost to provide homes. Support is needed for facilities/services (health, police, welfare etc), unclear if Cil can be used for essential services, new homes result in more council tax, how will council tax be spent, how is social housing provided, is there vacant properties/second homes that can be used.	Objection		No action	CIL will help support new infrastructure. The Council has its own housing provision and acquisition strategy to help provide affordable homes.	NA
0071	Goadsby on behalf of various clients	H1	Woeful delivery of housing due to continued reliance on windfall sites and directing development to locations that are unable to support family housing. Windfall development unlikely to continue at same pace. No evidence that development has or will succeed in inner urban locations. Strategy relies on sites that may never come forward e.g. Christchurch and others have constraints. Green Belt boundaries should be reviewed to assist in meeting housing needs.	Objection	Yes	No action	There is over 15 years of windfall delivery at a high rate and no evidence to show this is reducing, a large number of windfall sites have been identified through the HELAA. Sustainable locations in the urban area remain the best locations to direct development due to wider sustainability benefits. Some Christchurch sites in areas of flood risk are not included within our housing delivery figures due to uncertainties. A Green Belt review has been completed but the NPPF is clear Green Belt sites do not need to be considered to meet housing needs.	NA
0079	The Society for Poole	H1	Policy H1 could be made sound and is likely effective in serving the public interest. Standard method requirement fails to recognise challenges resulting from marketing of South Coast as place for retirement. Would be more obviously sound if target reflected locally needed dwelling types, particularly low cost family houses. Oversupply of other accommodation, including those that are not permanently occupied, is in conflict with local plan objective to 'build strong and inclusive communities'.	Support with changes		No action	Housing mix policy seeks to provide a range of dwelling types. Some allocations are also focused on family homes, including the urban extensions. Second homes were investigated as part of the plan making process but only can control new builds which can put more pressure on existing stock. Other mechanisms are likely to be more suitable to manage this issue.	NA
0175	Asda Stores Ltd	H1	Lack of ambition in policy H1, historic under delivery of housing, housing target well below objectively assessed need	Objection	Yes	No action	The BCP area has significant constraints which mean the level of growth set out in the standard methodology cannot be achieved	NA
0176	Friends of the Elderly	H1	Not meeting the need derived through the 'standard method' will do little to assist affordability issues. Of particular concern is the impact on 'key workers' and the recruitment and retention of nursing care staff. Also, if insufficient housing, demand will outstrip supply meaning windfall sites will deliver less housing for older people.	Objection	Yes	No action	The BCP area has significant constraints which mean the level of growth set out in the standard methodology cannot be achieved	NA
0183	Evans and Traves	H1	H1.a. housing target too low in light of 2021 Housing Needs Assessment and contrary to NPPF. Not positively prepared or sound. H1.b. not consistent with national policy. Does not reflect presumption in favour of sustainable development and need to significantly boost delivery of homes.	Objection	Yes	No action	The BCP area has significant constraints which mean the level of growth set out in the standard methodology cannot be achieved	NA
0220	LGIM Real Assets	H1	Objects as considers plan unsounds due to lower housing target of 24,000 is significant deviation from standard method of 42,090 homes. Consider 2014 based SNHP is mandated to ensure consistency and boost housing land supply but target of 24,000 homes will deliver significantly less homes worsening the affordability crisis and affecting graduates and young professionals.	Objection	No	No action	The BCP area has significant constraints which mean the level of growth set out in the standard methodology cannot be achieved	NA
0223	Fortitudo Ltd	H1	Object to this policy as minimum housing requirement should be standard method. Not clear how trajectory in 8.3 has been produced. Awaiting an up to date housing land supply statement to demonstrate 5 year supply at adoption.	Objection		No action	The BCP area has significant constraints which mean the level of growth set out in the standard methodology cannot be achieved. Five year housing land supply information included in the evidence base	NA
0235	Wyatt Homes	H1	No evidence has been provided to justify the proposed stepped trajectory in housing delivery, and the timing proposed. Approach is not justified or consistent with national planning guidance.	Objection	Yes	No action	Five year housing land supply information included in the evidence base	NA
0237	Toklon Ltd	H1	Housing requirements is not consistent with the standard methodology, previously developed land needs to be maximised.	Objection	Yes	No action	The BCP area has significant constraints which mean the level of growth set out in the standard methodology cannot be achieved. Five year housing land supply information included in the evidence base	NA
0245	Miller Homes and Bellway Homes (Wessex)	H1	Does not address current shortfalls in housing and affordable housing supply as bases first 5 years' delivery on historical build rates. Will exacerbate current negative economic and social consequences of acute under-supply. Trajectory in Figure 8.3 unrealistic. Early review if plan fails to deliver further reduces scope for step change in delivery. Range of development sites required, including medium sized strategic deliverable greenfield sites (refers to that owned by Bellway Homes and Miller Homes), to avoid deferring delivery to Plan period back end. Poor record of reviews following delivery shortcomings. Better to allocate more dwellings (including a buffer).	Objection	Yes	No action	The BCP area has significant constraints which mean the level of growth set out in the standard methodology cannot be achieved. In accordance with the NPPF the Plan does not propose to release Green Belt to meet housing needs.	NA

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0247	Hallam Land Management Ltd	H1	No exceptional circumstances to justify an alternative method of calculating housing need. Housing supply meets just 58% of standard method figure. Opportunities to accommodate unmet need in Dorset missed. Reliance on increased densities neglects huge need for family homes. Plan does not accord with NPPF and is not positively prepared - fails test of soundness. This policy is not considered sound. Causes plan as a whole to be unsound. BCP should properly assess its housing need in accordance with NPPF and engage with Dorset Council to accommodate any unmet needs sustainably.	Objection	Yes	No action	The BCP area has significant constraints which mean the level of growth set out in the standard methodology cannot be achieved. In accordance with the NPPF the Plan does not propose to release Green Belt to meet housing needs. Duty to cooperate arrangements set out in the duty to cooperate compliance statement	NA
0248	Hathor Property	H1	Lack of delivery from some allocations that are historic put doubt on their delivery in the new plan period. Will need a significant step change in delivery to meet requirements of Standard Method. Council placing significant reliance on the delivery of windfall sites, and this reliance is likely to exacerbate problems with the lack of family housing in the conurbation as homes and plots are sub-divided to deliver these sites, conflicting with other aims of the plan. Plan will not provide sufficient homes to meet the locally identified need. The significant reliance on windfall sites reduces the control and dilutes positive approach in the plan. A review of the plan in 2029 does not offer a solution to the 18,000 households without a home. Acknowledge stepped trajectory in delivery, however the conurbation will fall 1,000 dwellings short of objectively assessed need, and allocated sites have failed to deliver over a significant period of time, and no evidence to suggest a significant shift, or delivered later in the plan. The stepped trajectory will result in limited housing delivery in the first five years of the plan, and the Council will not be able to demonstrate a five year land supply against housing target of 24,000 or objectively assessed need of 42,000 homes. This approach could lead to slower delivery and take longer to remedy an already insufficient housing land supply position. It is not sound, and will lead to serious implications for affordability, housing and economic growth	Objection	Yes	No action	The BCP area has significant constraints which mean the level of growth set out in the standard methodology cannot be achieved. The area has a strong and consistent level of windfall but site availability not currently known, the HELAA identifies potential locations that illustrates a large number of windfall sites remain	NA
0250	East Dorset Friends of the Earth	H1	Strongly object. Minimum housing requirement conflicts with Policy S1, only required to house in-migrants, will negatively impact affordable housing supply for residents, will put pressure on resources, habitats, carbon emissions, drainage capacity, and will prevent several local plan objectives being met.	Objection		No action	Additional housing is required to improve affordability. The housing requirement considers the various constraints in the BCP area	NA
0263	Bellway Strategic Land, Miller Homes, AJC Group, Wyatt Homes, Fortitudo and WH White	H1	Representation by consortium of national and regional promoters and developers with shared concern regarding objectively assessed housing need figure is only 58% of standard method. Justification for very significant departure (constraints led approach and purported demographic anomalies) is unfounded and without precedent and considers plan to be not legally compliant or sound. Constraints based approach not advocated in NPPF and BCP constraints not exceptional. Not evidenced based but policy based evidence which fails to address development needs. Turley Economics conclude that Council's position is not justified or sound due to new data demonstrating projections to be higher than 2014 projections. Slower population growth not unique to BCP and not influenced by housing delivery. 26% few homes delivered since 2014. Appropriate to retain 2014 based projections. H1 not positively prepared as fails to present strategy as per area's objectively assessed needs resulting in consequence of frustrating access to appropriate housing, reducing choice and range and ability to 'right size'; reduced affordability and social mobility; suppressed household formation and aging population; housing inequality; lack of financial security and stability; poor impacts on physical and mental health; decreased social mobility; negative impact on children's education and development; reduced safety within households; risk of housing outside social support network; prioritisation of paying unaffordable rent or mortgage over basic human needs; increased national housing benefit bill; suppressing growth of working population and job creation; exacerbate recruitment and retention; reducing funding for infrastructure; reducing employment growth; increased in-commuting; and reducing funding for green infrastructure. Evidence not up to date. Plan inconsistent with national policy as won't enable sustainable development	Objection	Yes	No action	The BCP area has significant constraints which mean the level of growth set out in the standard methodology cannot be achieved. The area has a strong and consistent level of windfall but site availability not currently known, the HELAA identifies potential locations that illustrates a large number of windfall sites remain.	NA
0268	Talbot Village Trust	H1	Essential allocation policies do not stifle delivery of housing	Comment		No action	Policies aim to balance a range of planning considerations and provide clarity surrounding requirements to support delivery.	NA



ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0269	South West Housing and Planning Consortium	H1	Support phasing of housing delivery, higher level of delivery in the earlier period needed due to under delivery and acute housing need. Proposed required is far below the level of housing need identified in the evidence base. Critical on-going need for a substantial amount of new affordable housing. Need to facilitate affordable housing delivery in BCP. Updated 2024 Standard Method figure is 2,766 dpa. Encourage Council to revisit its housing requirement to meet or exceed the Standard Method. Right to Buy (RTB) losses compounding affordable housing need. Several locations exist where the release of Green Belt land would only have a low or low-moderate harm. Oppose decision not to release green belt. Exceptional circumstances exist for the Council to justify housing delivery in the Green Belt.	Objection	No	No action	The BCP area has significant constraints which mean the level of growth set out in the standard methodology cannot be achieved. In accordance with the NPPF the Plan does not propose to release Green Belt to meet housing needs.	NA
0271	Highwood Group	H1	Historic significant under-delivery fails to support council's approach and plan introduces no game changer/may further prohibit delivery due to housing mix, affordability and resistance to change of use. Must use standard figure and meet needs through housing allocations due to this and affordability, availability, ageing population, under-delivery, economy and infrastructure issues. Focus on urban area unsuitable. Green belt release required to meet needs. No identification of supply of specific, deliverable sites for 5 years from adoption. No buffer in light of under delivery. Does not identify supply from specific sites. Object to stepped requirement given need for early delivery to address issues.	Objection	Yes	No action	The BCP area has significant constraints which mean the level of growth set out in the standard methodology cannot be achieved. In accordance with the NPPF the Plan does not propose to release Green Belt to meet housing needs. Five year land supply information set out in the evidence.	NA
0273	Churchill Retirement Living	H1	Stepped delivery not sufficient to meet needs due to Significant historic under-delivery, shortfall and lack of land supply, notably in Christchurch, and affordability issues. No priority given to addressing flood risk issues. Allowing policy to further delay delivery not in compliance with requirement to boost supply	Objection		No action	The BCP area has significant constraints which mean the level of growth set out in the standard methodology cannot be achieved. Flood risk issues in Christchurch are factored into the trajectory and the sites are not relied upon to calculate the number of homes on allocated sites.	NA
0280	Dorset CPRE	H1	Support H1. Targets are sustainable and meet tests of soundness. BCP showing strong leadership in challenging the Standard Method target. 1600 homes per annum is more than number needed to meet likely household growth with an average of 1,111 extra households per annum projected. (10 year migration variant gives much lower average growth of 693 households over 15 year plan period). We would like to see BCP championing 'brownfield first'	Support	Yes	No action	Support noted	NA
0292	WH White	H1	Strongly objects to (a) as spatial strategy deficient and policy not positively prepared or justified. Housing figures not justified and inconsistent with NPPF rendering ineffective. No justification for stepped trajectory as strategic urban extension deliverable over next 5 years. This sill suppress population growth and household formation. Support intent and wording of (b) and (c).	Objection	Yes	No action	The BCP area has significant constraints which mean the level of growth set out in the standard methodology cannot be achieved.	NA
0445	Jake Ruggier	H1	Housing requirement is below the standard method and will not address the housing crisis. Increased supply would improve house prices. Need to make best use of brownfield land, eg Branksome Triangle and release Green Belt.	Objection	No	No action	The BCP area has significant constraints which mean the level of growth set out in the standard methodology cannot be achieved. In accordance with the NPPF the Plan does not propose to release Green Belt to meet housing needs.	NA
0447	Poole Quays Forum	H1	Support	Objection		No action	Support noted	NA

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0545	Nick Guildford	H1	Lack of vision for growth to address previous failings of legacy Bournemouth Council to provide sufficient housing and right type of housing (family houses rather than flats primarily provided) for residents. Not positively prepared. Bournemouth Hospital, University, and Football Club have highlighted aspirations for growth to support economy and need for housing growth to address needs in full due to affordability issues. Plan plans for growth significantly lower than standard method figure. Suggestion green belt is a constraint for growth, and resultant strategy is inconsistent with national policy, unjustified, unsound planning, without intention to meet residents' needs, and politically motivated. Strategy has prevented residents from buying a home due to increased prices and rental levels. Right type of housing (family houses most needed) and sites required – greenfield and green belt sites can help provide. 91% of completions in 2017/18 were flats according to AMR – forces purchase/rent of flats rather than houses needed. Flatted development in urban area often undeliverable due to viability issues, and provide limited/no affordable housing – only 13% of completions affordable housing (10% with right to buy allowance). Bournemouth Core Strategy Inspector raised concerns about that plan's similar strategy and modified to require early reviews, including potential need for strategic green belt housing allocations, but reviews did not take place. Sustainably located urban extension sites are available that could contribute towards needs for market/affordable family housing alongside social infrastructure and significant public open space. Also could contribute to Stour Valley Park initiative. More positive strategy supporting new residential on available greenfield and green belt sites in addition to further growth in urban areas <del>required to be sound.</del>	Objection	No	No action	The BCP area has significant constraints which mean the level of growth set out in the standard methodology cannot be achieved. In accordance with the NPPF the Plan does not propose to release Green Belt to meet housing needs.	NA
0571	Home Builders Federation	H1	Object to 24,000 minimum target and planned phasing – need to deliver standard method as a minimum as there are no exceptional circumstances - housing crisis, housing need, affordable housing need and need to support employment growth. Partnership work previously indicated Dorset Council was willing and able to meet unmet needs. Phasing suppresses housing needs/requirements to artificially demonstrate 5YHLS at adoption and avoid important strategic policy decisions. Annual requirement (which should be higher) should be spread evenly over plan period - should be set out in housing trajectory. Site by site analysis required to check each allocation's deliverability. Assumptions on lapse rates, non-implementation allowances, lead in time and delivery rates within overall HLS, 5YHLS and housing trajectory must be correct and realistic – should be supported by those responsible for delivery and sense checked by Council. Plan period not long enough. Inclusion of windfalls in housing requirement removes opportunity for them to provide additional supply and not a proactive strategy - windfall allowance buffer should be in addition to buffer added to standard method figure. Windfalls do not provide same choice, competition and flexibility as additional allocations. Proportion of reduced requirement reliant on windfalls vs allocations unacceptable. Reliance on windfalls contradicts environmental constraint policies, constraints-based approach, and on site BNG and other new policy requirements – must be resolved. Allowance should not be included until fourth year of housing trajectory, as earlier projected completions already known about. Monitoring of policies that trigger review if under-supply occurs is ineffective. Under-delivery must be addressed quickly – policy and monitoring framework should explicitly refer to potential to bring forward additional housing supply earlier. Could identify reserve sites and/or include policies allowing additional windfall sites that could/would be brought forward sooner to address under-delivery (i.e. shortfall of market/affordable commitments/completions or failures against HDT/plan monitoring). Must monitor delivery of unmet need by neighbouring authorities and actively participate in their local plan consultations/examinations. Need to set out when monitoring will be undertaken, and more information required on actions to be taken when under-delivering, otherwise ineffective and unsound.	Objection	Yes	No action	The BCP area has significant constraints which mean the level of growth set out in the standard methodology cannot be achieved. Details of duty to cooperate arrangements are set out in the duty to cooperate compliance statement. Windfall has provided a consistent source of supply and HELAA demonstrates additional windfall sites exist. Not possible to allocate these sites as they are unknown. Phasing of the plan is realistic and a step change in housing delivery will take time to implement.	NA

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0254	New Forest District Council NFDC	H1	Recognises the challenge faced in terms of meeting housing needs. Against the standard method, there will be a shortfall in homes. The scale of this shortfall could place pressures on surrounding areas. NFDC have a shortfall against the standard method and has commenced a full Local Plan Review. NFDC considers that paragraphs 11.20 and 11.21 should be strengthened and elevated to policy status to commit to a review, such a policy should also require review if New Forest District (outside the National Park) has a unmet need. It is not clear whether BCP Council will use Housing sensitivity report to formally challenge the need figure calculated by the standard method at their Local Plan examination.	Comment	Yes	Modification	Agree that further information surrounding unmet need and the review mechanism are required. Our approach was to start with the standard method need and apply a constraints based approach to determining the housing requirement. We are not relying on the housing sensitivity report although it does provide useful background and will be submitted alongside the local plan as evidence. We have discussed housing need at duty to cooperate meetings with NFDC and with Dorset Council. The emerging Dorset Council and NFDC Local Plan's will provide the opportunity to explore unmet needs and BCP Council will engage in that process. The outcomes of testing strategic options around housing delivery in the sustainability appraisals may require a review of the BCP Local.	Insert new policy ID3 in chapter 11 to set on monitoring and review arrangements
0267	Richborough Estates	H1	Object, due to plan period being too short. Extending would add additional 3,200 homes to target. Not attempting to meet standard method figure, in light of housing crisis (overcrowding, suitability, affordability, provision for first time buyers and of specialist care, government ambitions) which will worsen and social and economic benefits; and lack of exceptional circumstances due to inappropriate interrogation of official projections as 2014-based projections used to ensure consistency and supply boost, doesn't compare migration situation with other LPAs (not necessarily exceptional as migration fluctuates and PPG requires use of 2014-based projections regardless), other authorities required to use 2014-based projections, 2021-based interim projections almost exactly in line with 2014-based projections. Need to release green belt and work with neighbouring authorities to meet needs. Historic low delivery rates could continue due to economic uncertainty. Reliance on brownfield and windfall sites. Densities sometimes unrealistic given site requirements (notably BNG). Unreasonable to expect all to be delivered in plan period, particularly first half, given viability issues and historic rates. Limit on number of sites that can provide windfall development and not a positive strategy - more allocations required. Housing trajectory as more housing should be delivered in first 5 years given historic under-delivery and challenging to address shortfall in future years; need to extend plan period; need for delivery to be evenly spread; manipulated to allow demonstrating of 5YHLS; should plan to meet standard method figure; buffer for under-delivery required; should release green belt land.	Objection	Yes	Modification	Amend to change plan period. The BCP area has significant constraints which mean the level of growth set out in the standard methodology cannot be achieved. In accordance with the NPPF the Plan does not propose to release Green Belt to meet housing needs. The area has a strong and consistent level of windfall but where site availability not currently known, the HELAA identifies potential locations that illustrates a large number of windfall sites remain.	Amend references to plan period
0304	Sovereign Network Group SNG	H1	Plan should extend beyond 2039 due to adoption timescales. Higher housing delivery needed in response to housing needs and affordable housing needs. Under delivery against need. Follow standard method or significantly increase housing target..	Objection		Modification	Amend plan period. The BCP area has significant constraints which mean the level of growth set out in the standard methodology cannot be achieved.	Amend references to plan period
0195	Christchurch Town Council Neighbourhood Plan Working Group	H1	Could list strategic allocation sites and delivery expectations under this policy for sites >1ha to lock into a strategic policy and enable ward polices to be non-strategic. NPPF states strategic policies should not extend to detailed matters that are more appropriately dealt with through neighbourhood plans or non-strategic policies.	Objection		No action	All the sites are required to meet the housing requirement and are considered strategic.	NA
0292	WH White	Para 8.11-8.17	Supports pre-amble text but proposed approach fails to grasp scale of challenge. Affordable Housing Statement prepared by Telow King (appendix G) highlights number of issues and expected supply of affordable housing will equate to less than 2 years mostly delivered in first 5 years.	Objection	Yes	No action	Housing Delivery evidence paper (HOM10b) discusses affordable housing provision. This is a challenge for the Local Plan but the Council have sought to maximise the delivery of affordable housing while considering viability constraints.	NA
0280	Dorset CPRE	Para 8.15	8.15 insufficient evidence that affordable housing not viable in Bournemouth and Poole town centres. (Para 30 of NPPF requires policies to be underpinned by relevant and up to date evidence). This strategy does not meet BCPs development needs or support earlier policies for major developments to demonstrate they contribute to social value (4.23 Town Centres). Affordable housing can be viable in town centres with density projections of 300dph compared to 30dph on greenfield sites. Town centre will be more viable than suburban, reflected in GDV for town centre schemes due to tenfold increase in development and headroom of GDV over construction cost, finance and profit and base land value of EUV+. Planning obligations including affordable housing should be fairly set out in the plan and only varied in exceptional circumstances based on open book viability assessment. An SPD containing a viability code of practice or similar would provide clarity. 40% affordable housing should apply to all housing schemes.	Objection	Yes	No action	Affordable housing provisions have been set using the plan viability evidence, this has considered the various development costs and be prepared in collaboration with the development industry.	NA

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0079	The Society for Poole	H2	Policy H2 could be made sound and is likely effective in serving the public interest. However, not clear how many affordable dwellings will be sought or how proposed number compares with a reasonable assessment of number of residents. Under vision and objectives it is suggested that provision of affordable homes to meet needs should be prioritised over more expensive homes, holiday lets and similar. Reference to provision of 'affordable' homes being increased is noted. However, no evidence on correlation between management of waiting list and delivery of dwellings. Therefore unsound. Under introduction it is suggested that there is concern regarding housing affordability affecting ability to achieved balanced communities. Council building or fostering of community land trusts should be considered in order to provide well-located, suitable housing with suitable tenures .	Support with changes		No action	The provision of affordable housing is linked to the viability of schemes and the policy reflects this in seeking to maximise affordable housing. In plan preparation consideration was given to issues surrounding second homes/holiday lets but elsewhere restrictions on new builds can have unintended consequences on existing stock.	NA
0096	Go South Coast	H2	Policy maintains the existing policy approach to affordable housing which does not delivery affordable housing or commuted sums. Poor delivery will continue. Policy is unsound, Plan should plan positively to meet affordable housing needs.	Objection	No	No action	The affordable housing has changed, the affordable housing policy changes percentage of affordable housing required to reflect viability and introduces a tariff system to help secure additional affordable housing contributions, and provide certainty to developers.	NA
0146	Inspired Villages	H2	Support that affordable housing is not sought for specialist forms of housing. Extra care housing is normally Use Class C2.	Support with changes	No	No action	Support noted	NA
0195	Christchurch Town Council Neighbourhood Plan Working Group	H2	The option to make a financial contribution to the council for affordable housing should only be when on-site affordable housing is not feasible. Otherwise AH will be difficult to deliver and will be only 100% AH sites and not mixed.	Objection		No action	Tariff approach is intended to help secure more affordable housing than current system which is often challenged with viability reports and leads to no contributions at all.	NA
0220	LGIM Real Assets	H2	Supports but text should be clear that sites in Bmth and Poole town centres will be nil affordable housing for the plan period or otherwise provide clarity regarding annual publication of tariff.	Support with changes		No action	Plan is already clear that the tariff may be updated annually. This will allow contributions to be collected in future if viability improves.	NA
0223	Fortitudo Ltd	H2	Welcomed that affordable housing percentage for brownfield sites is more realistic, however no affordable housing is viable to deliver. CIL rates have been vastly increased instead where affordable housing has been reduced.	Objection		No action	CIL is non negotiable where affordable housing levels are frequently negotiated out of schemes. Viability report demonstrates headroom in some developments and can therefore collect CIL fund to spend on appropriate infrastructure.	NA
0225	Dorset Council	H2	Support the measures to deliver balanced communities within the town centres and local opportunity areas. However, development viability of urban sites will limit affordable housing delivery and family housing, and with few greenfield sites allocated in the plan, is likely to be displacement of housing demand to more remote locations beyond BCP, causing increased commuting on already congested roads.	Support		No action	Support noted. Four past Green Belt releases yet to be built will provide around 750 affordable homes / 2000 family houses over the next 5 years. BCP Council are also changing our approach to urban sites, requiring modest affordable housing financial contributions instead of on-site delivery. This will be reinvested in the Council's land holding to deliver affordable housing. New housing mix requirements will ensure the right type of homes to meet needs are delivered. It will be crucial to monitor the effectiveness of these policy changes over years 1-5 of the plan period to understand if a local plan review will be needed to address any shortcomings.	NA
0235	Wyatt Homes	H2	Position set out in para 8.14 does not represent a positively prepared approach to addressing development needs, and is not consistent with national policy. No evidence provided in terms of need for affordable housing, and so it is unclear as to how policy H2 will address the need for affordable homes across the plan period. Lack of provision of greenfield sites in the Plan to better provide the affordable housing provision. H2 is likely to deliver no more than 200-300 affordable homes per annum, which is a small fraction of the need in LHNA. It will not result in an increased delivery of affordable homes. With no target for affordable homes, there is no basis by which the council can judge if additional general needs housing sites should be allocated in order to ensure that the appropriate level of affordable homes can be met. LHNA out of date as considers Standard Method rather than significantly lower housing numbers BCP plans for. It is not clear as to why there are different requirements/options for affordable housing between the different value areas.	Objection	Yes	No action	The plan sets out the affordable housing need but does not set a requirement as this is linked with viability. The BCP area has significant constraints which mean the level of growth set out in the standard methodology cannot be achieved. In accordance with the NPPF the Plan does not propose to release Green Belt to meet housing needs.	NA
0245	Miller Homes and Bellway Homes (Wessex)	H2	Heavy reliance on brownfield and windfall sites - affordable housing delivery expected to worsen. Less than a quarter of required affordable homes will be delivered, almost certainly even less given many sites will not deliver. Aligning would standard method would result in delivery of 41% of estimated affordable housing need	Objection	Yes	No action	The BCP area has significant constraints which mean the level of growth set out in the standard methodology cannot be achieved.	NA
0250	East Dorset Friends of the Earth	H2	Strongly support attempts to increase affordable housing supply and quality. No significant development of greenfield sites required, alternative solutions available on brownfield (redeveloping bungalows, and developing town centre and brownfield sites, subject to not fragmenting retail space). Zoning to separate residential from employment uses sensible.	Objection		No action	Support noted	NA

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0250	East Dorset Friends of the Earth	H2	Generally supportive, but minimum percentages of affordable housing to low. Expect majority of development to be in affordable housing category.	Objection		No action	Policy in relation to affordable housing is pragmatic given viability issues.	NA
0258	Royal London Mutual Insurance Society Ltd	H2	Support policy	Objection	No	No action	Support noted	NA
0267	Richborough Estates	H2	Object as fails to plan for affordable housing despite considerable need and affordability crisis/housing issues. Land north of Townsend could deliver policy-compliant affordable housing on site and within early years of plan period.	Objection	Yes	No action	Policy offers a pragmatic approach to affordable housing. In accordance with the NPPF the Plan does not propose to release Green Belt to meet housing needs.	NA
0292	WH White	H2	Objects because policy won't be effective as a result of policy H2 but supports wording and intent of policy and threshold for affordable housing provision (aligns with NPPF); proportion of homes (40%) delivered on greenfield sites; proposed tenure split in provision 1(a) and 1(b)-(d). Canford Garden Village omission site could deliver were it allocated or reserved.	Objection	Yes	No action	In accordance with the NPPF the Plan does not propose to release Green Belt to meet housing needs.	NA
0447	Poole Quays Forum	H2	Support recognition of need to achieve affordable homes. However. non-viability should not be an excuse not to provide affordable/social housing. Site acquisition should account for affordable/social housing costs. Any provision to ensure site is not artificially held below ten dwelling threshold and to address any potential phasing that seeks to avoid affordable housing provision. Affordable housing should be provided in the Poole regeneration areas.	Objection		No action	The approach to affordable housing, including considering viability, is supported by the NPPF. The policy approach on affordable housing seeks to delivery a percentage of affordable housing aligned to viability testing and provides a tariff option to encourage contributions instead of viability challenges. Viability assessments have shown that viability in Poole Town Centre is constrained.	NA
0571	Home Builders Federation	H2	Question whether percentage of affordable housing sought deliverable. Amount of asks sought (including proposal CIL increases) will make plan undeliverable and unviable. Viability Study needs to fully consider challenges an additional costs facing developers (Future Homes part L, Building Safety Levy, increased materials and labour, costs arising from BNG). Plan viability testing does not require detailed testing of every site/assurances of viability, only typologies tested, therefore flexibility required on affordable housing provision to address issues on site. Policies should allow flexibility/opportunity for negotiation on policy requirements for site specific reasons as could be unviable due to plan policies, including changing types of affordable housing/percentages of each while still providing some overall proportion. 10% BNG required – going higher could impact affordable housing delivery and no evidence/justification for it. Requirements for M4(2) and M4(3) costs also need to be taken into account – distinction between M4(3)(a) and M4(3)(b) needed as latter can only sought on affordable housing and considerably more expensive.	Objection	Yes	No action	Plan viability testing has considered a wide range of factors and industry feedback has helped to shape assumptions. Affordable housing percentages therefore considered realistic.	NA
0176	Friends of the Elderly	H2	Paragraph 8.15 indicates development for specialist housing including care/nursing homes on brownfield sites not expected to make contribution to affordable housing but this is not explicitly reflected in the policy. It could be inferred from wording that care/nursing home and housing-with-care on greenfield sites would be expected to make a contribution towards affordable housing. Such an approach would make many schemes unviable as development more expensive (50-60% more) to build due to internal space standards, other design enhancements and need for separation and self-containment. Request policy is amended to exclude care/nursing homes from affordable housing contributions. This would be consistent with adopted policy approach which excludes C2 use classes. Note attempt to differentiate between specialist types of housing with care, with extra care (assisted living) as Class C3. There is considerable evidence that specialist housing-with-care, including extra care, should be classified as C2 (see Appendix 4 of rep). Concern about annual publication of the Affordable Housing Tariff. Not clear if changes would be based on specific research or just index-linked and appears interested parties will not be given chance to comment before adopted.	Objection	Yes	Modification	Agree clarification required surrounding types of homes to which the policy is applicable	Amend first part of policy H2 to provide further clarity surrounding specialist accommodation.
0233	University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust	H2	Text in 8.15 references specialist forms of housing, no reference is made to these in policy wording or to key worker housing. Amendments suggested.	Objection	Yes	Modification	Agree clarification required surrounding types of homes to which the policy is applicable	Amend first part of policy H2 to provide further clarity surrounding specialist accommodation.

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0269	South West Housing and Planning Consortium	H2	Support 40% affordable housing provision on-site at greenfield sites. Concerns First Homes and implications on traditional forms of affordable housing. Not as affective as shared ownership. Requests that First Homes and shared ownership policies are applied in BCP where First Homes is either included as a possible affordable home ownership option or excluded on the basis of not meeting needs. Flexibility needed if First Homes fall away over the plan period. Part 1(d) requires in perpetuity no wording in NPPF which requires this, not supported as restricts investment. Do not support excluding Bournemouth and Poole town centre from affordable housing requirements, financial contributions in these areas should also be reconsidered if on site delivery is considered unachievable.	Objection	No	Modification	Support noted. Viability work shows affordable housing (including first homes) are not viable in Poole and Bournemouth town centres. The May 2021 government written statement provides the policy of first homes and refers to discount under market value being retained in perpetuity through Section 106 Agreement - <a href="https://questions-statements.parliament.uk/written-statements/detail/2021-05-24/hlws48">https://questions-statements.parliament.uk/written-statements/detail/2021-05-24/hlws48</a> .	Clarify in Policy H2 (1)d that First Homes must remain affordable in perpetuity.
0280	Dorset CPRE	H2	H2. Greenfield sites - Wording poorly written. The remaining (75%) affordable/social rent housing should comprise 35% available at an affordable rent at less than 80% market rent, and 40% being available at less than 60% market rent. H2. Brownfield sites – should include provision for affordable/social rent housing	Objection	Yes	Modification	Agree that clarification can be provided regarding the remaining 75% of affordable homes on Greenfield sites.	Amend policy H2 part 1 to make it clear that the remaining 75% is for affordable/social rent
0304	Sovereign Network Group SNG	H2	Recognise the role of Housing Associations in the LP. In Part 2 acknowledge the need to work collaboratively and flexibly with registered providers. Concerned about impact of First Homes on traditional forms of affordable housing. Shared ownership more accessible/flexible. Shared ownership and affordable rent will be squeezed out. More flexibility needed if First Homes falls away. Consider guidance in Ministerial Statement and PPG.	Objection		Modification	Agree to reference the important role of Housing Associations.	Amend 8.14 to reference the important role of registered Providers in providing affordable housing
0424	NHS Property Services	H2	Consider the need for affordable housing for NHS staff and other health and care providers. Ensure NHS staff have access to suitable housing at an affordable price within reasonable commuting distance of the work place. Need for NHS staff should be factored into housing needs assessments, and consider site allocation for affordable housing for NHS staff.	Support with changes		Modification	Agree that key worker housing is important for NHS staff and other health providers. Potential to add in key worker homes promoted by the NHS for key worker housing (Wessex Fields and Poole Hospital) through further work on statement of common ground.	Amend policy P26 to add reference to land adjacent to Parkstone House. Continue to work on statement of common ground.
0540	McCarthy Stone	H2	Exemption of specialist housing for older people from provision of affordable housing on brownfield sites supported but should be incorporated into Policy H2 to address ambiguity. Viability Study needs to be revised - provision of 40% affordable housing on greenfield specialist housing sites for older people should be tested as viability of such schemes more finely balanced than general needs housing and to be consistent with national policy, otherwise may lead to significant delays to delivery due to inappropriate discussions about other policy areas (including affordable housing). If found unviable/less viable exemption or reduction in affordable housing provision requirements must be provided in plan.	Objection	Yes	Modification	Agree clarification required surrounding types of homes to which the policy is applicable	Amend first part of policy H2 to provide further clarity surrounding specialist accommodation.
0237	Toklon Ltd	H2	Wording would be more explicitly to state no affordable housing provision is required in Poole and Bournemouth town centre.	Objection	No	No action	Not needed in policy as it is covered in para 8.15	NA
0292	WH White	Para 8.18-8.24	Anticipates loss of existing family homes for sub-division and redevelopment adding pressure to net position. Delivering for family homes in centre locations challenging and limited appetite hence developer reluctance. Market intervention would defy expectations of future occupiers. Rapid take up of new homes at Canford Paddock demonstrate this. Concurs with para 8.23 the role of urban extensions in delivering family homes and more are required including Canford Garden Village omission site if allocated or reserved.	Objection	Yes	No action	In accordance with the NPPF the Plan does not propose to release Green Belt to meet housing needs.	NA
0077	Craig Hendry	H3	No protection of small family dwellings houses. More flats and HMOs over houses resulting in poor quality housing contributing to decline of the area.	Objection		No action	Housing Mix policy seeks to ensure the delivery of 3+ bed homes on sites and larger allocations, including the urban extensions, will deliver a high proportion of family homes. Proposals relating to HMOs will be assessed against the HMO policy. Flatted development does not automatically result in poor quality development and the policies in the plan seek to ensure good living conditions and high quality design.	NA
0082	Christchurch Harbour Ornithological Group	H3	Densities for Christchurch cannot be achieved particularly in view of heritage constraints and the proportions of studio and 1 bed homes suggested for Christchurch. Christchurch town centre should be a LOA in policy S2 and subject to those criteria.	Objection		No action	The densities included are indicative as every site will have different constraints/opportunities, these densities are however realistic for a town centre location. Development would need to adhere to housing mix policy which seeks to manage the proportion of studio and one bed units. The scale and function of Christchurch is considered to be that of a town centre..	NA
0096	Go South Coast	H3	Mismatch between supply and need, consented schemes for 1/2 bed homes. Housing mix policies given less weight in 5 year supply not maintained. Built to rent schemes not covered by the policy. Policy is unambitious in meeting housing need. Will compound imbalance of typologies, will result in a large amount of flatted development, lack of 5 year supply resulted in no control of mix or tenure. Not clear what pipeline of mix will be, not meeting needs for range of tenures or houses. Policy on tall buildings is weak. Amount of students in Lansdowne places pressure on bus stops. To provide family homes Green Belt release is needed.	Objection	No	No action	Part b sets out that build to rent and co-living is exempt from the requirements in the town centres of Poole and Bournemouth. There has not been pressure for these schemes in other locations. Housing mix policy seeks to support greater number of 3+ bed homes. In accordance with the NPPF the Plan does not propose to release Green Belt to meet housing needs.	NA

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0150	Ken Parke on behalf of various clients 3	H3	Housing mix will not be deliverable or desirable in many situations. Many sites suitable for 1 to 2 bed flats, not family housing as required in policy. Flexibility should be built into policy for varying circumstances (rather than only acknowledged in supporting text). Large requirement for family homes due to failure to release green field land where this and affordable housing can be viably delivered. Aspirational mix results from failed spatial strategy.	Objection		No action	Majority of sites are capable of providing a mix of unit sizes, different innovative typologies may be needed in some cases. In accordance with the NPPF the Plan does not propose to release Green Belt to meet housing needs.	NA
0170	Bloc Group / Network Rail	H3	Requiring 5% 3 beds should not be a specific requirement as may not be suited for large density schemes.	Objection		No action	Majority of sites are capable of providing a mix of unit sizes, different innovative typologies may be needed in some cases	NA
0195	Christchurch Town Council Neighbourhood Plan Working Group	H3	Not clear what a. means or if housing mix could be reason for refusal. 'c.' and 'd' could be difficult for conversions due to configuration of building. 'e.' add 'with reference to local needs' to provide clarity on how decisions will be made.	Support with changes		No action	The policy makes clear in the introductory sentence that proposal should contribute to the need as identified in the Strategic Housing Needs Assessment. The wording of the policy gives flexibility within the percentage range provided.	NA
0220	LGIM Real Assets	H3	Supports caveating of co-living and build to rent schemes as typical occupiers of such schemes are often graduates and young professionals who typically require smaller homes.	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0223	Fortitudo Ltd	H3	Proposed housing mix not deliverable. 3 bedroom homes desirable by Council, but not deliverable on brownfield sites due to viability. Table at page 161 within Local Housing Needs Assessment is not intended to translate in to policy requirement, and so policy is contrary to evidence base. Developers build mix of housing which can sell in the circumstances of individual sites. Inappropriate and unviable to require high proportion of 3 bedroom homes. Restrictions on location of 1 bedroom homes reduces choice of location to live. Green belt should be released to ensure delivery of family 3-4 bed homes and appropriate mix BCP-wide. 3 bed homes on town centre sites is not deliverable, viable or desirable. Plan conflicts with para 60 of NPPF. Policy is focused on open market housing. Those which would occupy affordable housing, but can't due to shortage, are occupying private rented properties. 70% of the affordable need is 1-2 bed homes. Delivering more smaller properties will increase choice for those relying on benefits to pay their rent. The market should deliver appropriate mix of housing for any given site.	Objection		No action	Majority of sites are capable of providing a mix of unit sizes, different innovative typologies may be needed in some cases. In accordance with the NPPF the Plan does not propose to release Green Belt to meet housing needs.	NA
0225	Dorset Council	H3	Support the measures to deliver balanced communities within the town centres and local opportunity areas. However, development viability of urban sites will limit affordable housing delivery and family housing, and with few greenfield sites allocated in the plan, is likely to be displacement of housing demand to more remote locations beyond BCP, causing increased commuting on already congested roads.	Support	Yes	No action	Support noted. Four past Green Belt releases yet to be built will provide around 750 affordable homes / 2000 family houses over the next 5 years. BCP Council are also changing our approach to urban sites, requiring modest affordable housing financial contributions instead of on-site delivery. This will be reinvested in the Council's land holding to deliver affordable housing. New housing mix requirements will ensure the right type of homes to meet needs are delivered. It will be crucial to monitor the effectiveness of these policy changes over years 1-5 of the plan period to understand if a local plan review will be needed to address any shortcomings.	NA
0235	Wyatt Homes	H3	Policy and supporting text set out an approach to housing mix which will fail to achieve recommended housing mix or anything close to it, due to being dependent of urban and brownfield sites coming forward to deliver new homes, which will not be able to provide level of family housing required. This is due to lack of release of Green Belt land for site allocations for political expediency rather than lack of supply or availability. Limits placed on proportion of smaller dwellings to come forward on Brownfield/urban sites, and inappropriate levels of 3+bed homes, with no evidence to support targets. This will lead to significant viability problems and planning delays, and affect delivery of affordable homes due to viability challenges on what may be appropriate on the type and location of sites. It is ineffective and wholly undeliverable, and contrary to paras 16, 35 and 63 of NPPF.	Objection	Yes	No action	In accordance with the NPPF the Plan does not propose to release Green Belt to meet housing needs.	NA
0237	Toklon Ltd	H3	Policy is too prescriptive, site circumstances may justify a different mix.	Objection	No	No action	A more prescriptive approach is justified given local needs	NA
0258	Royal London Mutual Insurance Society Ltd	H3	Royal London supports the caveating of co-living and build to rent schemes and note that the typical occupiers of such schemes are often graduates and young professionals who typically require smaller homes.	Objection	No	No action	Support noted	NA
0267	Richborough Estates	H3	Object as extremely unlikely that needs indicated by Figure 8.6 will be delivered on current allocated sites and windfall. Existing commitments heavily weight towards 1 and 2 bed flats. Land North of Townsend could provide policy compliant family sized market/affordable units.	Objection	Yes	No action	In accordance with the NPPF the Plan does not propose to release Green Belt to meet housing needs.	NA

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0271	Highwood Group	H3	Approach requiring different housing mixes for different areas not justified. Requirement for urban extensions and allocations focused on family housing not supported or justified and unnecessarily restricts 1 and 2 bed homes. Plan will not release additional land/windfall capacity to boost supply as housing mix will reduce capacity, viability policy will make accommodate housing in urban areas unless on existing brownfield sites, and increased density will have limited impact on improving viability. Should release green belt sites to help meet required housing mix.	Objection	Yes	No action	In accordance with the NPPF the Plan does not propose to release Green Belt to meet housing needs.	NA
0273	Churchill Retirement Living	H3	Specific housing mix not supported - will not support delivery and goes against gentle intensification. Not appropriate for retirement accommodation and will not needs of Christchurch Town Centre site or address specialist housing shortfall. Clarification required does not apply to retirement housing.	Objection		No action	Policy confirms it applies to C3 housing, if retirement housing proposed falls in this use class some large units should be provided.	NA
0292	WH White	H3	Objects because policy won't be effective as a result of policy H2. Policy will defy market expectations impacting on viability, urban development and regeneration on marginal sites. Canford Garden Village omission site is capable of delivering family homes if allocated or reserved where delivery trigger breaches.	Objection	Yes	No action	In accordance with the NPPF the Plan does not propose to release Green Belt to meet housing needs.	NA
0419	Geoff Bantock	H3	Support housing mix approach	Support	No	No action	Support noted	NA
0447	Poole Quays Forum	H3	The 5% provision in Poole town centre is unnecessarily low. Relatively high densities can be achieved including family homes. No specific mention of second and holiday/weekend homes. This is a target market for developers and does not address local need. Sites need a wide mix of homes and tenures.	Objection		No action	The percentage of 3+ units can be exceeded. It seeks to balance the need to provide larger units with what the market will deliver. Housing mix and affordable housing policies aim to deliver a mix of homes. Second homes were considered through the plan making process but could only be restricted on new build properties which could have unintended consequences on existing stock. A different mechanism may be more suitable to manage second homes.	NA
0653	Christchurch Town Council	H3	Housing mix for Christchurch Town Centre does not make sense - does not meet greatest need for family houses with small gardens. Sustainable location for families - supports active travel by children and older people. If policy non-strategic would enable residents/town council to address typologies required as long as accords with housing figures.	Objection	No	No action	The proposed mix also needs to reflect the reality of what developers will deliver. A large quantum of family housing will be delivered on the Roeshot Hill allocation.	NA
0282	Historic England	H3	Make explicitly reference to historic significance.	Objection		Modification	Agree	Amend policy H3 to reference historic significance
0292	WH White	Para 8.25-8.32	Supports National Described Space Standards and requirement for external amenity space but will be challenging in urban areas. Need explanation and rationale for M4(2) and 10% M4(3) requirements as could affect viability particularly on urban sites.	Support	Yes	No action	Para 8.30-8.32 set out information on M4(2) standards.	NA
0220	LGIM Real Assets	H4	Supports principle but objects to 1.iii as considers Build to Rent flatted schemes are not targeted at families with children and do not need to provide external space for playing. Also text regarding single aspect units should be revised, as units are often required to maximise delivery on brownfield sites and with good design, can provide appropriate amenity space.	Support with changes		No action	Policy is considered sufficiently flexible to support flatted development with space suitable to meet the needs of occupiers	NA
0250	East Dorset Friends of the Earth	H4	Support but should address other aspects of design (insulation standards, provision of renewable energy, water and waste conservation facilities).	Support with changes		No action	Sustainability features on new development are addressed in chapter 5.	NA
0258	Royal London Mutual Insurance Society Ltd	H4	Broadly supportive, a caveat needs to be added as in some scenarios sufficient amenity can be provided in single aspect units and these are often required to maximise delivery on brownfield sites	Objection	No	No action	Policy is flexible as it states 'as far as possible' avoid north facing single aspect rooms, acknowledging in some cases this may not be possible.	NA
0269	South West Housing and Planning Consortium	H4	Not essential to achieve these standards in order to provide good quality living. Lack of evidence for policy. Could undermined viability.	Objection		No action	Policy is considered necessary to support basic quality of life for future occupants	NA
0271	Highwood Group	H4	No justification, including regarding impact on affordability. If justified some flexibility required.	Objection	Yes	No action	Policy is considered necessary to support basic quality of life for future occupants	NA
0273	Churchill Retirement Living	H4	Policy requirement for all new homes to be M4(2) and 10% to be M4(3) acknowledged by supporting text to not be viable, therefore unjustified and will stifle delivery. Also conflicts with PPG. Building Regulations will supersede - no need for policy.	Objection		No action	To date changes have not been brought through building regulations. High proportion of elderly people in the area and those with disabilities	NA



ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0292	WH White	H4	Objects to 2(a) as ineffective alongside policy S2. Policy impact source of supply partially mitigating shortage of suitable homes. Canford Garden Village omission site is capable of delivering family homes if allocated or reserved where delivery trigger breaches. Supports National Described Space Standards in 1(a)(i). Supports intent of 1(a)(iii) but some concerned with flatted development in urban areas. Supports approach to M4(2) and M4(3) but reservation about meeting requirements in urban area and on sloping sites which could affect densities and windfall sites coming forward.	Objection	Yes	No action	A caveat for exceptional circumstances is included.	NA
0329	Andrew Reed	H4	- Support minimum outside amenity requirement for houses (eqv. to footprint). - Concerned about challenges given reference to "exceptional circumstances"	Objection	No	No action	It has to be acknowledged that some exceptional circumstances could exist	NA
0447	Poole Quays Forum	H4	Support. The design standards should be expanded to encourage 'greening' of the townscape.	Support with changes		No action	Support noted. Urban greening is required through policy NE4.	NA
0571	Home Builders Federation	H4	Do not support use of Nationally Described Space Standard (NDSS). Must be justified. Inflexible policy requiring all dwellings to meet NDSS will impact affordability and customer choice. Non-NDSS compliant dwellings can be good, functional homes and help meet market and affordable needs. Can result in larger homes without enough bedrooms, potentially increasing overcrowding and reducing quality of living environment. Should instead focus on good design to ensure homes fit for purpose. If NDSS adopted, should put forward proposals for transitional arrangements (as sites may have been secured prior to introduction), not required for reserved matters applications or any outline or detailed approval prior to a specified date. All requirements to meet Part M4(2) will be superseded by changes to Building Regulations, therefore no need for criterion b. PPG states unreasonable to require M4(2) and M4(3) compliant dwellings in some instances, such as where there is flood risk, therefore flexibility required to reflect site characteristics, otherwise ineffective and unjustified. Need to differentiate between M4(3)(a) and M4(3)(b), and consider viability implications of requiring development to comply with these standards in the Viability Assessment. This aspect of policy should be flexibly written	Objection	Yes	No action	NDSS proposed to meet basic living standards. Building Regulation proposals have not yet been brought in and therefore policy covers the issue in case of any potential change.	NA
0110	Watkin Jones Group	H4	Support co-living space standards, suggest additional wording. Co-living should be allowed more widely over BCP area. Should be clarified that co-living is a specialist form of housing not required to provide affordable housing.	Support with changes		Modification	Agree to clarification regarding co-living affordable housing. Setting out exceptions to the co-living space standard could result in many schemes trying to bring forward a lower standard	Amend policy H2 to set out exemptions for specialist housing
0270	McLaren Property	H4	Assumed that PBSA developments will not be subject to requirements in H4, and instead subject to requirements of H7, but reverence to 'other forms of residential accommodation' is ambiguous. Policy wording should either clarify this, or signpost reader to requirements of policy H7.	Support with changes		Modification	Agree, purpose build student accommodation to be considered under policy H7	Amend policy H4 to clearly reference co-living schemes rather than other forms of residential accommodation
0595	Public Health Dorset	H4	Support policy but supporting text should refer to importance for homes benefit health and wellbeing. Plan must specify standards new homes must meet to meet Policy S3 f, h and i. outcomes where possible. H4 criteria 1ai., 1aiii and 1b. of particular importance.	Support with changes		Modification	Agree	Amend introductory text to chapter to reference health and well being.
0235	Wyatt Homes	H4	Supporting text and policy wording have differing requirements/strength in applying M4(3) standards. As per the viability report, these should be encouraged, rather than 'should meet', as per the policy wording.	Objection	Yes	No action	Should meet is the same as encouraged.	NA
0250	East Dorset Friends of the Earth	H5	Sensible but revise criteria to minimise increase in hard cover (which gives rise to numerous negative impacts). Provision of parking at odds with the climate and transport objectives.	Support with changes		No action	Design of hard landscaped areas managed by policies in Chapter 5.	NA
0447	Poole Quays Forum	H5	Support	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0146	Inspired Villages	H6	Methodology to calculate housing need for older people in the Local Housing Needs Assessment is out of date and inaccurate, method produces artificially low outcomes	Objection	No	No action	Evidence is considered robust	NA
0167	Care South	H6	Wording needs to explicitly refer to new-build residential as currently could mean commercial development, conversions etc	Objection	Yes	No action	The specialist housing needs are set out in the supporting text	NA

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0176	Friends of the Elderly	H6	No explicit recognition in policy or text that majority of OAN for housing with care is pre-existing. FotE consider the policy approach fails to plan positively and explicitly for future OAN and would fail on tests of soundness with a risk that need that has been planned for would not be delivered. H6(1) Plan fails to plan for sufficiently for OAN (see table within rep). Reference in Oakdale ward policy site allocations that the Council "has a role to play in providing uses not always readily delivered by the market such as affordable housing or extra care". No clear reason for Oakdale to be a special case. Lack of sites/units identified via ward policies across BCP is a major concern. It would seem extremely unwise/unsound to rely so heavily on unplanned delivery i.e. windfall sites for housing for older people (circa 85%) when compared with the overall approach to windfall housing delivery (circa 35-40%). The likelihood of allocations actually being delivered is also a concern. 40-60 bed care/nursing homes are at lower end in terms of proposed operator size. Proposals of 40-45 units would be far too small. Schemes would need to be 80-120 to be deliverable. Likelihood is a scheme for 40-60 would only be attractive to an age-restricted product/operator such as a retirement home, but this is not where the OAN is. H6(2) supported but criterion a(ii) word "preferential" should be replaced with "more suitable". Concern that no explicit allowance has been made for the possibility, and indeed probability that a proportion of existing stock providing care will close (as was noted by the Inspector allowing an appeal for a new 69 bed care home in October 2022) Likely there will be some closures and no certainty through policy <del>they would be replaced</del>	objection	Yes	No action	The specialist housing needs are set out in the supporting text	NA
0250	East Dorset Friends of the Earth	H6	Support but caveat that such housing not permitted within 400m of heathland area.	Support with changes		No action	Covered by policies in chapter 6	NA
0267	Richborough Estates	H6	Note significant shortfall expected in housing with care. Opportunity to provide specialist accommodation close to facilities, services and amenities at Land north of Townsend.	Comment		No action	In accordance with the NPPF the Plan does not propose to release Green Belt to meet housing needs.	NA
0271	Highwood Group	H6	Figure 8.9 shows insufficient land identified to meet needs. Reliance on windfall misplaced. Requirements of care development means restricted to particular configuration and cannot be easily accommodated on urban sites or in vacant buildings. Should commit to a minimum level of provision over plan period to meet needs plus windfall so applications given positive weight and enable effectiveness to be reviewed after 5 years. Supporting text should also clarify level of need allocations seeking to address.	Objection	Yes	No action	The specialist housing needs are set out in the supporting text	NA
0273	Churchill Retirement Living	H6	Support aim of providing homes for older people. However policies H1 and H6 fail to identify target for older people's homes - must be addressed. Should support care/nursing home or specialist accommodation beyond allocations given needs may change.	Objection		No action	The specialist housing needs are set out in the supporting text	NA
0447	Poole Quays Forum	H6	Support but consider retention will be challenging.	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0540	McCarthy Stone	H6	Support	Support	No	No action	Support noted	NA
0096	Go South Coast	H7	Justification for concentrating PBSA in some areas is not clear. Bournemouth University offers discounted bus travel. Concentration in Lansdowne increases student use of U1 service, buses every 3 minutes at peak times, difficult to manage students in the peak times. Wider range of locations for PBSA could be appropriate.	Objection	No	No action	PBSA is proposed to be focused on campus locations which support students day to day activities or within a twenty minute travel time to the university /college by high quality, walking, cycling or existing high frequency bus route, this provides sufficient flexibility regarding the potential location of PBSA.	NA
0200	Meyrick Estate	H7	Plan should impose stricter controls on provision of HMOs in order to generate and sustain neighbourhoods. HMOs result in erosion of quality and positive identity contrary to plan objectives. Should make greater use of Article 4 Directions where damaging number of HMOs exist or are proposed. -Policies do not add any vision or requirement beyond individual sites - no requirements for neighbourhood enhancements or delivering infrastructure improvements. No incentive/requirement to contribute to context, local character, overall wellbeing or enhancement of area. -Need to work with businesses to improve frontages.	Objection	Yes	No action	The plan includes a policy to manage the provision of HMOs. Neighbourhood enhancements are set out in the ward policies. Working with businesses to improve frontages is outside of the local plan.	NA
0250	East Dorset Friends of the Earth	H7	Object to expansion of student accommodation on Talbot campus, due to potential threats to adjacent heathland and open space integrity.	Objection		No action	The campus is considered a suitable and sustainable location for an increase in student accommodation. The campus is located beyond 400m of the heathland.	NA
0268	Talbot Village Trust	H7	Support identification of Talbot Campus as location for student accommodation development/intensification.	Support		No action	Support noted	NA

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0284	Gervis Properties Ltd / Hinton Admiral Estate	H7	Concerned with uncontrolled proliferation of HMOs, management and impact on community through transient nature. Considers plan should impose stricter regulations in specific areas including Article 4 Directions where excessive HMOs pose a threat. H7 and H8 provide foundation but need more comprehensive vision/requirement. More neighbourhood enhancement and infrastructure improvements are required and collaboration with businesses to enhance visual appeal and character of area.	Support with changes		No action	HMOs can provide more affordable accommodation and can be managed through proposed policy H8 and the Article 4 arrangements. Potential neighbourhood improvements are outlined in the various ward policies.	NA
0287	Network Rail	H7	Support approach towards securing financial contributions towards sustainable transport infrastructure.	Support	Yes	No action	Support noted. We are prioritising the use of CIL to fund off site improvements, which includes active travel infrastructure.	NA
0447	Poole Quays Forum	H7	Students could add to Poole town centre. Student proposals should be near teaching areas.	Comment		No action	Poole town centre is considered remote from the main teaching campus areas.	NA
0039	Ropemaker properties	H7	Support principle of policy H7. Part E(i) is unclear how space standards relate to purpose built student accommodation as this accommodation is not a dwelling being sui generis rather than C3, more clarity needed on requirements.	Support with changes		Modification	Agree	Remove reference to Nationally Described Space Standards from policy H7
0110	Watkin Jones Group	H7	Generally supportive of Policy H7. Does not support 'a' that need is corroborated by the universities/colleges - unlikely to be provided, unclear what this requires, could be a letter but question practicality, could be nomination agreement but typically signed after planning, suggest needs assessment provided instead. Does not support 'e' as Nationally Described Space Standards do not apply to student accommodation (standards are too high as facilities are shared), eii not applicable to all student accommodation types e.g. ensembles, studios.	Support with changes		Modification	Agree	Remove reference to Nationally Described Space Standards from policy H7
0223	Fortitudo Ltd	H7	Supports flexible approach to location of purpose-built student accommodation, but objects to the requirement to meet an identified need corroborated by universities and colleges. Inconsistent with national policy and anti-competitive to identify whether it is needed or not. Evidence indicates significant capacity for additional student accommodation, which would in turn free up family homes occupied by students.	Objection		Modification	Agree	Amend policy H2 to remove reference to corroboration by the universities/colleges and replace with a student needs assessment; Amend policy H7 to remove reference to space standards.
0259	Arts University Bournemouth	H7	Principle policy is supported, changes to wording required. The areas where PBSA is to be focused should be defined on a map / plan. It is important that the policy does not limit the opportunity for PBSA schemes to be delivered within town centres. It is not clear what corroboration would entail, would all three universities need to corroborate the need, this could undermine effective delivery. Not clear how providers will demonstrate need for accommodation which needs clarification. Evidence does not set out how many students are in PBSA or what the target should be. Nationally Described Space Standards should not apply to PBSA schemes. Policy does not c address affordability of student accommodation and does not include proposals for securing affordable student accommodation within PBSA schemes. This should be considered and included within the policy wording.	Objection	Yes	Modification	Policy clearly specifies that PBSA should be focused on campus, within Bournemouth town centre, Boscombe or within twenty minutes travel time to a university/college. Agree, amend wording surrounding corroboration to ensure accommodation meets an established need and nationally described space standard. Need for student accommodation has been difficult to establish with a lack of information forthcoming for the universities/colleges.	Amend policy H2 to remove reference to corroboration by the universities/colleges and replace with a student needs assessment; Amend policy H7 to remove reference to space standards.
0270	McLaren Property	H7	H.7.1 - Support approach directing student accommodation to certain areas, particularly town centre. Also support flexible approach that doesn't rule out other areas. H.7.2 – support requirements including need to evidence demand; ensure compatibility with neighbouring uses; provide a Student Management Plan; sign up to approved code of management; and provide high standard of accommodation. Reference to need to meet Nationally Described Space Standards for bedrooms - presume this is 7.5sqm min area. This should be clarified in supporting text. Needs clarification what suitable quantum of communal or outdoor space is required. Also support recognition that new PBSA will allow conversion of HMOs back to family housing and wider benefits to housing market.	Support with changes		Modification	Agree, remove reference to nationally described space standards	Amend policy H7 to remove reference to space standards.
0286	Bournemouth University	H7	Generally supportive of H7 and Talbot and Lansdowne being focus for purpose built student accommodation. Concerned requirement in H7.2.a as not clear on assessment for identified need. Dorset and BCP Local Housing Needs Assessment 2021 states Bournemouth University has "confirmed there are enough student bedspaces within Bournemouth to meet the demand from the expected increase in student population and therefore no significant development is needed to accommodate their additional students. It is also the case that more students are choosing to live with their parents". BU do not consider that this includes need at Talbot campus. Also concerned Housing Needs Assessment (being 2-3 years old) does not accurately reflect needs.	Objection	Yes	Modification	Agree, amend wording surrounding corroboration to ensure accommodation meets an established need and nationally described space standard. Need for student accommodation has been difficult to establish with a lack of information forthcoming for the universities/colleges. Policy seeks to provide some flexibility to support their needs. The Council must balance with other needs of plan including housing and employment as well as ensuring appropriate infrastructure is in place to support development.	Amend policy H2 to remove reference to corroboration by the universities/colleges and replace with a student needs assessment;

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0200	Meyrick Estate	H8	Plan should impose stricter controls on provision of HMOs in order to generate and sustain neighbourhoods. HMOs result in erosion of quality and positive identity contrary to plan objectives. Should make greater use of Article 4 Directions where damaging number of HMOs exist or are proposed. -Policies do not add any vision or requirement beyond individual sites - no requirements for neighbourhood enhancements or delivering infrastructure improvements. No incentive/requirement to contribute to context, local character, overall wellbeing or enhancement of area. -Need to work with businesses to improve frontages.	Objection	Yes	No action	The plan includes a policy to manage the provision of HMOs. Neighbourhood enhancements are set out in the ward policies. Working with businesses to improve frontages is outside of the local plan.	NA
0250	East Dorset Friends of the Earth	H8	Parking provision element needs to be reviewed - at odds with objectives	Objection		No action	Parking is required for HMOs in accordance with the adopted Parking SPD, in some locations some parking would be supported.	NA
0284	Gervis Properties Ltd / Hinton Admiral Estate	H8	Concerned with uncontrolled proliferation of HMOs, management and impact on community through transient nature. Considers plan should impose stricter regulations in specific areas including Article 4 Directions where excessive HMOs pose a threat. H7 and H8 provide foundation but need more comprehensive vision/requirement. More neighbourhood enhancement and infrastructure improvements are required and collaboration with businesses to enhance visual appeal and character of area.	Support with changes		No action	HMOs can provide more affordable accommodation and can be managed through proposed policy H8 and the Article 4 arrangements. Potential neighbourhood improvements are outlined in the various ward policies.	NA
0447	Poole Quays Forum	H8	HMOs may represent a partial solution to homelessness and rough sleeping	Comment		No action	Policy H8 would support HMOs in some locations.	NA
0040	Natural England	H8	The Council should consider a reference to the Dorset Heathlands SPD which also provides guidance on the need for appropriate levels of mitigation for new HMOs.	Support with changes		Modification	Agree	Add new para and amend Policy H8 to clarify requirements for HMOs in relation to the Dorset Heathlands.
0195	Christchurch Town Council Neighbourhood Plan Working Group	H8	Reference in part b to 'Part 1' should this be H8a or a	Support with changes		Modification	Agree, amend numbering/referencing within policy for clarity	Amend Policy H8 part 2 to reference criteria a-c in part 1.
0292	WH White	Paras 8.63-8.65	Supports the explanation.	Support	Yes	No action	Support noted	NA
0223	Fortitudo Ltd	H9	Providing serviced plots for self or custom builders is unrealistic under (b), particularly on apartments and small scale developments of brownfield sites with high existing use values. This part of policy should be deleted. Releasing Green Belt land would ensure availability of self-build plots.	Objection		No action	The policy for self build specifically refers to houses rather than flats/apartments. This Plan is not seeking to amend Green Belt boundaries.	NA
0250	East Dorset Friends of the Earth	H9	Support such schemes but revise to emphasise opportunity to build highly energy-efficient houses (ideally passive houses) using low embedded-energy materials, and incorporating water salvage and waste minimisation features.	Support with changes		No action	Requirements in relation to sustainable construction set out in chapter 5 would apply to self build proposals.	NA
0271	Highwood Group	H9	Difficult to accommodate single plots by individuals alongside construction of market and affordable homes practically and safely. No justification. Should consider meeting demand by identifying additional sites specifically for this. Not necessary for self and custom build plots to be offered on open market prior to returning to developer, as interested individuals will have registered and only need to be advertised to them. 12 months more than enough time.	Objection	Yes	No action	Self build plots are often provided as part of larger developments, with a specific section identified for this purpose. Not all interested parties may have registered and therefore offering on the open market captures a wider potential audience.	NA
0273	Churchill Retirement Living	H9	Not appropriate for flatted schemes over 50 units to provide at least 5% plots for self and custom build. Clarification in policy required.	Objection		No action	The policy specifically requires housing developments over 50 homes to provide self build plots, not flatted schemes.	NA
0292	WH White	H9	Objects to 3 as ineffective alongside policy S2. Canford Garden Village omission site should be allocated or reserved as capable of delivering more homes. Strategic Urbans Extensions already commented so H8 largely superfluous not deliver.	Objection	Yes	No action	Canford Garden Village would require Green Belt release. IN line with the NPPF the draft Local Plan does not propose to amend Green Belt boundaries.	NA
0447	Poole Quays Forum	H9	Not understood why a self-builder should require a specific housing policy, should be used as a route to affordable ownership.	Objection		No action	Self build policy is included to meet the requirements of national planning policy/guidance.	NA

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0571	Home Builders Federation	H9	Inappropriate to require major developments to provide for self-builders (5% should not be required on sites providing 50+ dwellings). Should identify where self and custom-build would be supported in principle. Councils can facilitate provision of suitable land, such as through allocating own land for such development or allocating private land where agreed with landowners. Unlikely to be possible to co-ordinate with development of wider sites due to practical and health and safety issues. Risk of plots not being delivered – non-implementation rate should be accounted for in HLS. Unclear what happens when unsold – should clarify that after 6/12 months [both periods referenced] unsold plots will revert to developer to avoid detriment to neighbouring properties/whole development. Clarification required on how this will be done. Should be as short as possible timespan after commencement to avoid issues.	Objection	Yes	No action	Proposed policy is in relation to houses (not flats) and refers to a period of 12 months if sites are not purchased.	NA
0195	Christchurch Town Council Neighbourhood Plan Working Group	H9	Wording needs to explicitly refer to new-build residential as currently could mean commercial development, conversions etc	Support with changes		Modification	Agree	Amend to provide clarity that part 'b' refers to new build residential
0225	Dorset Council	Para 8.66-8.73	Support the allocation of a site to meet the jointly assessed need for gypsies, travellers and travelling show people and the commitment to identify transit pitches.	Support	Yes	No action	Support noted.	NA
0164	Environment Agency	Para 8.73	Support supporting text	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0069	Angela Laycock	H10	Para 8.67 conflicts with guidance as it refers to 10 years where the guidance refers to five years	Objection		Modification	Agree	Amend supporting text to update wording and provide clarification in relation to time periods and the definition.
0250	East Dorset Friends of the Earth	H10	Support encouragement of increase in dedicated sites. Requirements to provide car parking and need to travel by car conflicting. Due to lifestyles sites should be near major roads on periphery of conurbation but close to local centres. Branksome Triangle unsuitable due to poor location and biodiversity value.	Objection		No action	Some parking is required to support lifestyle. Considerations in relation Branksome Triangle are set out in the gypsy and traveller background paper	NA
0403	Elizabeth Lucas	H10	Providing traveller pitches is not justified. Local Housing needs should be prioritised.	Objection	No	No action	Planning policies are required to meet housing needs, including those of gypsies and travellers.	NA
0447	Poole Quays Forum	H10	Issue of gypsy and travellers should be addressed.	Comment		No action	The Plan identifies a Gypsy and Traveller Site.	NA
0126	Kushti Bok	H10	The Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (GTAA) is likely to be an underestimate of need due to issues relating to need from bricks and mortar housing as a lack of interviews were undertaken, and site waiting lists as those interested outside the area were not considered and those housed in bricks and mortar were not considered. Figure derived from the waiting list should be 8. Due to recent court decision the need should include all those who it is alleged do not meet the definition. Wording changes suggested to Policy H10. Comments on the proposed allocation at Branksome Triangle. The lack of published consideration of other sites.	Objection	Yes	Modification	Agree	Amend supporting text to update wording and provide clarification in relation to time periods and the definition.
0292	WH White	Paras 9.1-9.11	Supports parts but objects to omission of logistics sector and para 9.4 requirements not sufficient to meet needs of existing businesses looking to expand or consolidate or allow market churn (see Icen employment needs assessment). Shortage of housing curtailing economic fulfilment (see industry response).	Objection	Yes	No action	The plan protects existing employment land and provides additional land to meet the needs set out in the evidence, the needs relating to the logistics sector would be covered under the industrial/warehousing part of the evidence.	NA
0195	Christchurch Town Council Neighbourhood Plan Working Group	Para 9.4	Not clear if identified employment land need is for Dorset and BCP or just BCP	Comment		No action	Employment land figure quoted if for the BCP area.	NA
0079	The Society for Poole	Para 9.6	It is not clear how plans of Dorset Local Enterprise Partnership are understood by affected communities and businesses	Support with changes		No action	References to DLEP and its strategies are referred to in paragraph 9.4, the DLEP works with Councils and other partners to deliver its plans.	NA
0233	University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust	E1	Support strategic policy aims, employment sites need flexibility on range of acceptable uses.	Support	Yes	No action	Support noted. Employment areas need to be protected for employment uses to support the economy and economic growth.	NA

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0250	East Dorset Friends of the Earth	E1	Sustainable economic development accepted, but plan's concept of 'sustainability' incoherent. Growth (business, tourism, population, wealth) has limited and benefits should be distributed fairly. Can have numerous negative impacts. Policy needs to encompass these principles as basis for economic development. Any new premises should be built to high standards of energy efficiency (including construction materials), include renewable energy production where possible, have carefully designed waste handling, high levels of pollution control, and water saving measures as standard.	Objection		No action	Economic growth can also have positive impacts for the area. Sustainable development encompasses economic, social and environmental elements. Economic growth is directed by the Plan into established employment areas. Requirements for energy efficiency considered in chapter 5.	NA
0259	Arts University Bournemouth	E1	Support Strategic Policy E1. The policy is unclear as it does not specify which types of development proposals are to increase opportunities for higher education or what form the support for Universities will take. The policy does not seek to address key challenge of graduate retention. Graduates are unable to live in the BCP area. The Plan should encourage residential accommodation which is attractive to graduates, e.g. Co-Living accommodation.	Objection	yes	No action	The policy is a high level policy with detail set out elsewhere, criteria g references supporting colleges and universities. Student accommodation is supported under a policy H7 within the housing chapter	NA
0268	Talbot Village Trust	E1	Support criteria a, c, d, e and g - support proposals for Talbot Quarter.	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0292	WH White	E1	Supports intent and wording but objects to absence of ref to new employment land allocations.	Objection	Yes	No action	Employment allocations are referenced in part 'a' of the policy and considered in detail in policy E2.	NA
0571	Home Builders Federation	E1	Failure to plan for housing needs of BCP and wider area will have significant adverse impacts on local and wider economy.	Objection	Yes	No action	The BCP area has significant constraints which mean the level of growth set out in the standard methodology cannot be achieved.	NA
0195	Christchurch Town Council Neighbourhood Plan Working Group	E1	Focusing employment development on allocated sites may discourage employment uses elsewhere, particularly smaller scale or mixed use developments.	Comment		Modification	Agree	Provide clarity In Policy E1 that employment development is also supported within existing employment areas and, depending on the use class, within existing centres.
0292	WH White	Para 9.12-9.13	Strategic policies highlighted in para 9.12 are not new and rolled over from legacy plans. Some progress at Bournemouth Airport but location peripheral. Talbot Village and Wessex Fields committed for specific purposes and not able to meet general employment needs. New opportunities needed for choice and range of employment. Rapid take up at Magna Business Park.	Objection	Yes	No action	Sites are identified to meet needs, this includes sites which have previously been identified. The plan does not support Green Belt release for additional sites.	NA
0079	The Society for Poole	E2	Policy E2 is not entirely sound and is likely to be ineffective in serving the public interest, as it seeks to increase employment supply at Talbot Village (in conflict with Policy NE1)	Objection		No action	Land at Talbot Village is required to meet employment needs. Any impacts on the natural environment can be mitigated, demonstrated through the recent grant of permission at inquiry for an outline application and full application for a hospital on the land (decision issued July 2024).	NA
0166	Troika Developments Ltd	E2	Policies in the plan must support and protect employment at Wessex Fields and Bournemouth and Poole town centres. Suggests revised wording.	Objection	Yes	No action	Policies seek to protect existing employment land and allocate additional land at Wessex Fields. While the Plan supports town centre employment uses some permitted development rights exist from office to residential changes of use which can impact on town centre employment supply.	NA
0195	Christchurch Town Council Neighbourhood Plan Working Group	E2	No employment sites proposed in Christchurch except Airport and Reid Steel. Neighbourhood Plans could allocate site but this is not explicit in text- would be useful to add.	Support with changes		No action	The allocations reflect the existing employment areas in Christchurch. No further land has been promoted to the Council for employment uses. Neighbourhood Plans could consider this issue where additional sites are in conformity with the overall strategy in the draft Local Plan but it is not necessary to refer to neighbourhood plans and all potential neighbourhood plan activities in every section. The scope of neighbourhood plans will vary between different areas.	NA
0222	Lok'nStore	E2	Supports efforts to deliver improvements in natural capital via urban greening but consider a flexible approach might be appropriate in some locations such as Wessex Fields. Potential prospect of unintended tensions arising between intensification of site and respecting green infrastructure route adjacent.	Support with changes		No action	Support noted	NA
0225	Dorset Council	E2	Welcome the aspirations of BCP to meet their employment needs. As identified in the jointly produced Economic Needs Assessment the BCP and Dorset Council areas are economically linked.	Support	Yes	No action	Support noted. We will continue working closely to deliver economic growth across the functional economic market area of BCP and Dorset.	NA
0250	East Dorset Friends of the Earth	E2	Job growth can attract in-migration, and there is a limited to population capacity. Need to enhance overall sustainability of area in numerous ways - growth conflicts with plan objectives. Query need for office space due to home working. New office provision should be located in town centres, or in neighbourhood centres (where there is a proven local need). Lower allocation of employment land required. Object to Talbot Village and Wessex Fields allocations. Should require that no employment-related development be permitted within 400m of heathland.	Objection		No action	Employment study sets out employment needs, an element of home working does not negate the need for office as companies often have hybrid arrangements. Wessex Fields and Talbot Village required to meet employment needs. Development near heathland would be considered by the requirements of policy NE2 and mitigation required where necessary.	NA

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0254	New Forest District Council NFDC	E2	NFDC welcomes that BCP Council is planning to meet employment needs in full within its Plan Area.	Support		No action	Support noted. To confirm BCP Council is not asking neighbouring authorities to meet any unmet employment needs.	NA
0282	Historic England	E2	Specific comments relating to the Lansdowne and Poole town centre provided elsewhere.	Comment		No action	Comment noted	NA
0447	Poole Quays Forum	E2	Cobbs Quay and Dawkins Road should be allocated as employment sites. Consideration should be given to local transport, traffic, parking etc.	Objection		No action	Dawkins Road is allocated as an existing employment site. Cobbs Quay is a marina and any proposals impacting it would be assessed under policy NE5 Coastline which seeks to prevent the loss of any existing boat yards/storage areas. New proposals for employment uses would consider parking and traffic impacts under the transport policies in chapter 10.	NA
0176	Friends of the Elderly	E2	The RNNH sites is now included within the Wessex Fields allocation which could result in pressure for redevelopment for other uses. Para 9.29 notes presence of nursing home and that it could either remain in situ or, preferably, be relocated to another part of the site, but this is not reflected in policy wording.	Objection	Yes	Follow up	We will discuss possible modifications through a statement of common ground. Potential to provide clarity in relation to the nursing home which could remain or preferably be relocated as part of a comprehensive redevelopment.	
0233	University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust	E2	Quantum of development at Wessex Fields fails to consider road infrastructure and the nurses home. Site area without nurses home is 5.53 and therefore 7,1 including the home is incorrect. Para 9.12 text on combined site area in correct and use class E(e) omitted. On Wessex Fields Use Class E9g)(i) is unlikely to be deliverable, also uncertainty on E(g)(ii) due to commercial viability. Quantum of employment floorspace unlikely to be delivered. Lack of demand for office in this location, not been delivered for 30 years, rents do not support expenditure, negative residual land value. Low demand for large offices in BCP. Unclear how the employment floorspace on allocations has been derived, Wessex Fields has a higher floorspace density than other locations. Significant infrastructure upgrades would be required. 23,000 sqm more realistic. Network is congested in this area, floorspace modelled at Wessex Fields is less than allocation. Greater flexibility on uses required	Objection	Yes	Follow up	We will discuss possible modifications through a statement of common ground. Potential to update supporting text and policy to reflect future change in ownership. Employment provision is still required to support employment needs of the BCP area.	
0259	Arts University Bournemouth	E2	Policy does not clearly identify that allocation Em.2 only relates to the land identified as TV2. Changes needed to make policy clear and effective. "Other university related uses" in Em.2 is vague. Policy should identify the range or types of uses that will be acceptable for example, academic and learning floorspace, student residential accommodation, etc.).	Objection	yes	Follow up	Policy EM2 is shown on policies map as TV2, but for clarity TV2 can be added to Policy E2. Use classes in para 9.1.2 is inconsistent and unnecessary. Policy E4 covers the other university related uses and does not need repeating in E2. TV2 does not include student accommodation so should not be listed in E2. We will discuss further possible modifications through a statement of common ground.	Remove use classes from para 9.12. In Policy E2 make it clear EM.2 refers to TV2.
0268	Talbot Village Trust	E2	Object to scale of allocation. Halving of allocation not justified and now deliverable alternatives identified [see Appendix 1]. Fails to capitalise universities' strengths. Co-location of Innovation Quarter and Universities critical to facilitating partnerships and research between regional health care and technology innovators. Innovation Quarter will stimulate high skilled growth and provide innovation infrastructure to retain talent, encourage inward-investment, increase productivity and deliver significant economic value, jobs and earnings. Only opportunity to drive R&D and innovation and meet growing needs of businesses. Should be supported and capacity maximised. Sustainably located and heathland support area can mitigate harm to heathland.	Objection	Yes	Modification	The outcome of the public enquiry into the planning application across the wider site is now known and the southern part of the site can therefore be added to the commitments.	Amend figure 9.1 to add additional commitment to the south of site allocation EM.2.
0286	Bournemouth University	E2	BU objects to E2 as not clear that Em.2 Innovation Quarter only covers TV2 and not the BU campus.	Objection	Yes	Modification	Policy EM2 is shown on policies map as TV2, but for clarity TV2 can be added to Policy E2	In Policy E2 make it clear EM.2 refers to TV2.
0292	WH White	E2	Support intent and wording of policy. Concerned there are no new site allocations with number of sites committed to particular sectors. Opportunity at Canford Garden Village omission site to deliver new employment land, particularly renewable energy proposals and would geographically complement other strategic sites.	Objection	Yes	Modification	Canford Garden Village site is located in the Green Belt and the Plan does not propose to amend Green Belt boundaries. Note Churchill Business Park is part of Magna Business Park.	Rename Churchill Business Park in Policy E2 and Policy P2 as Magna Business Park.
0195	Christchurch Town Council Neighbourhood Plan Working Group	Figure 9.1	Two locations in table at Sopers Lane but only 1 in policy	Comment		No action	One site is a commitment so does not need to be referenced again in the table in the policy.	NA
0292	WH White	Para 9.14-9.36	Allocations rolled over from legacy plans and do not provide additional employment land. Opportunity at Canford Garden Village omission site to deliver new employment land, particularly renewable energy proposals and would geographically complement other strategic sites.	Objection	Yes	No action	Sites are identified to meet needs. Canford Garden Village site is located in the Green Belt and the Plan does not propose to amend Green Belt boundaries.	NA

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0040	Natural England	Para 9.18	Reference water quality impacts on the Moors River SSSI as current levels of use are have existing adverse impacts. Business and airport expansion need to be tied into securing waste water management at the nearby Wessex Water sewage treatment works (STW) rather than allowing the private STW to continue to be used.	Support with changes		Modification	Agree	Amend para 9.18 to reference Moors River SSSI.
0040	Natural England	E3	Support section 2. iv) of the policy which will reduce air pollution impacts.	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0096	Go South Coast	E3	Airport is already a concentration of employment. E3 looks to consolidate and expand employment. Airport is outside of built up area of BCP by considerable distance, served well by existing transport routes, only generates travel activity at peak times, multiple destinations and origins on surrounding roads would make it hard to determine successful routes, and it would be hard for bus service to complete with successful road network in terms of journey times. Area around airport becomes heavily congested, which would not create a reliable bus service. Unclear what public transport services are envisaged, their operation costs or ongoing effectiveness and sustainability without permanent high levels of revenue support. <u>Deliverability of policy, or effectiveness is not demonstrated.</u>	Objection	No	No action	Detail of mitigation arrangements in relation to public transport would be agreed under individual planning applications. Some applications have already been approved which support improvements to bus services accessing the airport.	NA
0148	FCERM	E3	Query whether evidence supporting previous applications relating to this allocation will form part of the evidence base for this policy.	Comment		No action	We are aware of the previous application and the supporting information.	NA
0158	New Forest National Park Authority	E3	Planes should avoid flying over National Parks. Potential impacts from development at the airport on the National Park must be considered.	Support with changes		No action	National park already referenced.	NA
0164	Environment Agency	E3	Support policy's required approach to flood risk on site.	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0169	Malmesbury Estate	E3	Support new development within airport curtilage and business park, additional development outside the current curtilage of these businesses over the plan period maybe required.	Objection	Yes	No action	Support noted	NA
0250	East Dorset Friends of the Earth	E3	Oppose expansion of flights. No employment development within 400m of heathland.	Objection		No action	Previous planning approvals support the growth of the airport. Any development in proximity of the heathland would be assessed under policy NE2.	NA
0287	Network Rail	E3	Supportive of promoting sustainable transport and contributing to sustainable infrastructure. Improved connects needed via high frequency bus route to Bournemouth rail station	Support with changes	Yes	No action	Support noted. Any proposals linking the aviation park with town centres would be expected to include good access to the town centre train stations so additional reference is not necessary.	NA
0078	Hurn Parish Council	E3	Typo spotted, second bullet point relating to car park management is unclear.	Support with changes		Modification	Amend Operation to Operational. A management plan for car parking is flexibly termed, enabling discussion over the approach.	Amend Operation to Operational in Policy E3 (1)a.
0162	Bournemouth Airport	E3	Paragraph 9.17 refers to the operational Airport in figure 9.2 but figure 9.2 shows Talbot Village, not the Airport. Consider that reference to "vital" in paragraph 9.17 and 1ai of Policy E3 should be changed to be more flexible to allow development supportive to growth and ongoing role as important infrastructure for sub-regionally economy. Typo in 1a - operation should be operational. Unless why only B2 and B8 employment uses are supported; and should include E(g) uses. Part 1c of the policy is important from a safety and amenity perspective but some clarity is needed in the drafting. Policies Map 11 (Commons) includes the Airport and business parks as dominant features, but makes no reference to Policy E3. The division between Policy E3 areas A1 (the operational Airport) and A2 (the Northern Aviation Business Parks) is shown incorrectly and arbitrarily as a straight line across the airfield. Important parts of the operational Airport are included within an area identified as being in the business parks. 2a of the policy includes transport improvements which are not capable of being provided. <u>2b is not consistent with paragraph 9.18</u>	Objection		Follow up	Amend typo and map reference. Disagree with changing vital as a policy test. Disagree with adding sentence on development control but agree with changing material to unacceptable. Unsure what safeguarding issues are referring to so are not included. Policies Map shows allocations and policy E3 reference is unnecessary. Dividing line key to distinguishing the areas. The transport requirements are essential and therefore disagree with adding 'practical and viable'. Agree to update flood risk text. We will seek to prepare a statement of common ground.	Insert omitted airport map as Figure 9.2 and renumber subsequent figures. Amend Operation to Operational in Policy E3 (1)a. Add modelling to Policy E3 2a and update Para 9.18 to align with latest SFRA Level 1.
0225	Dorset Council	E3	Within Policy E3, the Northern Aviation Business Park site should prioritise the establishment of sustainable transport connections to Ferndown and West Parley. Ferndown and West Parley are areas that have the potential to accommodate additional growth over the medium and longer term and therefore it is important to support the delivery of sustainable travel connections to the business park.	Support	Yes	Modification	Support noted. The airport policy E3 allows for the provision or contribution towards sustainable transport. Amend policy wording to provide additional clarity	Refer to Ferndown and West Parley in E3 2.a(v).
0597	Hampshire County Council	E3	The County Council is developing proposals to upgrade the Avon Valley Path and would welcome discussion to link the Avon Valley Route with the BCP cycle route network between the airport, aviation park and Ringwood.	Comment		Follow up	Discuss through SOCG	
0040	Natural England	Para 9.24	Reference to residential use should be removed as it is within 400m of the designated site.	Objection		Modification	Amend to provide further clarity that residential should be outside of the 400m consultation area.	Amend paras 9.23 and 9.24 to define where residential uses are allowed.



ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0014	Talbot & Branksome Residents' Association	E4	Objects to allocation of TV2 and TV3 for employment, health and university uses as it is unsound and unjustified because it is agricultural land and should be retained as a farm. Heathland Support Areas will result in damage to Talbot Heath. All of TV2 is within 400m of heath and reference to residential should be deleted. Farm provides buffer to heathland and protects its biodiversity and habitats including nightjars. Environment Act requires 10% biodiversity net gain and DERC records show thousands of wildlife. Suggest modification to delete from Local Plan with hospital re-located to Wessex Fields Em.3 or near the airport and university uses to Lansdowne Em.7. Talbot Heath Sustainable Neighbourhood should be re-named Talbot Village.	Objection	Yes	No action	Employment at Talbot Village required to meet employment needs. Any potential impacts can be mitigated. Biodiversity and habitat issues have been explored with Natural England who do not object to the proposed use. The recent planning application has demonstrated that 10% net gain in biodiversity can be achieved. Renaming would cause confusion with historic Talbot Village area north of Wallisdown Road.	NA
0020	RSPB	E4	Support 1a need to safeguard NSN heathland sites.	Support		No action	Dorset heathland sites already referenced under part 1b	NA
0045	Harriet Stewart Jones	E4	Object to development at Talbot Village/Highmoor Farm, vital green buffer, functional relationship with the heathland, need for employment over estimated, heavily congested area, more valuable as agricultural land, heathland support area will attract more dogs/visitors,	Objection		No action	Employment at Talbot Village required to meet employment needs. Any potential impacts can be mitigated. Biodiversity and habitat issues have been explored with Natural England who do not object to the proposed use. The recent planning application has demonstrated that 10% net gain in biodiversity can be achieved.	NA
0048	Helen Bateman	E4	Object to Talbot Village/Highmoor Farm redevelopment, site is a buffer for the heath and a open area for people to enjoy. Should be a working farm.	Objection		No action	Employment at Talbot Village required to meet employment needs. Any potential impacts can be mitigated. Biodiversity and habitat issues have been explored with Natural England who do not object to the proposed use. The recent planning application has demonstrated that 10% net gain in biodiversity can be achieved.	NA
0079	The Society for Poole	E4	Policy E4 is ineffective and unsound, as it seeks to increase employment supply at Talbot Village (in conflict with Policy NE1 and new active duty for BCP Council (amongst others) to 'further the purposes' of the national environmental organisations).	Objection		No action	Employment at Talbot Village required to meet employment needs. Any potential impacts can be mitigated. Biodiversity and habitat issues have been explored with Natural England who do not object to the proposed use. The recent planning application has demonstrated that 10% net gain in biodiversity can be achieved.	NA
0250	East Dorset Friends of the Earth	E4	Oppose any further development at Talbot Village/Highmoor Farm, on basis of congestion issues, biodiversity issues, no need for innovation centre, conflicts with Policy S2. Note policy requirements prohibit a private hospital. Facilities related to university academic activities should be located at Lansdowne	Objection		No action	Employment at Talbot Village required to meet employment needs. Any potential impacts can be mitigated. Biodiversity and habitat issues have been explored with Natural England who do not object to the proposed use. The recent planning application has demonstrated that 10% net gain in biodiversity can be achieved.	NA
0259	Arts University Bournemouth	E4	Supports principle of Policy E4. Appropriate provision should be made for the growth and development of AUB (and BU) over the plan period. TV1 is currently shown as an 'employment area' (policies map), not accurately reflecting its character should be area for academic floorspace as a priority. Amount of development specified is unlikely to meet needs of both Universities, flexibility needed, a minimum of 14,000 sq.m. of additional academic floorspace is needed for AUB. Unnecessary to restrict the number of student bed-spaces to 150. Reference to 40 homes is not clear as to the location or how figure arrived at. Policy does not specify the location of the north south cycle route, should not be through AUB campus.	Objection	Yes	No action	Employment at Talbot Village required to meet employment needs. Any potential impacts can be mitigated. Biodiversity and habitat issues have been explored with Natural England who do not object to the proposed use. The recent planning application has demonstrated that 10% net gain in biodiversity can be achieved.	NA
0280	Dorset CPRE	E4	Scale of development proposed at Talbot Village does not meet requirements of para 8 of NPPF. The development would result in loss of highly valued green space which is ecologically important in its own right and forms an important buffer to Talbot Heath SSSI. <u>Do not need this site to meet employment land needs for plan period</u>	Objection	Yes	No action	Employment at Talbot Village required to meet employment needs. Any potential impacts can be mitigated. Biodiversity and habitat issues have been explored with Natural England who do not object to the proposed use. The recent planning application has demonstrated that 10% net gain in biodiversity can be achieved.	NA
0287	Network Rail	E4	Support promoting sustainable transport. Encourage link with the nearest rail stations and a high frequency bus service should be promoted to link with rail stations.	Support	Yes	No action	Support noted.	NA
0308	Joanne Keeling	E4	Objection to the inclusion of land in Talbot Village. Site adjacent to SSSI with significant ecological value, it should not be developed. No benefits or exceptional reasons which outweigh detrimental effect to Talbot Heath. Statutory requirement to protect habitats and species. Previous planning applications on the site refused. Proposals would strain infrastructure, add to traffic congestion and dangers to pedestrians, adversely impact air quality. No realistic mitigation in place.	Objection		No action	Employment at Talbot Village required to meet employment needs. Any potential impacts can be mitigated. Biodiversity and habitat issues have been explored with Natural England who do not object to the proposed use. The recent planning application has demonstrated that 10% net gain in biodiversity can be achieved.	NA
0040	Natural England	E4	Refers to residential but should specify T1, as T2 is within the 400m area. Support 1. a), 2. e).The note relating to TBW.4/Em.2 is welcome clarification of the agreed position.	Support with changes		Modification	Support noted. Amend to provide further clarity that residential should be outside of the 400m consultation zone.	Amend Policy E4 2 to define where residential uses are allowed.

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0268	Talbot Village Trust	E4	Support inclusion of policy and several aspects. Object to 27,000sqm figure for new academic floorspace which is not evidenced and will unnecessarily restrict universities' response to needs. Object to quantity of student bedspaces proposed. Not justified/evidenced. BU expressed need to build more than 150 at Talbot Campus, and AUB may have future needs. Object to having Innovation Quarter but support mix of uses proposed. Support principle of new homes outside 400m zone but object to 40 home figure as is substantial underestimate of capacity of area TV1 given numerous development sites - unnecessarily restrictive so figure should be removed. Appendix 2 addresses transport impacts. Revisions required to Policy E4 and associated text. Plan needs to take forward several aspects from existing Poole Local Plan and Talbot Village SPD in relation to heathland support area, hospital, innovation park, sustainable transport network enhancements. Improved sense of place with community at heart required according to public engagement, plan does not achieve this vision. Policy should support enhanced local centre; creation of mixed use place, sustainable transport and green infrastructure rather than zoning; greater flexibility to quantum of development; creation of new green infrastructure network.	Objection	Yes	Follow up	Development quantum's were agreed through the Talbot Village SPD including a shadow HRA and transport assessment. It would need to be demonstrated that increased quantum's can be satisfactory accommodated. Will discuss further through statement of common ground.	
0282	Historic England	E4	Recommendations from HIA should be incorporated into the policy. To protect the tree buffer on northern boundary of site and to mention the scheduled monument.	Objection		Modification	Amend to reflect HIA. Wallisdown Road is identified as a strategically important transport route which may impact on the future protection of the trees.	Refer to scheduled monument in Policy E4
0096	Go South Coast	E4	The universities are a major contributor to life and economic vitality of the conurbation, and are well served by a bespoke public transport operation involving 15 buses subsidised in numerous ways. Improvements to transport and movement at Talbot Village need to take in to consideration existing congestion, and the need for delivery of bus priority measures on the A347 and A3049, or contributions towards these measures. No mention made of existing comprehensive bus offer available.	Objection	No	No action	The universities are required to provide public transport which includes bus services.	NA
0286	Bournemouth University	E4	Does not consider positively prepared, justified or consistent with national planning policy. University supports principle of policy in making provision for major growth of universities but objects to levels of academic floorspace and student bed numbers as it doesn't reflect BUs growth aspirations or provide sufficient flexibility for Local Plan period. Considers 33,000 sqm academic floorspace and 450 student bed spaces in TV1 to be reasonable estimate for BU's future floorspace and bed space requirement based on their current strategy plan and wider external economic, social and policy context. BU significantly contributes to local and regional economy and should not be fettered by Local Plan. BU has no plans to deliver university facilities in TV2 but wording should not preclude this. Considers it appropriate to merge TV1 and TV2 together to allow integration between university and innovation quarter. Currently updating Strategic Plan 2025 and Estates Development Framework and has general aspiration for growth and to deliver further academic floorspace and student accommodation to support university. BU supports strategy for proportion of need in town centre and on campus. Policy for 150 student beds at Talbot is risk there will not be enough in this location and will need to be split with Arts University. On campus accommodation important for location and affordability, reducing need for HMOs, and students with disabilities. Unclear why academic floorspace and student accommodation reduced except impact. Transportation and parking typical concern for development at Talbot but BU operating successful Travel Plan, delivered new bus interchange at campus, improvements to Boundary Road roundabout. Other relevant material considerations capable of being addressed at application stage and not overriding reasons why to prevent principle of quantum of development. Interactive Proposals Map shows part of campus in employment area which is not correct.	Objection	Yes	No action	Development quantum's were agreed through the Talbot Village SPD including a shadow HRA and transport assessment. It would need to be demonstrated that increased quantum's can be satisfactory accommodated. We are providing further clarity on detailed aspects of the policy including the outcome of the recent planning appeal.	NA

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0096	Go South Coast	E5	Supports identification of Wessex Fields for strategic development, including facilities to allow for the enhancement and expansion of health service provision, and homes for key workers. Site is highly sustainable, and already a major node on bus network for regular, high frequency and inter-urban bus services. Therefore, not clear what is sought under point e. in policy. Already high frequency buses to town centre when combining different services, although servicing interchange is problematic. Would be costly to run a true 'high frequency' service to town centre, and would unlikely cover its costs. Would be more efficient to improve frequency on existing routes, and would secure overall uplifts in public transport use than a single fast bus service. Agreed that development in policy should contribute to bus priority measures, but these are not specified in policy, and already exist on Castle Lane East. Keen to work with Council and Hospital trust for buses to use planned southbound slip road, as would reduce journey times from Ringwood and Ferndown in to hospital site, and could offer element of additional bus priority mentioned in policy.	Objection	No	No action	Point 'e' relates to contributions to transport infrastructure that can be secured as part of future planning applications.	NA
0250	East Dorset Friends of the Earth	E5	Oppose any further development at Wessex Fields, on basis of poor location in relation to neighbourhoods, congestion, poor active and public transport connectivity, generation of car journeys, flood risk, biodiversity issues, and conflict with plan objectives. Proposals to "improve access" to site are road based private vehicular solutions.	Objection		No action	Land at Wessex Fields is required to meet employment needs.	NA
0282	Historic England	E5	Include site specific recommendation from HIA within the policy regarding the Art Deco nurses home.	Objection		No action	The site forms part of Wessex Fields strategic employment allocation, needed to deliver our strategic employment needs. The retention of the nursing home would prevent the strategic economic regeneration plans.	NA
0287	Network Rail	E5	Support 4 e high frequency bus service to Bournemouth railway station.	Support	Yes	No action	Support noted.	NA
0166	Troika Developments Ltd	E5	Supportive of policy but considers a wide range of uses should be allowed.	Objection	Yes	Follow up	We are reviewing this policy through Statements of Common Ground and will consider this request.	
0176	Friends of the Elderly	E5	The RNNH site included within Wessex Fields allocation which could result in pressure for redevelopment for other uses. Para 9.29 notes presence of nursing home and that it could either remain in situ or, preferably, be relocated to another part of the site, but this is not reflected in policy wording. Objection to criterion 2(e) - building heights as Building Heights Strategy does not incorporate a detailed assessment of this site. It would be more appropriate to assess through a masterplan/design brief or planning application.	Objection	Yes	Follow up	We are reviewing this policy through Statements of Common Ground and will consider this request.	
0222	Lok'nStore	E5	Not sufficiently clear whether E5 applies to whole of Wessex Fields (particularly given para 9.25). Extant consent for B8 use in wider Wessex Fields but policy E5 does not permit B8 use (only E(e) (medical/ health), E(g)(i) (offices) and E(g)(ii) (research and development). E2 includes Wessex Fields but does this include this site with extant permission? Need for clear definition of terms; i.e. Wessex Fields Business Park and the new employment allocation need to be separately defined so the policies can be clearly understood, interpreted and applied. In addition to site, Wessex Fields not complete and room for further intensification such as B8 or offices. Supports Policy E7 for existing employment areas as this permits B8 use.	Support with changes		Modification	Agree current text isn't clear and would benefit from amendment. The existing employment area supports B8 Use Class. Lok'nStore is missing from the supply table and the land to the north of Lok'nStore (windfall).	Amend Para 9.25 to explain the differences between the allocated site (Em.3) and the existing employment area. Add a map for context after Para 9.25. Add Lok'nStore as an commitment to Table 9.1. Add vacant land adjacent to Lok'nStore to Table 9.1 (Redevelopment sites in existing employment areas (windfall)).
0225	Dorset Council	E5	The inclusion of a requirement for a high-frequency bus route to and from the Wessex Fields site is supported however it is suggested that additional connections should be made between this site and the neighbouring areas of Wimborne, Ferndown, and Trickett's Cross.	Support	Yes	Follow up	Support noted. Consider if references to other locations are required. Will discuss through Statement of Common Ground.	
0233	University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust	E5	Confirms Trust is acquiring land at Wessex Fields to provide over 500 units for key worker housing, senior living, health related education and research facilities (new medical school), energy infrastructure, multistorey car park, healthcare uses, care home/senior living/research and healthcare innovation. Site could support district heating. Masterplan being prepared for mix of uses. General employment support if there is spare land and trips can be absorbed. Mix and quantum of uses on Wessex Fields allocation does not meet Trust aspirations. Allocation includes the Retired Nurses National Home, which it didn't previously. Nurses home could be relocated. Policy is too restrictive in types of uses, more flexibility needed.	Objection	yes	Follow up	We are reviewing this policy through Statements of Common Ground and will consider this request.	
0148	FCERM	Para 9.33	Update required due to publication of updated masterplan	Support with changes		Modification	Amend to reference port masterplan.	Refer to updated Poole Port Masterplan in para 9.33.
0164	Environment Agency	E6	Support policy. Water compatible nature of port operation means broader flood risk management work will need to be considered at all stages.	Support		No action	Support noted.	NA

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0225	Dorset Council	E6	Freight routing from the A31 to the port of Poole is a concern. There are currently already high levels of Freight traffic travelling through Ferndown to join onto the A31. Policy E6 should consider the measures needed to support freight movement on the highway network to ensure the existing situation is not made worse with <u>betterment being sought where possible</u> .	Support	Yes	No action	Support noted. The Port/A31 freight route is a declared strategic freight route that Dorset Council and BCP Council helped set up. Further work will continue jointly with Dorset Council and National Highways.	NA
0250	East Dorset Friends of the Earth	E6	Do not favour port expansion. Oppose marine leisure facilities expansion due to conflict with Poole Harbour nature conservation. New development should pay full price for flood defences.	Objection		No action	Proposals at the port would need to consider natural environment considerations in line with policies in chapter 6.	NA
0447	Poole Quays Forum	E6	E6a - Ensure sufficient parking for boat owners. Ensure sufficient attractions on the Quayside. Safeguarded and improve visible low cost (non-marina) traditional sea wall mooring. The layout of the Quay is established and offers little scope to provide additional parking but parking does existing in nearby public car parks. E6c - The current road network cannot cope and will need improvement if the Port is to be expanded. Use of the railway to move freight is important but a great deal of consideration will need to be given to the point outside the port where the freight will be collected for onward shipment.	Objection		No action	Activities within the Harbour including mooring are beyond Council control and are managed by Poole Harbour Commissioners. The Local Plan supports retaining visitor attractions (Policy E10 Visitor Attractions) and active ground floor uses in the town centre (Policy E11 Retail and town centres). Policy E6 Port of Poole ensures the railway is safeguarded for freight handling. The road network within the town centre has been upgraded within the last five years through the town side access scheme to improve access to the Port. Further upgrades would be secured through the development of the former Power station site to allow the <u>efficient operation of the two bridge system</u> .	NA
0614	National Trust	E6	Support but must ensure emissions and water quality not significantly impacted by port development. Should acknowledge infrastructure could impact Poole Harbour. Port infrastructure should support islands and protect sensitive harbour ecosystems.	Support with changes	No	No action	Any proposals in the port would need to accord with other relevant plan policies including those relating to the natural environment.	NA
0287	Network Rail	E6	Support para c rail freight. Support flood risk sequential test needed where relevant to rail network.	Support with changes	Yes	Modification	Support noted. The proposed change covers development across BCP area so is better covered by Policy T4. Amend T4 which considers freight.	Add support for development to consider rail freight in Policy T4.
0292	WH White	Para 9.37-9.40	Concur with high demand and low vacancy rates but limited capacity for churn resulting in some businesses relocating elsewhere.	Comment	Yes	No action	Existing sites are protected and new land allocated to provide employment land to meet needs.	NA
0162	Bournemouth Airport	E7	Concerned that the policy is unclear and unduly restrictive because whilst the core employment function of these areas is protected, there should be flexibility to allow complementary uses.	Objection	Yes	No action	Small scale ancillary uses would be permitted under the exemptions in the retail policy E11.	NA
0225	Dorset Council	E7	Note policies require 6 months of marketing, whereas the industry standard is closer to 12 months.	Support	Yes	No action	Support noted. Much urban development involves the reuse of industrial land and 6 months is considered a suitable timeframe to produce evidence.	NA
0250	East Dorset Friends of the Earth	E7	Support. Starter units and shared sites for small scale (SME) start-ups should be encouraged.	Support with changes		No action	Support noted.	NA
0292	WH White	E7	Support intent and wording including ref to renewal and intensification within existing employment areas. Pressure for another uses will continue. 1(b) criteria helpful and 2 supported.	Support	Yes	No action	Support noted.	NA
0304	Sovereign Network Group SNG	E7	Spectrum House potential residential site, policy E7 would restrict residential. Robust evidence needed to protect employment sites in the context of housing need.	Objection		No action	Along with housing the area has employment needs and therefore seeks to retain employment uses on employment sites. Some sites may benefit from permitted development	NA
0447	Poole Quays Forum	E7	E7b- Sites must allow for employee parking and need a bus service suitable for any shift work	Objection		No action	The requirements for employee parking would be assessed utilising the Parking SPD, the levels of parking would vary on the proposed use and its location. The policies in the Plan (Chapter 10 Transportation) allow for the collection of contributions to support public transport.	NA
0292	WH White	Para 9.41-9.43	Supports initiative but application to all majors may be issue for minor majors and higher threshold is suggested.	Support with changes	Yes	No action	The threshold is supported by the Council's economic development team, the detail of the agreement could be considered to ensure it is straightforward for smaller developments to comply with the policy.	NA
0223	Fortitudo Ltd	E8	Whilst the principle of the policy is understood as a minimum, would expect the threshold for the provision to be higher than 10 dwellings. Suggest a suitable threshold is circa 50 dwellings before this requirement is applicable.	Objection		No action	The threshold is supported by the Council's economic development team, the detail of the agreement could be considered to ensure it is straightforward for smaller developments to comply with the policy.	NA
0225	Dorset Council	E8	Support use of Local Labour Agreements. With the cross over of employees working in BCP and Dorset areas the policy should also consider the labour supply arising from the Dorset Council area.	Support	Yes	No action	Support noted. In the guidance note / checklist define local to include some parts of neighbouring Councils.	NA
0292	WH White	E8	Supports initiative but suggest higher threshold be considered.	Support with changes	Yes	No action	The threshold is supported by the Council's economic development team, the detail of the agreement could be considered to ensure it is straightforward for smaller developments to comply with the policy.	NA
0162	Bournemouth Airport	E8	Policy requires major planning application to enter into local labour agreement but the applicant may not be the developer/builder.	Objection	Yes	Modification	Amend to specify arrangements for when applicant is not the developer.	Change applicants to developers in E8.b.
0250	East Dorset Friends of the Earth	E8	Support. Starter units and shared sites for small scale (SME) start-ups should be encouraged.	Support with changes		Follow up	Consider if a modification can be made to reference start up businesses.	

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0614	National Trust	E8	Support several aspects. Reference should be made within section on 'Supporting the local workforce' to supporting employment and training within marine infrastructure and services (skills gap).	Support with changes	No	Modification	Highlighting one skills gap would miss others and goes beyond the local plan. Instead suggest aligning supporting text with skills plan.	Align para 9.41 with PE11 BCP Skills Plan.
0189	Sandbanks Community Group	Para 9.48	Supports para 9.48.	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0079	The Society for Poole	E9	Policy E9 is not necessarily sound and is likely to be effective in serving the public interest, as retention and expansion of visitor accommodation where it provides a valuable contribution to the market - may encourage neglect of facilities and for them not to be put on the market.	Objection		No action	Part b provides further guidance to ensure the loss of tourism accommodation is managed appropriately.	NA
0200	Meyrick Estate	E9	Support policy in principle, but lacks priciness and inappropriately biased towards retaining existing when there are major changes in the market (not a positive requirement). Reference to 'valuable contribution to the market' lacks required preciseness, and could be used to retain unsatisfactory accommodation. No justification for use of 10 rooms as a threshold for application of the policy. Could result in loss of accommodation to achieve higher value rather than due to need/contribution. Strategy to temper loss by enabling investment in remaining tourism accommodation or elsewhere is imprecise and deliverability questionable	Objection	Yes	No action	Further details on how to assess the contribution of existing accommodation to the market are set out in the Council guidance note on visitor accommodation. The threshold of 10 allows some smaller types of accommodation flexibility and proved a reasonable threshold in the Poole Local Plan.	NA
0250	East Dorset Friends of the Earth	E9	Support retention/development of hotel accommodation principally in town centres and the coastal belt. Concerned about growth of holiday flats and informal accommodation and significant impacts on housing provision. Policies should increase second homes council tax. Criteria that holiday parks should not be located in areas of landscape or biodiversity sensitivity, especially within 400 m. of heathlands need to be far more explicit.	Support with changes		No action	Controlling second homes/holiday lets on new development can have unintended consequences on existing stock. Proposals in proximity to heathland are assessed in accordance with policies in chapter 6.	NA
0258	Royal London Mutual Insurance Society Ltd	E9	Policy supersedes SPD and the SPD needs to be deleted from evidence base. Former Belvedere is not identified in Tourism Strategy as a key site for tourist accommodation - agree. Caveats should be incorporated into P.E9 to allow for former hotel sites which have not been in use for a number of years to be exempt from criteria (i) and (ii)	Objection	No	No action	The BCP Hotel Visitor Accommodation Research Report (PE14) identifies continued demand for hotels. The policy sets out that hotel accommodation can be lost where the site has been marketed or demonstrated it is no longer viable, these are considered reasonable caveats.	NA
0284	Gervis Properties Ltd / Hinton Admiral Estate	E9	Objects to policy E9 and considers unfit for purpose. Too easy to circumvent and abuse particularly E9 2(b) loss of existing tourist accommodation. Overlooks and hinders potential for improvements or innovation. 10 bedroom threshold criteria needs justification and merit in subjecting all visitor accommodation to viability, visitor appeal and local interest assessments to prevent loss to speculative proposals. Proposal to mitigate losses through investment isn't specific and questions about feasibility and enforcement.	Objection		No action	Further details on how to assess the contribution of existing accommodation to the market are set out in the Council guidance note on visitor accommodation. The threshold of 10 allows some smaller types of accommodation flexibility and proved a reasonable threshold in the Poole Local Plan.	NA
0329	Andrew Reed	E9	Plan should not be developed to support Haven Hotel development by allowing loss of tourist accommodation to support investment.	Objection	No	No action	Tourism policy outlines the steps that need to be followed if tourist accommodation is to be lost.	NA
0260	Dorset Lake Community	E9	Plan need to focus on retaining key hotel sites which provide employment and facilities. Policy E9 restricts hotels to town, district and local centres. Important hotels exist in Canford Cliffs ward which is key tourism area. Need to retain hotels in this area. Viability test of 6 months is very short, should be 12 months. stronger policy in favour of retaining hotel use across wards.	Objection	Yes	No action	Policy E9 Part 2 safeguards hotels wherever they are located.	NA
0292	WH White	Para 9.51-9.52	Supports approach	Support	Yes	No action	Support noted	NA
0225	Dorset Council	E10	Note policies require 6 months of marketing, whereas the industry standard is closer to 12 months.	Support		No action	Support noted. Much urban development involves the reuse of industrial land and 6 months is considered a suitable timeframe to produce evidence.	NA
0250	East Dorset Friends of the Earth	E10	Any significant increase in visitor attractions will generate increased traffic congestion and pressure on biodiversity. More specific criteria needed to ensure policy meets Plan objectives of climate, biodiversity and health/wellbeing	Support with changes		No action	Impacts on traffic and biodiversity will be dealt with by other policies in the plan. The whole plan needs to be read together.	NA
0292	WH White	E10	Supports approach	Support	Yes	No action	Support noted	NA
0447	Poole Quays Forum	E10	Provide access tourists to visit – regular bus service until late at night, accessible and suitable parking, electric car charging points, water taxi's. Poole's High Street, Back Lanes, Footpaths and Bus Station must be upgraded or a change of use implemented.	Objection		No action	The Plan identifies potential public realm and bus station improvements within Poole Town Centre. It also supports public transport and a review of town centre parking.	NA
0292	WH White	Para 9.53-9.69	Supports pre-amble text but objects to absence of reference to new community hubs or local centre in strategic urban extensions. Should be referenced to negate sequential test/impact assessment.	Support with changes	Yes	Modification	Agree	Amend Para 9.66 to correct typo and to clarify that proposals included in strategic urban extensions would not require a sequential test and impact assessment.

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0195	Christchurch Town Council Neighbourhood Plan Working Group	Para 9.61-9.62	Confusing as buffer zones for retail centres not shown on map. Also confusing as some categories include consideration of district and local centres rather than edge of centre sites.	Comment		No action	We don't map the buffer zones on the policies map. This is quite a technical policy area which reflects national policy.	NA
0195	Christchurch Town Council Neighbourhood Plan Working Group	Para 9.66	Could this also include other small-scale needs identified through neighbourhood plans?	Support with changes		No action	Yes provided that the units are under 280sq m.	NA
0039	Ropemaker properties	E11	Support policy E11	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0131	McDonalds	E11	Support objectives to improve health and wellbeing. Policy E11 too restrictive, been found unsound by other inspectors, in other authorities proved ineffective in tackling obesity. 400m exclusion zone inconsistent with national policy, blanket rejection of drive thus not proportionate or evidenced, more positive approach needed. More evidence needed on relationship between obesity and development. No evidence drive thus have adverse impacts on public health. McDonalds makes a positive contribution to economy and environment of up, McDonalds has healthy/low calorie food options, made great efforts to reduce fat, salt and sugar content, committed to helping customers make informed choices. No national support for exclusion areas, need to plan positively for economic development and sequential approach to retail. No consideration given to how 400m is measured. Planning should not be used to limit people's dietary choices, other class E uses can provide unhealthy products not just hot food takeaways. Drive thrus provide additional choice and often used as part of linked trips, a ban would ignore demand and place pressure on existing facilities. Approach is not positive and damaging to economy, does not manage areas where there is a proliferation so use and limits consumer choice. Disproportionate impact on hot food takeaways, if consistent other use classes should also be restricted. Only around 2-3% of children can get fast food while at school, opportunity for children to access hot food takeaway as part of the school day is limited, limiting drive thru adversely affects those with restricted mobility. No link between proximity of takeaways and poor health - lack of evidence, causes of obesity are complex, lack of evidence to support approach. Similar policy approach found unsound elsewhere.	Objection	No	No action	Evidence now published (previously drafted) that sets out the issues for BCP and the evidence that supports controlling the distribution of hot food takeaways.	NA
0220	LGIM Real Assets	E11	Supports considers over provision of retail set out in the BCP Retail and Leisure Study (2021) & need for flexibility of uses on ground floor of former/existing retail space within primary shopping areas of town centres.	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0223	Fortitudo Ltd	E11	Not permitting drive-thru takeaways in any location is inconsistent with national policy which identifies this use as a town centre use. Inappropriate and inconsistent with national policy to impose a ban on a type of development directed at town centres. Practicalities of restricting hot food takeaways within 400m of schools is not reasonable in an urban area with schools in the town centres. Inconsistent approach to 'edge of centre' definition between policy and NPPF with regard to retail parks and sequential tests. Does not support town centre priority of the NPPF, as a site on retail park could then be preferred to a well-connected site to town centre.	Objection		No action	Evidence now published (previously drafted) that sets out the issues for BCP and the evidence that supports controlling the distribution of hot food takeaways	NA
0231	Castlepoint LP	E11	Support classification as Major District Centre. Support main town centre uses being appropriate within the centre. Castle Point plays a major role in the retail hierarchy and in supporting employment and socioeconomic activity.	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0250	East Dorset Friends of the Earth	E11	Retail sites outside of town centres or neighbourhood centres, including Castlepoint, not desirable. Strict restrictions on parking (which should be charged at same rate as existing locations) and environmental criteria (impact on landscape/townscape, biodiversity effects, increased runoff from hard surfaces/pressure on drainage systems, etc.) required. Retail development should not be permitted within 400m of heathland. Should use zoning system within larger retail locations: central sites - no change of use from retail; in peripheral sites, residential and office uses permitted, subject to assessment of any overall impact whole centre's viability.	Objection		No action	Parking rates on private sites are not controlled by the Council. Permitted development right limit the extent changes of use can be controlled within centres and allow for some flexibility.	NA

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0595	Public Health Dorset	E11	Support restriction of new hot food takeaways in the areas surrounding schools for health reasons - compliant with NPPF. Wish to add contributions to plan's evidence base. Supports NHS Dorset's Joint Forward plan objective to 'prevent 55,000 children from becoming overweight by 2040'.	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0175	Asda Stores Ltd	E11	Part 2 implies that a replacement or new store would have to perform a sequential and retail impact assessment when the store is long established. Object to part aii as not satisfactorily justified and not appropriate.	Objection	Yes	Modification	Agree plan can be amended to provide clarity regarding replacement stores	State allocated sites are exempt in Policy E11 (3) a.
0292	WH White	E11	Does not object to intent and wording but provision should be included in 3 for new community hubs/local centres in strategic urban extensions.	Support with changes	Yes	Modification	Amend to reference new centres which come forward as part of any large strategic site which are out of centre.	Amend Para 9.66 to clarify that proposals included in strategic urban extensions would not require a sequential test and impact assessment.
0195	Christchurch Town Council Neighbourhood Plan Working Group	E11	No reference to the importance of parking and transport interchanges for health and vitality of town centres. Would be helpful to cross-refer to T1(i) and the need to safeguard these. Would be useful to acknowledge ability of neighbourhood plans to update centre boundaries to reflect changes as understood by local community. Greater clarity needed on centres and buffers for sequential tests. Not clear how catchments are defined. Exceptions could also include small scale needs identified by NP. Add reference to neighbourhood plans.'	Support with changes		No action	Policy E11 sets out criteria to manage new retail development. Wider town centre considerations are set out within the ward policies. There are many factors that contribute to the viability of the town centres and footfall is not always directly associated with parking. It is not considered necessary to reference all potential neighbourhood plan activities in every section. Small scale exceptions are already noted by section 3. Retail buffers aren't mapped.	NA
0259	Arts University Bournemouth	E11	Section 1 does not provide enough weight to the role that education, and cultural activities within the town centres, and should provide more support for these uses. AUB have used town centre space for learning, incubator space and the display. These spaces are not just on the ground floor. Need to make specific reference to improving routes, connectivity and frontages across the town centre.	Objection	No	No action	Para 9.55 covers diversification and we do not consider it necessary to specifically include education in the policy.	NA
0292	WH White	Para 9.70-9.75	Supports ref to strategic residential development (para 9.73) and clarification open space and outdoor rec facilities determined against NE7 (9.75).	Support	Yes	No action	Support noted	NA
0195	Christchurch Town Council Neighbourhood Plan Working Group	E12	Can the policy also enable neighbourhood plans to identify suitable sites, particularly for community facilities/services.	Support with changes		No action	Neighbourhood Plans could provide more detail but it is not considered necessary to refer to all potential neighbourhood planning activity in every section, the scope of neighbourhood plans will vary in different areas.	NA
0225	Dorset Council	E12	Note policies require 6 months of marketing, whereas the industry standard is closer to 12 months.	Support		No action	Support noted. Much urban development involves the reuse of industrial land and 6 months is considered a suitable timeframe to produce evidence.	NA
0250	East Dorset Friends of the Earth	E12	Broadly support. No new facilities within 400m of heathland, and applications should be judged against environmental criteria we propose for retail areas.	Support with changes		No action	Any potential impact on heathland will be determined against policies in chapter 6.	NA
0351	Sport England	E12	Sport England feel there is a need for a Built Facilities Assessment to make strategy more robust, in line with para 102 of NPPF. Some sports [facilities] need more natural environment than what could be provided in an urban area. Some sports have a wider catchment than a local neighbourhood, and this needs to be acknowledged in policy.	Objection	No	No action	Built Facilities Assessment has been completed. Policy requires the loss of facilities is considered against the needs of the area and does not refer to local catchment.	NA
0473	Judy Windwood	E12	Supports policy as sport, leisure and community facilities are important to the health of the population and for those without a car and generally to support policies on health, climate change and pollution.	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0641	Thomas Brian Penney	E12	Does not suspect BCPLP's compilers would do anything illegal.	Comment	No	No action	Comment noted	NA
0092	British Speedway Promoters	E12	Existing stadium in ideal location. Support Policy E12, part 2b wording varies from NPPF - unclear why. Reiterate that there is a sporting need for speedway.	Objection		Follow up	Ensure wording aligns with the NPPF.	
0113	Team Dorset Athletics Network, Dorset County Athletics Association and Ashdown Track Users Group	E12	Support E12, more emphasis in 2a to link to projects in para 4.16 and figure 11.1. 2bii any new facilities should require there attractiveness, accessibility and usability to be demonstrably better than current facility.	Support with changes	Yes	Follow up	Consider amendment to provide additional clarification.	
0237	Toklon Ltd	E12	To demonstrate there is no need/demand and adequate provision is available is inconsistent with the NPPS. Concerned how alternative locations are dealt with by the policy. Lack of evidence surrounding the uses that take place in Poole Stadium.	Objection	Yes	Follow up	Ensure wording aligns with the NPPF.	

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0257	AFC Bournemouth	E12	Concerned with the requirement for a 'retail sequential test' to be undertaken for sites located outside of a town or district centre, question if reference to a 'retail sequential test' is an error and that E12a) should simply refer to a 'sequential test'. Important the Local Plan supports the retention and future development of a football stadium in Kings Park.	Objection	Yes	Modification	Sequential test should be clearer and refer to Main Town Centre Uses which would include an new stadium, rather than retail. A new site for a stadium would need to undertake a sequential test. However if AFCB redevelops the current site Policy E12 2(a) does not require a sequential test.	Replace 'retail' with 'main town centre uses' for sequential test in Policy E12 1(a)
0286	Bournemouth University	E12	Objects to requirement for intensive sports and leisure facilities located outside of a town centres to undertake a retail sequential test. BU questions whether reference to a 'retail sequential test' is an error and that E12a) should simply refer to a 'sequential test'. Likely to fail 'soundness' tests because not consistent with national planning policy.	Objection	Yes	Modification	Should refer to main town centre uses sequential test, not retail sequential test.	Amend references throughout plan from retail sequential test to main town centre uses sequential test.
0292	WH White	E12	Do not object to intent and wording but new community hubs / local centres in strategic urban extensions should be recognised in 1 for walkable neighbourhoods and improvements in community infrastructure.	Support with changes	Yes	Modification	Agree to recognise the provision of new facilities as part of strategic urban extensions.	Amend policy E12 to reference facilities included as part of new allocations
0416	Bournemouth Rugby Football Club	E12	Bournemouth Rugby Football Club are looking for a new home to grow and develop. Current base at Bournemouth University's Chapel Gate Sports is no longer suitable and restricts ability to generate revenue.	Objection	Yes	Modification	Agree to reference to club requirements to be made in infrastructure and delivery chapter.	Amend figure 11.1 to reference Bournemouth Rugby Club
0424	NHS Property Services	E12	Healthcare facilities are included within the definition of community facilities, this can have a harmful impact on the NHS's ability to deliver essential facilities and services for the community. Flexibility is needed, some sites need to be disposed of for best value, exploring for alternative community use adds delay into reinvestment programs. Decisions about surplus sites undertaken by NHS with a rigorous process. Alternative wording suggested.	Objection		Follow up	Then policy provides criteria for when community uses can be lost such as the provision of replacement facilities which would support the NHS plans. However, further discussions can occur with NHS Dorset through the preparation of a Statement of Common Ground.	
0646	Theatres Trust	E12	Policy supported, but period of marketing should be extended to at least 12 months (ideally more) in line with other plans, to guard against unnecessary loss, give time to local groups to bid for sites. Should explicitly cover cultural facilities including theatres and music venues, as could be considered visitor attractions or community facilities depending on nature, boosting social and cultural wellbeing.	Support with changes	No	No action	Acknowledge concerns but 12 month is often considered too long a timeframe.	NA
0016	Brian Sutcliffe	Chapter 10	Plan does not tackle traffic congestion in the conurbation an effective public transport system and parking management strategy is needed.	Objection	Yes	No action	The detailed transport strategy will be set out within the Local Transport Plan 4 which will support the overall approach set out within the Local Plan. Public transport is not controlled by the Council but is supported by the Local Plan	NA
0238	National Highways	Chapter 10	Responsible for managing strategic road network, A31 relevant in BCP context. Work needed on updated transport modelling to confirm if plan is sound. Support transport modelling and approach to sustainable growth. Welcome need to reduce private car travel. To date national highways has been involved in modelling work to date issues identified on A31 Ashley Heath roundabout, issue with base model data and support more recent base year. Modelling needs to align with Plan allocations. Any emerging allocation in Dorset could contribute to cumulative impacts. Further discussion and review mentioned.	Objection	Yes	No action	Transport modelling has been updated (June 2024) and shared with National Highways.	NA
0660	William Wherity	Chapter 10	Park and ride scheme required to address congestion, road safety issues, parking issues and difficulty for residents caused by visitors, particularly in summer months. Would also assist commuters. Add reference to park in ride in the active travel infrastructure section of each ward. Differential parking fees should be used at beaches to not detriment residents and increase revenue.	Objection	No	No action	The Plan safeguards Park and Ride site and Local Transport Plan 4 will consider Park and Ride strategy further,	NA
0112	Dorset Ramblers Countryside	Chapter 10	Welcome overall approach, adopt a road user hierarchy to reflect vulnerability of users. Consider that Rights of Way Improvement Plan should be referenced.	Support with changes		Modification	Agree	Add paragraph after 10.9 to reference Rights of Way Improvement Plan
0225	Dorset Council	Chapter 10	Support sustainable transport corridors throughout the BCP area. They should connect into Dorset as many people travel regularly between the two areas of to access work, facilities and services. Encouraging active travel for local trips and sustainable transport can produce healthier lifestyles and have positive impacts on traffic congestion and air quality.	Support		Modification	Support noted. It is noted that some figures in the transport chapter do not show connections beyond the BCP and this can be made clearer.	Amend Figures 10.1 and 10.2 to show linkage beyond BCP into neighbouring council areas.
0260	Dorset Lake Community	Chapter 10	Plan is focussed on walking and cycling. High proportion of elderly and disabled people. Policies discriminate against private vehicles and do not support access for those with reduced mobility. Plan does not consider needs of population.	Objection	Yes	Modification	The plan reflects national planning policy to support alternatives to the private car. Make modification to reference the high proportion of elderly people and their needs in chapter 10 Transportation.	Add different groups of people will have different needs in para 10.1.
0292	WH White	Para 10.1-10.11	Supports introductory text underpinning principles and providing helpful content. New infrastructure helping to create comprehensive network to sustainable travel route to facilitate modal shift.	Support	Yes	No action	Support noted	NA
0195	Christchurch Town Council Neighbourhood Plan Working Group	Para 10.9	Could acknowledge role neighbourhood plans could have in refining local cycling and walking routes and contributing to LCWIP	Support with changes		No action	Not necessary to refer to neighbourhood plans	NA



ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0040	Natural England	T1	Support the general thrust of the policy and specifically T1 b, c and h.	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0078	Hurn Parish Council	T1	Do not support reduced traffic speeds, lack of evidence to support this, adverse impact on the economy, benefits and disbenefits need to be balanced. Concerned point f is contradictory to Green Belt Policy - as written suggests acceptable in any location.	Objection		No action	Reduction in traffic speeds will be appropriate in some locations to support safety, walking and cycling. If the provision of electric vehicle charging noted in point 'f' was within the Green Belt then Green Belt policy would apply.	NA
0096	Go South Coast	T1	Policy aligns with national policy and is welcomed, however it must secure development in a way that achieves different outcomes than previously. Bus services are disadvantaged by increase in development as congestion increases due to car dependency. Individual development proposals will struggle to encourage behaviour away from car usage, and contributions to travel plans are not effective. Policy needs to set plan up to encourage mode shift with strategies and solutions, either by contributing to wider initiatives or at development level to increase active travel and public transport use. Policy too broad, and doesn't provide any definitive actions. Not much that Planning can achieve, mostly sat with Transport and/or highways teams to deliver improvements, given small size of development sites. There is no transport strategy to support Draft Local Plan, which reduces effectiveness and justification for strategy, and likely that only an LTP4, Bus Service Improvement Plan and Infrastructure Development Plan will resolve. Development strategies in existing local plans more successful, clear and coherent to sustainable transport. Frequent bus service is not defined in Local Plan, which is required to assisting developers and stakeholders in identifying costs of new/updated services.	Objection	No	No action	More detail will be included as part of LTP4	NA
0195	Christchurch Town Council Neighbourhood Plan Working Group	T1	Sustainable neighbourhoods not shown on policies map but appear to cover built up area - not clear from wording if the centres of sustainable neighbourhoods are sequentially preferable? g. Should we clarify aim is to reduce freight traffic on unsuitable routes (i.e. not all about increasing freight traffic)? i. no context to say if parking important	Support with changes		No action	Not considered necessary to show sustainable neighbourhoods on policies map. There is no sequential approach.	NA
0220	LGIM Real Assets	T1	Supports principles of policy and emphasises the importance of locating new development in sustainable locations to ensure the greatest opportunities for active and low carbon travel are unlocked.	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0245	Miller Homes and Bellway Homes (Wessex)	T1	Kinson Manor Farm in a highly sustainable location in proximity to numerous facilities, amenities and public transport options to many locations (including those mobility impaired), as demonstrated by evidence base and unusual for a site outside urban area with potential to deliver large number of homes, and thus meets objectives of policy, including reducing private car use. Substantial improvement to public transport in locality expected as lies between Merley and Bearwood, and Bournemouth town centre. Opportunity for development to make S106 contributions to 'kick start' the additional resource required for public transport improvements - site required as no other developments could achieve this for Kinson that would meet NPPF requirements.	Objection	Yes	No action	Comment noted. In accordance with the NPPF the Plan does not propose to release Green Belt to meet housing needs.	NA
0250	East Dorset Friends of the Earth	T1	Includes proposals to encourage sustainable travel, but lacks strategies to reduce car use [gives examples]. Policies should encourage use of shared taxis, ban petrol and diesel delivery vans in residential areas, and clarify control use of electric bikes and scooters (including protecting cyclists and pedestrians). Better management of these required. Major investment in public transport through innovative funding required. Reintroduce trams with central link between Bournemouth Station and Hospital along Wessex Way.	Objection		No action	More detail will be included as part of LTP4	NA
0254	New Forest District Council NFDC	T1	Welcome continued engagement on such infrastructure proposals as they progress that adjoin or relate to NFDC's own Plan Area, including cycle network.	Support		No action	Support noted. BCP Council will continue to engage with NFDC to ensure our strategies and projects align.	NA
0258	Royal London Mutual Insurance Society Ltd	T1	Support policy.	Objection	No	No action	Support noted	NA
0280	Dorset CPRE	T1	Policy not sound as does not contribute to radical reductions in greenhouse gas emissions. Policy does not go far enough to meet UK target of reducing emissions by 68% relative to 1990 level (Climate Change Committee 2023). Does not go far enough to make significant changes required in transport use.	Objection	Yes	No action	Policy has to balance a variety of needs and encourage a shift away from high levels of car dependence.	NA
0287	Network Rail	T1	Support the strategic policy relating to promoting and developing a transport strategy and para g in its promotion of the use of rail freight. Include the need to secure financial contributions towards funding these improvements in criteria h. and reference the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.	Support with changes	Yes	No action	Support noted. Policy ID1 covers the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and the need to secure mitigation and funding for transport and does not need repeating as all policies are read together.	NA

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0292	WH White	T1	Supports intent and wording and embodied in vision for Canford Garden Village omission site. Supports ref to infrastructure for alternative transport fuels. Whites Pit generating renewable energy, battery storage and production of hydrogen.	Support	Yes	No action	Comment noted. In accordance with the NPPF the Plan does not propose to release Green Belt to meet housing needs.	NA
0447	Poole Quays Forum	T1	T11- Zero parking requirement on new developments within Zones A and B is unrealistic, areas are not well served by public transport, shops, and local services. T1i- Transport strategies for the town centres need urgent review.	Objection		No action	Th parking SPD supports zero parking in the most sustainable locations, although developers can choose to provide parking if justified. Transport strategy will be subject to significant review as part of LPT4.	NA
0473	Judy Windwood	T1	Supports policy which supports vision and objectives.	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0514	Mark Davison	T1	Too heavily weighted to active transport, motorists have been ignored. Cycling has reduced, despite amounts of money being spent on active travel. No metrics on active travel produced by BCP, and no cost effectiveness produced. Active travel measures have increased pollution, for example removal of bus lay byes on Wallisdown Road, which increases congestion and pollution. Closed junctions and roads result in longer journey times. Not enough resource in to road repairs. Greater emphasis should be put on traffic management i.e. more thought in to traffic light use/non-use, intermittent use of 20mph zones, better roadwork management, road inspections after works have been carried out by contractors. Need to reduce congestion and pollution rather than continue with active travel initiatives that have failed to demonstrate benefits.	Objection	Yes	No action	Active travel alongside traffic management remains the focus of the Local Plan and Local Transport Plan.	NA
0595	Public Health Dorset	T1	Support requirement for contribution to sustainable/active travel. Supporting text should explain whole population to be considered/included in infrastructure design, due to health inequalities. A movement for movement should be included in evidence base - demonstrates commitment between partners to address issues	Support with changes		No action	Inclusive design required by the policy, no further explanation is considered necessary. Could be added to glossary if needed.	NA
0225	Dorset Council	T1	Support sustainable transport corridors throughout the BCP area, which should connect into Dorset as many people travel regularly between the two areas of to access work, facilities and services. Support active travel for local trips and sustainable transport for healthier lifestyles and tackling traffic congestion and air quality. Local Plan transport improvements should be considered strategically with traffic impacts mitigated. Consider schemes against forthcoming Local Transport Plan (LTP) priorities. Examples include widening A338 to three lanes, a new link road from A338 to the airport, Ashley Heath roundabout, Castleman Trailway and the B3073 corridor Hurn Roundabout to A338 Blackwater Junction.	Support	Yes	Modification	Support noted. Agree that the impact of BCP growth needs consideration on BCP, Dorset Council and National Highways transport infrastructure and through the LTP.	Amend Figures 10.1 and 10.2 to show linkage beyond BCP into neighbouring council areas.
0539	Dorset Local Access Forum	T1	Support Strategic Policy T1 (b) and (c) which emphasise the importance of active travel. Section 10 Should do more to highlight the links between green infrastructure, active travel, active lifestyles, access to nature and health and wellbeing. Section should reference needs of public in accessions green/blue spaces. More references required to the BCP ROWIP.	Support with changes		Modification	The introduction to the transport strategy can be amended to highlight the health benefits of active travel.	Add active travel health benefits to para 10.1.
0614	National Trust	T1	Support emphasis/prioritisation of active/public transport modes and trials of traffic free zones. Travel by water should be included in policy to support more sustainable modes across water. Consideration need to support infrastructure and investment for this.	Objection	No	Follow up	Consider if any additional referencing to Sandbanks Ferry required. Wider movement by water has been considered previously and it has not been proved to be a viable alternative and it is not currently run by any commercial operator. The Plan does not preclude this happening but it not a key focus.	
0195	Christchurch Town Council Neighbourhood Plan Working Group	Para 10.12	Amend text to say 'avoid the need to travel by car'.	Support with changes		Modification	Agree	Clarify it is need to travel by car in para 10.12.
0292	WH White	Para 10.12-10.21	Supports introductory text and indicators of health streets. Parking standards working well and interactive parking and proposals maps helpful and guidance on thresholds for transport assessments.	Support	Yes	No action	Support noted	NA
0521	Martin Miller	Figure 10.5	BCP Parking Standards SPD 2021 erroneously shows Arley Road, Poole, falling in Zone A when it is not within the town centre. Arley Road does not comprise of high density development, and should be in Zone D.	Objection	Yes	No action	Ashley Road is within an area with a range of facilities and high frequency bus routes. Parking zones will remain and be subject to further monitoring.	NA
0595	Public Health Dorset	Para 10.15	Support use of Healthy Streets. Developers should be encouraged to use the Health Streets New Development Check List - should be included in this paragraph.	Support with changes		Modification	Amend to add reference to Healthy Streets check list.	Reference Healthy Streets New Development Checklist in para 10.16
0260	Dorset Lake Community	10.17	Restricting parking spaces for flats/apartment creates a problem for reduced mobility residents requiring access to vehicle parking for themselves or carers and for those concerned to be on public transport, walking or cycling, particularly at night.	Objection	Yes	No action	Requirements in parking SPD provide a strategic approach to BCP and is set out to help support modal shift.	NA

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0195	Christchurch Town Council Neighbourhood Plan Working Group	Para 10.18	Does this reflect Building Regs requirements for EV charging for new dwellings?	Comment		No action	Policy does not impact on building regulation requirements	NA
0077	Craig Hendry	T2	Lack of town centre parking reduce footfall. Residents with no parking will park where shoppers might park.	Objection		No action	The Parking SPD seeks to support modal shift and allows for a reduced parking standard in the most sustainable locations, such as town centres. Furthering monitoring once approvals are built out to monitor any potential impacts are required. Overall public parking capacity in the town centre will be considered through the town centre parking study, we are aware that some car parks are not well used and have significant capacity for the majority of the year. The study will seek to balance making efficient use of town centre land with some parking to support town centre activities.	NA
0195	Christchurch Town Council Neighbourhood Plan Working Group	T2	1.d. Parking Standards - Could include acknowledgement that Neighbourhood plans can provide evidence for local variation to this strategy. 2.b. where do needs of mobility impaired fit?	Support with changes		No action	The car parking standards are BCP wide and set strategically.	NA
0220	LGIM Real Assets	T2	Supports principles of policy and emphasises the importance of locating new development in sustainable locations to ensure the greatest opportunities for active and low carbon travel are unlocked.	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0225	Dorset Council	T2	Policy T2 states that "proposals which are likely to generate significant transport impacts must be supported by a transport assessment / statement and a travel plan (at the Council's request)" and this is supported. However, there is no suggestion of what constitutes "a development that generates a significant amount of traffic". Clarity on this is needed to enable the potential impacts on the Dorset Council area as well as the impacts on the BCP area to be understood.	Support	Yes	No action	Support noted. This will be assessed on a site by site basis and impacts judged accordingly.	NA
0250	East Dorset Friends of the Earth	T2	Substantial strengthening required. Lacks requirement of use of active/public transport and disincentives to drive. Major developments - costs of providing buses and cycleways should borne wholly by developers.	Objection		No action	Policies within Chapter 10 Transportation support the use of public transport, active travel and the provision of mitigation where necessary.	NA
0258	Royal London Mutual Insurance Society Ltd	T2	Support policy.	Objection	No	No action	Support noted	NA
0273	Churchill Retirement Living	T2	Adopted parking standards should only be taken into consideration, otherwise too inflexible and SPD hasn't been tested at examination.	Objection		No action	The car parking standards are BCP wide and set strategically.	NA
0287	Network Rail	T2	Policy not clear on what the mitigation measures could be. Whilst the hierarchy is supported, it should be more flexible so that wider opportunities aren't missed . Replace numbers with bullets so all options are considered. Supports 2. and 3. In 3. add para about securing financial contributions.	Support with changes	Yes	No action	Support noted. We are prioritising the use of CIL to fund off site improvements so proposed changes are unnecessary.	NA
0292	WH White	T2	Support intent and wording and requirements of 2 and embodied in vision for Canford Garden Village omission site.	Support	Yes	No action	Support noted	NA
0473	Judy Windwood	T2	Supports policy which supports vision and objectives on pollution, climate change and health of the population.	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0514	Mark Davison	T2	Too heavily weighted to active transport, motorists have been ignored. Cycling has reduced, despite amounts of money being spent on active travel. No metrics on active travel produced by BCP, and no cost effectiveness produced. Active travel measures have increased pollution, for example removal of bus lay byes on Wallisdown Road, which increases congestion and pollution. Closed junctions and roads result in longer journey times. Not enough resource in to road repairs. Greater emphasis should be put on traffic management i.e. more thought in to traffic light use/non-use, intermittent use of 20mph zones, better roadwork management, road inspections after works have been carried out by contractors. Need to reduce congestion and pollution rather than continue with active travel initiatives that have failed to demonstrate benefits.	Objection	Yes	No action	Active travel alongside traffic management remains the focus of the Local Plan and Local Transport Plan.	NA

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0597	Hampshire County Council	T2	The County Council has recently adopted a new Local Transport Plan (LTP4). The Transport Policies set out in T1, T2 and T4 of the BCP Reg 19 Local Plan align well with the aims and objectives of the Hampshire LTP4. Supports Policy T2.1 and assumes policy is applicable across the county boundary in Hampshire where development impacts from the BCP are anticipated. The County Council would welcome opportunities to work with BCP to secure contributions..	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0096	Go South Coast	T2	T2 is not properly evidenced or effective, in that it restates NPPF, and smaller developments struggle to meet requirements. Presumption in favour of sustainable development at para 11d of NPPF creates cumulative impacts on the network, and this is certain to continue for BCP with proposed housing delivery approach. Council need to find a mechanism for enduring all development help to achieve desired strategy, and could be through CIL. T2 1 c. needs to reference LTP4, LCWIP and BSIP. Supports T2 2 for major development. T2 2 e. should include car club spaces, an advance on current 'could'. T2 3 a. restates NPPF expectations, but is sound, with lack of national guidance at present. T2 3 b. (travel plans) are largely ineffective. Proposed policy will not achieve anything more than current policy, which has had no impact.	Objection	No	Modification	Amend to provide additional clarity. More detail will be included as part of LTP4	Reference the Council's strategies in Policy T2 d.
0259	Arts University Bournemouth	T2	Requirement to provide "mobility hubs on the site, or in the vicinity" is not deliverable for all major development, some sites already benefit from sustainable transport hubs. Clarification as to what is meant by mobility hubs	Objection	No	Modification	Each site will be considered on a case by case basis with the highways authority. The policy allows for this.	Add text about mobility hubs after para 10.21.
0270	McLaren Property	T2	Requirements within Part 2(e) may not be suitable for all forms of major development. Not clear what a mobility hub would be expected to provide. Requirement should be commensurate to type and scale of development rather than a requirement for all major development.	Support with changes		Modification	Each site will be considered on a case by case basis with the highways authority. The policy allows for this.	Add text about mobility hubs after para 10.21.
0271	Highwood Group	T2	More flexibility required to ensure viability and deliverability	Objection	Yes	Modification	Each site will be considered on a case by case basis with the highways authority. The policy allows for this.	Add text about mobility hubs after para 10.21.
0447	Poole Quays Forum	T2	T2(1cii) - Accessibility and frequency of public transport must be improved. T2(1civ) -Transport improvement schemes must be practical, realistic and take into account the high number of residents needing disabled driver access. T2(1d) All residential and mixed use development need onsite parking. People still own a car and park on the streets. Parking ideally underground, large surface car parks should be avoided. T2(2c) The quality of the public realm is paramount for better living. T2(3b) Travel plans, should be encouraged, but must be practical and realistic.	Objection		Modification	The Council will continue to work with bus operators to improve public transport. The draft Local Plan support the provision of improved public transport. Transport improvement schemes seek to balance the needs of different users and modes of transport. We will reference healthy streets guidance. The Parking SPD seeks to support modal shift and allows for a reduced parking standard in the most sustainable locations, such as town centres. Furthering monitoring once approvals are built out to monitor any potential impacts are required. Research to support the parking SPD demonstrates that not everyone owns a car. The Local Plan supports improvements to the public realm. There is significant scope from improvement but the Council is limited in what it can fund unless contributions or improvements are made as part of new development. Policy T2 transport and development requires the provision of travel plans.	Reference Healthy Streets New Development Checklist in para 10.16
0039	Ropemaker properties	T2	Where mobility hubs cannot be provided on site financial contributions to provide nearby should be allowed.	Support with changes		No action	Each site will be considered on a case by case basis with the highways authority. The policy allows for this.	NA
0175	Asda Stores Ltd	T2	Object to policy T2, Parking Strategy has not been published for comment, imperative that sufficient parking is provided for ASDA	Objection	Yes	No action	Draft car parking strategy to support local plan will be published as soon as possible.	NA
0447	Poole Quays Forum	T3	All residential and mixed use development need onsite parking. People still own a car and park on the streets. Parking ideally underground, large surface car parks should be avoided.	Objection		No action	The Parking SPD seeks to support modal shift and allows for a reduced parking standard in the most sustainable locations, such as town centres. Furthering monitoring once approvals are built out to monitor any potential impacts are required. Research to support the parking SPD demonstrates that not everyone owns a car.	NA
0473	Judy Windwood	T3	Supports policy as it allows for active travel and vision and objectives on pollution, climate change and health of the population.	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0250	East Dorset Friends of the Earth	T3	Generally support. Should be presumption against new access which crosses cycle path/bridlepath or well-used footpath. Policies required to deal with current excessive levels of on-street parking, a safety risk and deterrent to active travel.	Support with changes		No action	Accesses will be considered on a case by case basis. Development in an urban area will require most accesses to cross a pavement.	NA
0292	WH White	Para 10.25-10.29	Supports text.	Support	Yes	No action	Support noted	NA
0040	Natural England	T4	Support the policy and its encouragement for modal shifts from combustion based transport, particularly section T4 2).	Support		No action	Support noted	NA

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0079	The Society for Poole	T4	Policy T4 is unsound and weak in serving the public interest, as it is not effectively coordinated with other policies in the plan. It: -does not refer to improving rail link with Swanage (in contrast to Policy E1 -conflicts with policies P1 and P33, as they do not comply with 'must' statements in this policy -conflicts with Policy P12 regarding an existing park and ride (see item 3c)	Objection		No action	Policy T4 supports the enhanced and expanded use of the rail network, this would support connections to places in Dorset (such as Swanage) but the operation of rail services is outside of Council control. The ward policies within P1 and P33 are considered to support the aspirations set out in policy T4.	NA
0175	Asda Stores Ltd	T4	Object to policy T4, more information needs to be made available in relation to strategically important transport schemes to justify their inclusion in appendix 2.	Objection	Yes	No action	Strategically important transport schemes have been developed in collaboration with the Council's highways department and through joint working with neighbouring authorities on transport issues.	NA
0220	LGIM Real Assets	T4	Strategically important transport schemes should be included in the Plan only if they are deliverable and have a realistic prospect of coming forward. Scheme include a 'New Poole Station at land adjacent to Poole Bus Station'. Land at Poole Bus Station is wholly owned by a third party who have not put this site forward for redevelopment. Development at the Dolphin can come forward without bus or rail schemes. Any intervention at the station would likely take place beyond the plan period of this Draft Local Plan.	Objection	No	No action	While delivery of these transport projects are longer term they need to be planned for within this plan period as part of a wider regeneration strategy.	NA
0225	Dorset Council	T4	The requirement in T4 that transport infrastructure should be designed to "be safe, attractive and accessible for all users" should be used as a guiding principle for all transport related infrastructure.	Support	Yes	No action	Support noted	NA
0250	East Dorset Friends of the Earth	T4	Sensible policy but needs to go further. Should define areas where pavement parking is forbidden, with specific measures for narrow streets. Bus and rail connectivity, fares and frequencies across conurbation need to improve, and car use disincentivised. Mass transit system required (tram/light rail linked to rail network). More roads should be bus only (with cycleways).	Objection		No action	Suggestions too detailed for local plan	NA
0287	Network Rail	T4	Support para 1a and 4. a, b and c. Reference should be made to securing financial contributions towards improvements to the rail network.	Support with changes	Yes	No action	Support noted. We are prioritising the use of CIL to fund off site improvements so proposed changes are unnecessary.	NA
0292	WH White	T4	Supports intent and wording.	Support	Yes	No action	Support noted	NA
0447	Poole Quays Forum	T4	T4(3) Accessibility and connectivity to services must be improved. Quick and easy links needed between (Poole) Railway Station and Bus Station and between Poole Quay and the Rail/Bus station. Existing Park and Ride facilities must be reviewed. T4(4) The Poole, Bournemouth, Christchurch corridor needs a frequent rail link with easy and frequent road links to the Town centres and key visitor attractions.	Objection		No action	Policy P26 Poole Town Centre supports improvements to the connections within Poole town centre and acknowledges that links between key facilities need to be enhanced. The Park and Ride is safeguarded until a comprehensive review can take place as part of LTP4. The Council will continue to work with rail operators to seek to improve the frequency of rail links. Town Centres and most attractions are accessible but access across all modes is not always equal.	NA
0473	Judy Windwood	T4	Supports policy as allows for active travel and modes other than the car and supports the vision and objectives on pollution, climate change and health of the population.	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0614	National Trust	T4	Support in principle but infrastructure for marine traffic must be considered and should be referred to in policy. Investment in ferries required for tourism/local economy. Policy must refer to importance, ongoing use and maintenance of mooring and jetties. Opportunities could exist to improve services and create more sustainable marine traffic options.	Objection	No	Follow up		
0096	Go South Coast	T4	Policy too broad and ill-defined. Not effective until evidence base is brought up to date. Strongly worded, but with no defined goals and lack of clarity on what would justify bus service improvements. 'Quality bus corridors' need to be defined. Bus network will need to be enhanced to meet DFT objectives, through collaboration with Council, bus industry and guided by BSIP. There is an important role for developments across the area to play in this through contributions and direct investments in infrastructure.	Objection	No	No action	More detail will be included as part of LTP4 and through collaborative work outside of the Local Plan process.	NA
0292	WH White	Para 10.30-10.33	Support intent and recovered aggregates used in construction of Canford Paddock and Canford Vale from Whites Pit. Similar opportunity for Canford Garden Village omission site.	Support	Yes	No action	Support noted	NA
0079	The Society for Poole	T5	Policy T5 is sound and effective in serving the public interest. Note policy requires evidence regarding incineration of plastic and use of waste plastic to produce hydrogen and graphene.	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0287	Network Rail	T5	Supports 1b and c and promotion of rail freight.	Support	Yes	No action	Support noted	NA
0292	WH White	T5	Support intent and wording. Opportunity to modify for Canford Garden Village to accord with 1(b).	Support	Yes	No action	Support noted	NA
0447	Poole Quays Forum	T5	Support	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0473	Judy Windwood	T5	Supports use of cargo bikes for last mile deliveries.	Support		No action	Support noted	NA

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0250	East Dorset Friends of the Earth	T5	Vague policy requires revision. Could use peripheral depots and smaller distribution vehicles. Use of rail freight should be encouraged. Lorry bans needed in some areas. Limit vehicle size in residential areas, and ban non-electric delivery vehicles after 2028. Strengthen parking loading and loading restrictions, including regarding times allowed.	Objection		No action	These proposals are better considered through the Local Transport Plan as they go beyond the role of planning.	NA
0292	WH White	Para 10.34-10.36	Supports text.	Support	Yes	No action	Support noted	NA
0040	Natural England	T6	Support the policy approach set out which complements the need to seek air quality improvements for habitats sites in BCP and nearby.	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0082	Christchurch Harbour Ornithological Group	T6	Air quality also impacts on internationally important habitats. Supporting text should refer to Policy NE2 or the Dorset Heathlands Interim Air Quality Strategy.	Support with changes		No action	Information about air quality in relation to habitats sites is set out in chapter 6 (Natural Environment).	NA
0250	East Dorset Friends of the Earth	T6	Policy ineffective - needs to be redrafted. Not enough done to tackle poor air quality - need to reduce number of vehicles and restrict traffic use (such as through LEZs).	Objection		No action	Further measures to be considered as part of LTP4	NA
0292	WH White	T6	Supports intend and wording.	Support	Yes	No action	Support noted	NA
0447	Poole Quays Forum	T6	Support. Although residents will need parking. Public transport must be made a more attractive.	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0473	Judy Windwood	T6	Supports policy as allows for active travel and the vision and objectives on pollution, climate change and health of the population.	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0222	Lok'nStore	T6	Supports efforts to improve air quality across BCP but policy lacks precision and not clear between pre-able text and policy wording whether three names areas are likely for adverse impact and what mechanism would be needed to trigger air quality assessment.	Support with changes		Modification	Each application will be considered on a case by case basis. The trigger will depend upon known air quality issues, preferred highway routes used by the development and the number of trips. Policy T6 could be improved by specific mention to the 3 named areas.	Add to Policy T6 where the highest nitrogen dioxide concentrations are.
0245	Miller Homes and Bellway Homes (Wessex)	Figure 11.1	Stour Valley is included as a planned Green Infrastructure project. See our comments on the Stour Valley Park Strategy and on the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.	Objection	Yes	No action	Stour Valley is listed in Figure 11.1 and included in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.	NA
0148	FCERM	Figure 11.1	Add to column 1 "Flood and coastal risk management measures", and in column 2 "Poole and Christchurch town centres, Poole & Christchurch bays open coasts and sea cliffs and chines."	Support with changes		Modification	Agree	Reference coastal risk management measures and open coasts, sea cliffs and chines in Figure 11.1.
0292	WH White	Para 11.1-11.6	Supports introductory text and ref to Infrastructure Delivery Plans for Strategic Scale development and utility capacity understanding.	Support	Yes	No action	Support noted	NA
0148	FCERM	Para 11.3	Amend "...flood protection measures..." to read as "...flood and coastal risk management measures..."	Support with changes		Modification	Agree	Add coastal risk management measures to para 11.3.
0079	The Society for Poole	ID1	Policy ID1 is sound and effective in serving the public interest.	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0113	Team Dorset Athletics Network, Dorset County Athletics Association and Ashdown Track Users Group	ID1	Support commitment to Ashdown athletics facility. More detailed commentary required. Support developer contributions to improve built leisure facilities - more clarity on improvements and scope should be recognised. Ongoing demand for facility and ways to increase capacity and ensure its fit for purpose - all weather accommodation and improved lighting needed. Welcome opportunity to engage over what improvements would be of benefit. Facility needs to be protected and enhanced. Plan should encourage a working group. Masterplan needed. More detailed needed about the objectives and investment required.	Support with changes	Yes	No action	Plan references and protects the facility. A working group and facility master planning would need to take place separately to the Local Plan	NA
0220	LGIM Real Assets	ID1	The Infrastructure Delivery Plan (2024-2039) (IDP) should not include 'train station redevelopment / relocation to Dolphin Centre' and 'replacement of level crossing, redevelopment of existing bus station'. Scheme is unfunded and outside council control.	Objection	No	No action	This is core part of the regeneration of Town Centre North in Poole and needs to be explored as part of the masterplanning, so reference in the IDP is warranted.	NA
0226	Bournemouth Water / South West Water	ID1	Supportive of ID1, particularly (b). A Water Resources Management Plan is being prepared to examine water demand, availability and supply. The Bournemouth area is water stressed and abstraction from sensitive sources to be reduced. Asset upgrades will be required for some allocated sites in the Lansdowne and Christchurch.	Support		No action	Support noted, water stress issues are referred to in chapter 5.	NA
0250	East Dorset Friends of the Earth	ID1	Unclear how will address inadequacy of main drains/sewers unless developers are required to pay the full costs of upgrading the entire systems. Demonstrates proposed growth should be limited.	Objection		No action	Utility companies plan and deliver upgraded infrastructure to meet demand	NA
0258	Royal London Mutual Insurance Society Ltd	ID1	Support policy.	Objection	No	No action	Support noted	NA

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0267	Richborough Estates	ID1	Object to infrastructure delivery approach as does not include Phase 2.1 and 2.2 of Wessex Fields Improvements required to support plan delivery (would also support hospital, Wessex Fields and business park). Subject to extant permission, appropriate for government grant, community infrastructure and S106 funding. Would improve pedestrian and cyclist accessibility with associated benefits, and improve investment, new jobs and economy.	Objection	Yes	No action	Planned growth does not require the segregated road junction.	NA
0292	WH White	ID1	Support intent and wording.	Support	Yes	No action	Support noted	NA
0374	Corinne Martin	ID1	Considers more green spaces are needed for children/adults to exercise (football pitches and parks).	Objection	No	No action	The plan seeks to protect exist open spaces and provide new spaces within large developments	NA
0424	NHS Property Services	ID1	New development should make a proportionate contribution to funding the healthcare needs arising from new development, particularly primary care. Health infrastructure should be at the forefront of infrastructure priorities. Planning policies should enable the delivery of essential healthcare infrastructure and help deliver estate transformation. Policy does not sufficiently reflect the likely level of healthcare infrastructure required to support the level of growth proposed by the plan. Options should enable financial contributions, new-on-site healthcare infrastructure, free land/infrastructure/property, or a combination of these.	Objection		No action	Policy ID1 Infrastructure sets out infrastructure can be provided directly or through contribution and makes a specific reference to health care facilities.	NA
0511	Dorset Local Nature Partnership	ID1	Nature-based solutions should be prioritised. Opportunities for SUDs should be included and linked with para 5.44-5.57.	Objection	No	No action	Opportunities for SuDs and drainage solutions are set out in chapter 5.	NA
0582	Rob Brailsford	ID1	Sport provision important for community, including for youth development, community enhancement (satisfy demand/address shortage) and supporting clubs.	Support	No	No action	Support noted	NA
0659	Wilfred Masson	ID1	Poole requires new sports facility for Poole Town FC, other clubs, community (for youth development, school clubs)	Support	No	No action	Support noted. Reference to Poole Town to be added in chapter 11	NA
0068	B Fisher	ID1	Poole town need proper ground, existing site not good enough, stadium site a disgrace	Comment		Modification	Agree	Amend infrastructure table in chapter 11 to reference clubs requiring new premises including Poole Town FC
0070	Martin Smith	ID1	Support new sports facilities for Poole Town FC.	Support		Modification	Agree	Amend infrastructure table in chapter 11 to reference clubs requiring new premises including Poole Town FC
0148	FCERM	ID1	Change in terminology required	Support with changes		Modification	Agree	Amend policy ID1 to change flood risk terminology
0166	Troika Developments Ltd	ID1	Supportive of policy but considers further flexibility should be introduced by amending b. to include 'and where necessary'.	Objection	Yes	Modification	Agree	Amend policy ID1 to add add flexibility
0271	Highwood Group	ID1	More flexibility required to ensure viability and deliverability	Objection	Yes	Modification	Agree	Amend policy ID1 to add add flexibility
0287	Network Rail	ID1	Support para a. Para b should be modified to address safeguarding land around the rail network for rail improvements. In first para refer to Grampian planning conditions and legal agreements to secure infrastructure improvements.	Support with changes	Yes	Modification	Agree to reference legal agreements and transport infrastructure. The Council doesn't support use of Grampian agreements	Amend to refer to legal agreements and expand wording in relation to transport infrastructure.
0293	Dorset County Football Association	ID1	There is a lack of suitable sporting facilities in the area, football facilities suffer heavy demand and some clubs/team are unable to find regular training venues. There is a need for additional 3G artificial facilities, need to work together to identify the correct location for additional provision.	Comment	No	Modification	Agree	Amend infrastructure table in chapter 11 to reference clubs requiring new premises including Poole Town FC
0351	Sport England	ID1	Site required for Bournemouth Rugby Club in plan area. Support golf club site previously proposed for allocation now omitted.	Objection	No	Modification	Agree, refer to club requirements in infrastructure and delivery chapter. Golf club referred to is not within the BCP area	Amend infrastructure table in chapter 11 to reference clubs requiring new premises including Poole Town FC
0355	Brian Poole	ID1	Insufficient provision for sports facilities in Local Plan. There should be community hubs for sport and leisure provision across BCP. Lots of sports team in conurbation in need of improved facilities e.g. Poole Town FC. Improvements could help youth sports programmes and improve health of local population. Existing swimming pool in central Poole need redevelopment, but could be incorporated in to a community, sports and leisure hub for Poole.	Objection	No	Modification	Agree	Amend infrastructure table in chapter 11 to reference clubs requiring new premises including Poole Town FC
0357	Bryan Hoile	ID1	Plan needs to make more provision for sport/recreational facilities (organised sports/clubs) - poor provision in BCP, particularly Poole - for fitness/health	Objection	No	Modification	Agree	Amend infrastructure table in chapter 11 to reference clubs requiring new premises including Poole Town FC
0390	David Tonkes	ID1	There are many sports clubs in the area in urgent need of new grounds and facilities, including Poole Town FC.	Comment	No	Modification	Agree	Amend infrastructure table in chapter 11 to reference clubs requiring new premises including Poole Town FC
0292	WH White	Para 11.7-11.21	Supports introductory text for better clarity but policy provision for change of use not well defined.	Support	Yes	No action	Comment not clearly defined to enable response	NA

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0280	Dorset CPRE	Para 11.8	The approach taken in the viability assessment does not provide a true assessment of urban centre viability. Harman report points out the importance of minimising risks to the delivery of the plan. These can come from policy requirements that are too high or too low. Requirements for delivering affordable housing have been set too low. The reality of brownfield is there is a huge variety of percentage degree of full site economic development. Many sites are under developed and have potential to afford significant planning obligations. The broad-brush typology that underpins the plan is superficial and inaccurate. Using benchmark of £3million across brownfield is bound to guarantee non viability.	Objection	Yes	No action	The HOM10b Housing Delivery Report June 2024 para 6.5 provides evidence that setting an affordable housing target isn't an effective policy and a change in approach is necessary, with a refocus on CIL as non negotiable cost that must be factored into the land price.	NA
0280	Dorset CPRE	Para 11.15	Not requiring affordable housing on majority of schemes does not meet BCP development needs. Housing needs assessment (para 8.13) suggests a need for 1653 social/affordable homes per annum	Objection	Yes	No action	Affordable housing thresholds reflect viability issues.	NA
0036	Southwood Partners	ID2	Existing process is adequate, funding information is confidential and institutions won't release such information.	Objection	Yes	No action	This information is essential for transparency and can remain confidential if necessary.	NA
0071	Goadsby on behalf of various clients	ID2	Existing process is adequate, funding information is confidential and institutions won't release such information.	Objection	Yes	No action	The existing process is not working and needs change, as evidenced in HOM3b para 6.5 where schemes are not achieving policy compliance and the significant number of unimplemented planning permissions (HOM11b). This information is essential for transparency and can remain confidential if necessary.	NA
0162	Bournemouth Airport	ID2	Policy is too onus as deliverability/viability should not have to be demonstrated where a scheme complies with policy. Also the criteria for requiring a letter by financial institution may be unnecessary and unjustified where there may not necessarily be financial institution involved.	Objection	Yes	No action	If a policy compliant planning application is submitted it will satisfy the opening sentence of the policy without additional work to demonstrate it. Where viability is challenged the letter is essential for transparency and can remain confidential if necessary.	NA
0166	Troika Developments Ltd	ID2	Does not explain how deliverability will be assessed. If deliverability synonymous with viability sentence not needed as per NPPG. Wording inconsistent with NPPF. Section 1.c too prescriptive. Section 1.d unclear and inappropriate, suggest removed. Revised wording suggested.	Objection	Yes	No action	It is up to the developer to demonstrate to the Council that the scheme is viable and can be built within the appropriate timeframe. If a policy compliant planning application is submitted it will satisfy the opening sentence of the policy without additional work to demonstrate it. If the scheme isn't viable and there is no chance of it becoming viable from changing market circumstances (e.g. rising sales prices) then it isn't a deliverable scheme. The NPPG is not policy. ID1 provides detail to help applicants provide comparable inputs, for example the exceptional costs on a specific site may exceed the generic Local Plan viability assessment. EUV+ aligns with the NPPG and is necessary to change the current approach and avoid overinflated land transactions at the cost of policy compliance. Financial institution will in practice refer to 'lender or funding body'.	NA
0175	Asda Stores Ltd	ID2	Object to policy, no requirement to demonstrate deliverability in statute, NPPF or PPG.	Objection	Yes	No action	If a policy compliant planning application is submitted it will satisfy the opening sentence of the policy without additional work to demonstrate it.	NA
0176	Friends of the Elderly	ID2	No requirement within statute, NPPF or PPG to demonstrate 'deliverability'. Therefore opening sentence of the policy should be deleted.	Objection	Yes	No action	If a policy compliant planning application is submitted it will satisfy the opening sentence of the policy without additional work to demonstrate it.	NA
0220	LGIM Real Assets	ID2	Objects to policy as does not consider there to be requirement for applicant to have to demonstrate 'deliverability'	Objection	No	No action	If a policy compliant planning application is submitted it will satisfy the opening sentence of the policy without additional work to demonstrate it.	NA
0223	Fortitudo Ltd	ID2	It is not justified to require viability assessments to use same inputs as viability assessment for plan, as this runs until 2039, and inputs will change during plan period. Developments need to be considered on a case-by-case basis for viability. Some site may never be viable in providing a policy compliant level of affordable housing, and won't be possible to demonstrate what has changed. Flawed to use 'existing use value plus' as benchmark land value as rarely provides incentive for a landowner to sell with other factors included. Part (d) is onerous and unnecessary (involving financial institutions). Policy is unsound.	Objection		No action	ID1 provides detail to help applicants provide comparable inputs, for example the exceptional costs on a specific site may exceed the generic Local Plan viability assessment. Costs will change over time and can be compared to Local Plan viability assessment (which is expected to be updated every 5 years as part of a review). EUV+ aligns with the NPPG and is necessary to change the current approach and avoid overinflated land transactions at the cost of policy compliance. This letter is essential for transparency and can remain confidential if necessary.	NA
0233	University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust	ID2	No requirement in national policy to demonstrate deliverability at the submission of application in the context of viability.	Objection	Yes	No action	If a policy compliant planning application is submitted it will satisfy the opening sentence of the policy without additional work to demonstrate it.	NA
0235	Wyatt Homes	ID2	Site specific testing viability is broadly acceptable, but does not support criterion d. of ID2 as unnecessary and unreasonable. Viability appraisal evidence provided by independent specialists should be sufficient. Some schemes not funded as required in criterion d. Not consistent with para 16(f) of NPPF.	Objection	Yes	No action	This information is essential for transparency and can remain confidential if necessary. Financial institution will in practice refer to 'lender or funding body'.	NA



ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0245	Miller Homes and Bellway Homes (Wessex)	ID2	Criterion 1 d. of concern - no precedent for requiring letter from financial institution backing proposed scheme setting out why development in current form isn't viable and how scheme can be made viable. Viability appraisals should be undertaken by independent experts. Will cause delays and difficulties and could undermine commercial sensitivity of financial negotiations.	Objection	Yes	No action	This information is essential for transparency and can remain confidential if necessary. There may be no precedent but the current process is flawed and needs a new approach.	NA
0250	East Dorset Friends of the Earth	ID2	Should require evidence developer can fund the necessary infrastructure improvements, etc, to meet Plan objectives.	Objection		No action	Securing infrastructure and policy compliance is the fundamental aim of the policy.	NA
0258	Royal London Mutual Insurance Society Ltd	ID2	Paragraph 11.7 which notes "the viability evidence shows that margins are tight in Bournemouth and Poole town centres and across the central part of the BCP area", CIL should therefore not be required for town centre re-generation sites to ensure they can be delivered within the plan period.	Objection	No	No action	Fnding infrastructure is essential to support regeneration. CIL is preferable to S106 as the cost is known when developers enter into land transactions providing certainty to all parties.	NA
0267	Richborough Estates	ID2	Object to viability approach due to proposed residual valuation methodology - unrealistic as do not assume or allow for any abnormal costs of construction. Benchmark land value - incorrect valuation assumption on greenfield sites - different benchmark land value depending on whether land is developable or ancillary greenspace, SANG etc as both are equally important as cannot exist without other - presented to reduce benchmark land values to improve viability. No national requirement to demonstrate 'deliverability'.	Objection	Yes	No action	Abnormal costs are included in th residual land valuations set out in Appendix F of the viability assessment appendices (IAD1b). Disagree with assertions about benchmark land value. In practice SANG land around BCP is non developable land (e.g. River Meadow along the Stour Valley If a policy compliant planning application is submitted it will satisfy the opening sentence of the policy without additional work to demonstrate it) and should have a lower land value. If a policy compliant planning application is submitted it will satisfy the opening sentence of the policy without additional work to demonstrate it.	NA
0271	Highwood Group	ID2	Unclear how BCP will accept demonstration of deliverability. Proposals that meet policy requirements should be assumed to be viable, therefore no need to evidence demonstrate deliverability. Requiring FVA to use same inputs as used for plan viability assessment contrary to guidance. Plan making viability assessments generic, so site specific assessments may not be capable of demonstrating a viable scheme on the basis of the plan's assessment's assumptions. Unclear what 'financial institution is referred to - this criterion is too prescriptive and should be removed. Policy criteria regarding changes of use place a significant hurdle to achieving enhanced urban capacity due to onerous requirements and is contrary to plan's strategy and should be deleted.	Objection	Yes	No action	If a policy compliant planning application is submitted it will satisfy the opening sentence of the policy without additional work to demonstrate it. If the scheme isn't viable and there is no chance of it becoming viable from changing market circumstances (e.g. rising sales prices) then it isn't a deliverable scheme. The NPPG is not policy. ID1 provides detail to help applicants provide comparable inputs, for example the exceptional costs on a specific site may exceed the generic Local Plan viability assessment. EUV+ aligns with the NPPG and is necessary to change the current approach and avoid overinflated land transactions at the cost of policy compliance. Financial institution will in practice refer to 'lender or funding body'. Change of use element of the policy is not onerous and will help protect important uses that could continue to operate viably, but once given up to housing cannot be replaced.	NA
0273	Churchill Retirement Living	ID2	Retirement living typology should have been tested in BCPLP Viability Assessment given Former Gas Works owner to inform policies. Otherwise study identifies retirement living unviable (including in Former Gas Works band (2)). Viability Study finding that 15% affordable housing viable in 5 years' time on site subject to change and inappropriate to use to inform policy. Build costs underestimated. Inadequate allowances for nutrient neutrality mitigation. Insufficient allowance for requirement to meet C1, C2, C6, NE2, NE3, and NE4 (particular concern regarding flood risk implications). Cost of meeting M4(3) also needs to be included as is required by H4. No headroom for CIL charge yet emerging charging schedule proposed rate of £300 m2 applied to this value band - would be unviable. [Refers to intended further representations on viability testing].	Objection		No action	M4(3) in Policy H4 is not a must and does not testing. Phopshate neutrality costs in the River Avon will reduce over time once the market is established. The former gas works site cannot be developed alone without a strategic approach to flood defences. CIL from this development and other Christchurch town centre schemes will provide the necessary part funding of flood defences that enable the Council to secure government grant so is essential to enable delivery.	NA
0292	WH White	ID2	Considers 1D2 to be unjustified. Applicants should not have to demonstrate schemes are deliverable. 1(d) is inappropriate, disproportionate and unreasonable. 2 is not well defined as does not relates back to E12, E9, E10, H7 or E7. Does not consider this will have any merit.	Objection	Yes	No action	If a policy compliant planning application is submitted it will satisfy the opening sentence of the policy without additional work to demonstrate it. Change of use element of the policy is not onerous and will help protect important uses that could continue to operate viably, but once given up to housing cannot be replaced.	NA
0571	Home Builders Federation	ID2	Requirement to demonstrate major development schemes deliverable contrary to PPG - should have been undertaken through plan-making process - and should be deleted. Object to requirement from financial backers of development when viability is an issue - not required under national policy/guidance and unreasonable.	Objection	Yes	No action	If a policy compliant planning application is submitted it will satisfy the opening sentence of the policy without additional work to demonstrate it. Where viability is challenged the letter is essential for transparency and can remain confidential if necessary.	NA
0245	Miller Homes and Bellway Homes (Wessex)	Para 11.20	Poor record of addressing delivery shortcomings and undertaking required reviews. Need to allocate more dwellings, including to meet a buffer, than for plan to fail.	Objection	Yes	No action	Up to date local plan needed which can then be monitored and reviewed if necessary.	NA
0020	RSPB	Part 2 (Ward policies)	Ward policies – not looked at all but should ensure allocations conform with spatial constraints set out in local plan and requirements set out in Dorset Heathlands Planning Framework 2020-25. If not, we would object.	Comment		No action	Site allocations reflect the various constraints within the BCP area.	NA

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0103	Ken Parke on behalf of various clients 2	Part 2 (Ward policies)	Part 2 not necessary, too prescriptive, negative policies, prevents development, limit how development can come forward, policies should optimise the urban area, generalised height restrictions, inflexible, not consistent with spatial strategy, some aspects could be dealt with a general development management policy, no development management policies on infill development. Section needs removing or redrafting. Local opportunity areas and opportunity streets limit ability of areas to evolve.	Objection		No action	Ward policies have enabled councillors and residents to engage with the process, identifying a range of spatial issues that need to be addressed. The ward policies and level of detail provides clarity and certainty over expectations.	NA
0146	Inspired Villages	Part 2 (Ward policies)	Allocations for extra care are for up to 60 units which is not viable for must extra care scheme. Sites require at least 100 units to ensure deliverability.	Objection	No	No action	Previous industry feedback suggested units of 60 bed would be viable and other schemes at this scale have been built in the BCP area.	NA
0150	Ken Parke on behalf of various clients 3	Part 2 (Ward policies)	Individual ward policies overly restrictive on development opportunities. Limited flexibility for development within and outside local opportunity areas and streets stifles appropriate innovation and growth, and prevents responses to evolving needs for housing and infrastructure, and social and economic changes. Allocating development heights unnecessarily restrictive. Fail to consider permitted development rights for upward extensions. Appears that proposals outside local opportunity areas and streets will resisted/not be permitted - unacceptable approach and calls into question reliance on windfall allowance. Concerned about relationship with Part 1 of the plan. Package of generic development management policies covering whole plan area would more effectively allow consideration site of specific circumstances, content and character of settings of sites. Part 2 should be removed to enable delivery of sustainable development to meet objectively assessed needs consistent with vision and objectives.	Objection	Yes	No action	Ward policies aim to provide clarity regarding development requirements, including height which is often a source of lengthy negotiation at application stage. LOA/LOS identify where intensification can be focused but does not prevent other proposals coming forward outside these areas.	NA
0250	East Dorset Friends of the Earth	Part 2 (Ward policies)	Sets outs issues to be addressed by neighbourhood plans and proposed procedural requirements	Comment		No action	Comment noted	NA
0079	The Society for Poole	P1	Policy P1 is sound and effective in serving the public interest as does not require care home in ABV.A.	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0150	Ken Parke on behalf of various clients 3	P1	Unclear how 35 dwellings figure has been derived, or if it reflects the ward's housing need. Unclear whether development is expected to comply with Policy H2. High reliance on windfall sites when focus restricted to local opportunity areas and streets - question achievability. Unclear why size of local community shops is restricted and they are restricted to some parts of the ward. No need for prescriptive approach to building heights - do not take permitted development rights into account. Unclear whether development outside local opportunity areas and streets is permissible.	Objection		No action	All the wards collectively contribute to the delivery of housing. Each ward has its own characteristics and constraints which impact the number of homes which can be delivered. The figure for the number of homes is calculate from a combination of existing commitments, proposed allocations and windfall sites. The windfall figure has been calculated using historical averages for the number of homes typically delivered within the ward. Development would be expected to comply with other plan policies include H2 Affordable Housing. LOA/LOS identify where windfall can be focused and increased heights achieved but this does not prevent windfall in other locations. Size of shops is restricted to avoid an adverse impact on existing retail areas/centres and the locations highlighted where there is a current lack of facilities. Approach to heights seeks to provide clarity about the design expectations.	NA
0287	Network Rail	P1	Support 1e to improve accessibility at Branksome Railway Station. Contributions should be sought from nearby development to fund improvements.	Support with changes	Yes	No action	Support noted. Accessibility of the station is the responsible of the rail operator but Cil can be used if fund off infrastructure improvements.	NA
0521	Martin Miller	P1	Tangerine/Parrs factory site on Alder Road would be highly sustainable place for new housing, given location close to railway station, retail facilities and major public transport corridor. Plan should make provision for this development to take place. Not clear as to whether this site falls within ABV.A, therefore policy cannot be effective and so is unsound.	Objection	No	No action	The site is privately owned and is not available for housing.	NA
0576	Richard Cleveland	P1	Some road traffic improvements not taken into consideration (Alder Road/Yarmouth Road, Herbert Avenue/Alder Road, and Ringwood Road/Herbert Avenue). Impact of self driving vehicles on traffic flows also not considered.	Objection	No	No action	The road referred to are highlighted in policy P1. Impact of self driving cars largely unknown at this stage.	NA
0190	John Dymott	P1	Biodiversity and heritage concerns - Talbot Heath needs to be taken into account. Additional monuments to Fern Barrow exist in area alongside pre-Roman features	Objection	Yes	Modification	Agree	Amend policy E4 to reference scheduled monument.
0079	The Society for Poole	P2	Policy P2 is sound and effective in serving the public interest as seeks to rectify severe infrastructure issues.	Support		No action	Support noted	NA

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0150	Ken Parke on behalf of various clients 3	P2	Unclear how 1,545 dwellings figure has been derived, or if it reflects the ward's housing need. Unclear whether development is expected to comply with Policy H2. High reliance on windfall sites when focus restricted to local opportunity areas and streets - question achievability. Approach to building heights over-prescriptive and does not take permitted development rights into account. Unclear whether development outside local opportunity areas and streets is permissible. Conflict between policy supporting text and Policy NE2 regarding whether net increases in residential or tourist accommodation may be appropriate within 400m of Dorset Heathlands.	Objection		No action	All the wards collectively contribute to the delivery of housing. Each ward has its own characteristics and constraints which impact the number of homes which can be delivered. The figure for the number of homes is calculate from a combination of existing commitments, proposed allocations and windfall sites. The windfall figure has been calculated using historical averages for the number of homes typically delivered within the ward. Development would be expected to comply with other plan policies include H2 Affordable Housing. LOA/LOS identify where windfall can be focused and increased heights achieved but this does not prevent windfall in other locations. Approach to heights seeks to provide clarity about the design expectations. Supporting text highlights that residential development is restricted within 400m of a heathland. Proposals would be assessed under policy NE2 and other uses would be <u>considered under this policy</u> .	NA
0164	Environment Agency	P2	Former landfill. Regulatory input required and potentially remediation.	Comment		No action	Regulatory input would take place outside of the local plan.	NA
0225	Dorset Council	P2	Land north of Merley (BM.1) needs to consider impacts on the A31and A31 Merley roundabout and land north of Bearwood (BM.2) needs to consider traffic impacts along the A348 and Longham bridge. Active travel connections will be needed along Ringwood Road towards Ferndown and secured via the financial contribution required in BM.2. Provide sustainable transport connections towards Wimborne town centre.	Support	Yes	No action	Planning permissions have been agreed for the two sites. We will work with Dorset Council on mitigating traffic impacts.	NA
0287	Network Rail	P2	Support para h but also consider connections to Bournemouth and Poole rail stations.	Support with changes	Yes	No action	Support noted. Linkage with town centres would be expected to include good access to the town centre train stations so additional reference is <u>not necessary</u> .	NA
0362	Caroline Lindsay	P2	Blank	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0415	Magwatch (local action group)	P2	The strategy should not include Green Belt land. Any development on Green Belt in Bearwood and Merley will be contravention of NPPF and render the plan unsound.	Support	Yes	No action	Support noted	NA
0473	Judy Windwood	P2	Supports improvements to Castleman Trailway as important route for active travel and supports the vision and objectives on pollution, climate change and health of the population.	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0619	Stephen Phillips	P2	Blank	Support	No	No action	Support noted	NA
0076	Cala Homes	BM.1	Support ongoing allocation of the site. Request bullet xii. Is amended to provide at least four custom/self build plot to reflect the approved outline planning application.	Support with changes		Modification	Agree	Amend to reflect planning application for four self build plots
0040	Natural England	Em.4	The policy needs to ensure that there is no worker access southwards directly onto Canford Heath, by amending Section 3. D) iii) to specify the need for impervious fencing suitable for the business park use.	Support with changes		No action	This is a requirement of Policy P2 3.d.ii.	NA
0036	Southwood Partners	P2	Merley can accommodation further residential development to meet housing needs. Green Belt boundary in south east edge of Merley should be revised to exclude Southwood Farm which can accommodate 150-220 family homes and should be allocated for residential development to meet housing needs.	Objection	Yes	No action	The NPPF is clear that Green Belt boundaries do not need to be revised to meet housing needs. The Local Plan strategy does not propose to amend Green Belt boundaries.	NA
0064	Rose Young	P2	Lack of support for smaller, scale deliverable sites in Merley such as Land at Willett Road. Site could come forward in five years	Objection		No action	The NPPF is clear that Green Belt boundaries do not need to be revised to meet housing needs. The Local Plan strategy does not propose to amend Green Belt boundaries.	NA
0159	Morrish Homes	P2	Land south of Merley Park Road offers significant potential to deliver a residential development to meet housing needs and community benefits. The Site remains available, deliverable and developable. Significant under provision of homes, updated NPPF is not explicit on the relationship between housing need and green belt boundaries. Approach not justified, failure to deliver homes and affordable homes. Flawed not to consider Green Belt. Over reliance on windfall to deliver homes in the ward. Many benefits with land at Higher Merley Farm, considers site has a limited role in purposes of Green Belt, site should be allocated	Objection		No action	The NPPF is clear that Green Belt boundaries do not need to be revised to meet housing needs. The Local Plan strategy does not propose to amend Green Belt boundaries. Windfall development is a consistent source of supply that will come forward across all ward.	NA

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0167	Care South	P2	Former Oaks Garden Centre is achievable, available and suitable for development subject to release of Green Belt. Site only makes a weak or no contribution to green belt purposes and the harm of its release would be low-moderate. Site should be allocated as a care village.	Objection	Yes	No action	The NPPF is clear that Green Belt boundaries do not need to be revised to meet housing needs. The Local Plan strategy does not propose to amend Green Belt boundaries.	NA
0271	Highwood Group	P2	HELAA suggests West of Broadway Lane (site ref. 21/04) unsuitable for care home due to green belt location, despite no constraints and stating site is available and potentially achievable. Location, size and configuration means suitable for care home. Opportunity to deliver much needed homes in area of low growth and support services and infrastructure and meet strategic needs and aspirations. Apart from setting of listed building which can be addressed no other constraints identified. States available and potentially achievable. Opportunity to deliver much needed homes in area of low growth and support services and infrastructure and meet strategic needs and aspirations.	Objection		No action	The NPPF is clear that Green Belt boundaries do not need to be revised to meet housing needs. The Local Plan strategy does not propose to amend Green Belt boundaries.	NA
0292	WH White	P2	Object to supporting text, key diagram and policy. Consider there to be strong argument for release of Green Belt to facilitate the allocation or reservation of the Canford Garden Village omission site to meet housing and employment needs. 1(c) be modified to include references to harness opportunities and 1(h). 3 should include Canford Garden Village omission site and 4 should be modified to include Knighton Farm as a local opportunity area. Provision 3(d) should be modified to reference Magna Business Park not Churchill Business Park. Supports 1(d), 1(e), 1(f).	Objection	Yes	No action	The NPPF is clear that Green Belt boundaries do not need to be revised to meet housing needs. The Local Plan strategy does not propose to amend Green Belt boundaries. Amend business park name.	NA
0028	Susan Chapman	P3	Considers policy to be unsound, and not positively prepared, not justified, or effective as it does not go far enough with regards to tackling climate change.	Objection	Yes	No action	The plan seeks to address the climate and ecological emergency in relation to planning matters, wide engagement and education on climate change sit outside the scope of the document	NA
0148	FCERM	P3	Clarification required on coastal change/sea cliff stability risks and approach to addressing these issues (including Policy C5 applicability). Clarification also needed on approach to flood risk in the ward.	Support with changes		No action	Do not consider that it is necessary for this ward policy to contain information regarding coastal erosion and sea cliff stability risk zones or for a cross-reference to Policy C5 to be included. Consider Policy C5 sufficiently addresses this issue, the plan will be read as a whole and it is unnecessary to duplicate policy requirements. Text regarding approach to flood risk is only included in ward policies where this is not adequately covered by generic flood risk policy/flood risk is a significant issue for development near the coast/river/harbour in the ward. It is considered that generic flood risk policy adequately addresses the approach to flood risk in this ward and that text regarding flood risk is therefore not required in this ward policy.	NA
0150	Ken Parke on behalf of various clients 3	P3	Unclear how 425 dwellings figure has been derived, or if it reflects the ward's housing need. Unclear whether development is expected to comply with Policy H2. High reliance on windfall sites when focus restricted to local opportunity areas and streets - question achievability. No need for prescriptive approach to building heights - do not take permitted development rights into account. Unclear whether development outside local opportunity areas and streets is permissible.	Objection		No action	All the wards collectively contribute to the delivery of housing. Each ward has its own characteristics and constraints which impact the number of homes which can be delivered. The figure for the number of homes is calculate from a combination of existing commitments, proposed allocations and windfall sites. The windfall figure has been calculated using historical averages for the number of homes typically delivered within the ward. Development would be expected to comply with other plan policies include H2 Affordable Housing. LOA/LOS identify where windfall can be focused and increased heights achieved but this does not prevent windfall in other locations. Approach to heights seeks to provide clarity about the design expectations.	NA
0287	Network Rail	P3	Support 1b need to improve routes from Pokesdown rail station. Opportunities to better connect the railway station and the AFC Bournemouth should also be pursued. Contributions should be sought towards improving accessibility at Pokesdown rail station.	Support with changes	Yes	No action	Support noted and agree with AFCB suggestion. We will use CIL to fund off site improvements so proposed changes relating to contributions are unnecessary.	NA
0148	FCERM	P4	Clarification required on coastal change/sea cliff stability risks and approach to addressing these issues (including Policy C5 applicability). Clarification also needed on approach to flood risk in the ward.	Support with changes		No action	Do not consider that it is necessary for this ward policy to contain information regarding coastal erosion and sea cliff stability risk zones or for a cross-reference to Policy C5 to be included. Consider Policy C5 sufficiently addresses this issue, the plan will be read as a whole and it is unnecessary to duplicate policy requirements. Text regarding approach to flood risk is only included in ward policies where this is not adequately covered by generic flood risk policy/flood risk is a significant issue for development near the coast/river/harbour in the ward. It is considered that generic flood risk policy adequately addresses the approach to flood risk in this ward and that text regarding flood risk is therefore not required in this ward policy.	NA

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0150	Ken Parke on behalf of various clients 3	P4	Unclear how 1,050 dwellings figure has been derived, or if it reflects the ward's housing need. Unclear whether development is expected to comply with Policy H2. High reliance on windfall sites when focus restricted to local opportunity areas and streets - question achievability. No need for prescriptive approach to building heights - do not take permitted development rights into account. Unclear whether development outside local opportunity areas and streets is permissible	Objection		No action	All the wards collectively contribute to the delivery of housing. Each ward has its own characteristics and constraints which impact the number of homes which can be delivered. The figure for the number of homes is calculate from a combination of existing commitments, proposed allocations and windfall sites. The windfall figure has been calculated using historical averages for the number of homes typically delivered within the ward. Development would be expected to comply with other plan policies include H2 Affordable Housing. LOA/LOS identify where windfall can be focused and increased heights achieved but this does not prevent windfall in other locations. Approach to heights seeks to provide <u>clarity about the design expectations</u> .	NA
0287	Network Rail	P4	NRIL supports paras c and f in seeking to improve access to public transport	Support	Yes	No action	Support noted.	NA
0282	Historic England	BW.2	Historic buildings could be highlighted within the allocation, important that building heights in relation to heritage assets are explicitly referenced.	Objection		Modification	Agree	Amend to reference historic buildings
0039	Ropemaker properties	P5	Support policy P5	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0110	Watkin Jones Group	P5	Object to the inclusion of high quality office within Lansdowne, prevents delivery of homes, viability needs to be considered.	Objection		No action	The Lansdowne remains a key town centre location and a sustainable location of office. Percentage of office space required significantly reduced from previous plans to support viability.	NA
0137	Primetower Properties	P5	P5 is overly restrictive.	Objection		No action	Requirements are set out in the interests of good planning and to provide certainty about site expectations	NA
0148	FCERM	P5	Clarification required on coastal change/sea cliff stability risks and approach to addressing these issues (including Policy C5 applicability). Clarification also needed on approach to flood risk in the ward.	Support with changes		No action	Do not consider that it is necessary for this ward policy to contain information regarding coastal erosion and sea cliff stability risk zones or for a cross-reference to Policy C5 to be included. Consider Policy C5 sufficiently addresses this issue, the plan will be read as a whole and it is unnecessary to duplicate policy requirements. Text regarding approach to flood risk is only included in ward policies where this is not adequately covered by generic flood risk policy/flood risk is a significant issue for development near the coast/river/harbour in the ward. It is considered that generic flood risk policy adequately addresses the approach to flood risk in this ward and that text regarding flood risk is therefore not required <u>in this ward policy</u> .	NA
0150	Ken Parke on behalf of various clients 3	P5	Unclear how 16,330 dwellings figure has been derived, or if it reflects the ward's housing need. Unclear whether development is expected to comply with Policy H2. High reliance on windfall sites when focus restricted to local opportunity areas and streets and existing plots - question achievability. No need for prescriptive approach to building heights - do not take permitted development rights into account. Unclear whether development outside local opportunity areas and streets is permissible.	Objection		No action	All the wards collectively contribute to the delivery of housing. Each ward has its own characteristics and constraints which impact the number of homes which can be delivered. The figure for the number of homes is calculate from a combination of existing commitments, proposed allocations and windfall sites. The windfall figure has been calculated using historical averages for the number of homes typically delivered within the ward. Development would be expected to comply with other plan policies include H2 Affordable Housing. LOA/LOS identify where windfall can be focused and increased heights achieved but this does not prevent windfall in other locations. Approach to heights seeks to provide <u>clarity about the design expectations</u> .	NA
0177	Michael Old	P5	Bournemouth Central - Parking, and ease of parking (particularly for mature/elderly), is important to successful trading, particularly in Westover Road and Hinton Road, and Bournemouth Pavilion car park. Safety is important for parking, as is attention to various alleyways from these car parks. Costs of car parks should be considered against other towns, and Local Parking cars should be followed up. Difficulties with rough sleepers and beggars. Cycling is dangerous in pedestrianised areas, and needs addressing particularly around The Square. Student flats in the town centre will affect town's performance as a quality resort. Facilities will respond to student demand rather than visitors or more mature/elderly demand. Potential to add Trouville Hotel to Winter Gardens site.	Objection		No action	Some aspects such as the cost of parking are beyond the scope of the local plan. Town centre considered the most suitable location for students who can add vibrancy to the area and reduce issues with student properties in other residential areas. Tourville Hotel in separate ownership to Winter Gardens and topography and heritage issues result in it being better treated as a separate site.	NA
0287	Network Rail	P5	Support para d in seeking opportunities to improve links between the town centre and the rail station. Maximise dwelling numbers on sites allocated close to the station. Include requirement for funding improvements at the station and reference to Bournemouth Rail Station.	Support with changes	Yes	No action	Support noted. Part 6 of policy commits to transport infrastructure delivery. Constraints such as heritage limit dwelling numbers. We are prioritising the use of CIL to fund off site improvements.	NA

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0371	Clifford Morse	P5	Castlepoint has impacted town centre retail, particularly Bournemouth, and will be difficult to regenerate it. However, regeneration is not optional. Homes planned at M&S and Beales sites is consistent with S1, and prevents use of Green Belt land, but doubts viability. Will residents enhance town centre offering, as unclear who will live in them. Is demand for this accommodation there, and what research has been done to look in to likely demographic. Concerns over potential housing on car park sites, when Parking Strategy has not yet been published to ascertain if parking is still required.	Objection	No	No action	The Council do not own or have any control over the main Castlepoint shopping area. The Council will continue to support town centre regeneration efforts. New homes of all different types and sizes are needed across the BCP area. The existing town centre properties are home to a variety of people and the end users would depend on the detailed design of individual proposals. Increased residents will help to support businesses within the town centre. The Council is preparing a town centre parking study to consider which car parks should remain to support the retail and commercial function of the town centre.	NA
0403	Elizabeth Lucas	P5	Part 2b - Developments within Policy P5 do not support its role as a Primary Shopping Area. Retail space should be retained and not used for flats/student accommodation. Part 5 - 6,330 homes in the town centre ward is excessive and will take away retail and office space. A greater balance between uses is necessary in Bournemouth's central business district. The densities required will be detrimental to amenities and the town centre as a whole.	Objection	Yes	No action	Developments within the Primary Shopping Area require the retention/provision of an active ground floor retail/commercial/cultural frontage. In line with the overall strategy to support brownfield development protect the Green Belt increased town centre densities will be required. Policies exist in the plan to protect retail and ensure the provision of office space.	NA
0175	Asda Stores Ltd	P5	Object to the use of the word must - makes policy to prescriptive/onerous, trade offs needed to make schemes viable. Object to criteria I - Not practical for one comprehensive scheme that delivers all of the proposed uses. Not clear what reconfiguration of the highway is being sought. Not is Asda's gift to provide crossing of St Pauls Road. Parking strategy has not been released, not clear what implications are for the site. Object to prescriptive criteria at v - inflexible on building heights, suitable area for tall buildings in BHS, limit of nine storeys not justified. Criteria vii too prescriptive. Only modest work would be needed to resolve surface water flooding, criteria can be simplified.	Objection	Yes	Modification	Agree	Amend to provide clarity surrounding the mix of uses across the site and to ensure the site can be delivered either in conjunction with highways improvements and independtly
0246	Nicholas James Group	P5	Objects to failure to include site at Bourne Park. Site was promoted during Call for Sites for comprehensive redevelopment for hotel and residential uses for delivery (not viable to provide hotel without residential element). Site allocations in Local Plan for hotels which will not be deliverable. Site where hotel can be delivered in a highly desirable location. Site should be included as strategic site for hotel and residential use. Opportunity to create connectivity with the Gardens and create an active frontage at garden level. Development would be highly sustainable and add to strategic needs for new quality tourism accommodation and additional housing in town centre.	Objection		No action	The site is in a sensitive location adjacent to a Listed Building and the Lower Gardens. Potential for impacts on these heritage assets. At this stage it is too late to include in the Local Plan.	NA
0148	FCERM	BC.1	Proposals on BC.1 will need to be complete Coastal Vulnerability Assessment and demonstrate will not impact/be impacted by sea cliff stability.	Support with changes		Modification	Agree.	Amend P5, B.C.1 to refer to Coastal Vulnerability Assessment
0282	Historic England	BC.1	Need to retain and improve link between the historic Gardens, Pier and seafront.	Objection		Modification	Agree	Amend to add reference to pedestrian connections
0270	McLaren Property	BC.2	Support the continued allocation, and increase in size of this area, which includes the former ABC cinema site. Mix of proposed uses should be expanded to include purpose built student accommodation, due to policy H7 directing this use to town centres. Student units would contribute to housing targets, and criterion (ii) should be updated accordingly. The requirement to retain and better reveal historic facades would place onerous requirements on future development and impact viability and deliverability. Policy to be re-worded to encourage retention rather than require it.	Support with changes		No action	Policy refers to new homes which could include student accommodation	NA
0282	Historic England	BC.2	Policy should seek to retain non designated heritage assets not just façades. Unclear why Hinton Road properties included.	Objection		No action	Agree - amend criteria c.iii Seek opportunities for refurbishment or adaptive re-use of historic buildings based on an understanding of their significance.  The boundary include Hinton Road as a number of developments have been proposed in that area, inclusion gives more certainty surrounding heights but criteria i to be amended to read 'Provide a mix of uses with active ground floor frontages and retail, commercial, leisure or cultural uses (Use Classes E, F1 and F2, theatres, venues for live music performance, concert halls and conferencing facilities) along Westover Road'.	NA

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0223	Fortitudo Ltd	BC.2	Inappropriate for active ground floor uses to be required on Hinton Road. Town centre units already struggling to be filled, and Hinton Road's character is not for active ground floor uses, and should be directed to Westover Road, and focus homes and student accommodation on Hinton Road. Proposed heights of 4-6 storeys is not justified, given the town centre location, extant permissions for 7 and 8 storey buildings, and PD rights which could allow increase in existing heights. Westover Road has 10 storey building, and consent for a 7 storey building. Context therefore makes it unclear why limit has been set at 6 storeys. Site should reference acceptability of student accommodation in this town centre location to match Policy H7.	Objection		Modification	Agree, amend to provide clarification regarding the location of active ground floor frontages. The area is a sensitive location with numerous heritage assets, heights are predominantly between 4 and six storey as set out in the policy, this does not prevent some areas of increased height.	Amend Site BC.2 bi to ensure active frontages are on Westover Road
0282	Historic England	BC.3	Allocation should reference physical and visual permeability through the site.	Objection		Modification	Agree	Amend to include reference to permeability
0289	THAT Group	BC.3	Has entered joint venture to develop former M & S site. Supports P5, parts 1, 2, 3 and 4. Comments regard policy H1 and difference between Local Plan proposed housing target of 1,600 compared with BCP Local Housing Needs Assessment which is 2,667 dwellings pa. Therefore part 5 housing should strongly support housing proposals at brownfield sites in highly sustainable locations such as Bournemouth Centre. Supports allocation of Avenue Road/Commercial Road BC.3 and supports flexibility of uses for redevelopment but should also apply to existing development until it is redeveloped and suggests amendment (see suggested modification). Concerned with wording temporary or meanwhile as is too restrictive and detracts potential occupiers and suggest amendment (see suggested modification).	Objection	No	Modification	Agree	Amend to provide clarification about uses on the site
0137	Primetower Properties	BC.4	BC.4/Em.7 is overly prescriptive in relation to height. Does not allow for Holdenhurst Road as a whole to function as tall building area, conflicts with policy BE4. Makes assumption that buildings at 1 to 44 Holdenhurst Road are worthy of retention, the properties at 4-26 Holdenhurst Road are not on the Local List.	Objection		No action	To ensure a cohesive townscape and respect the character and amenity of adjacent properties it is considered reasonable and in line with the tall buildings evidence to reduce heights on the edge of the cluster. Terrace at 1-44 Holdenhurst is considered worthy of protection.	NA
0137	Primetower Properties	BC.4	BC.4/Em.7 is overly prescriptive in relation to height. Does not allow for Holdenhurst Road as a whole to function as tall building area, conflicts with policy BE4. Makes assumption that buildings at 1 to 44 Holdenhurst Road are worthy of retention, the properties at 4-26 Holdenhurst Road are not on the Local List.	Objection		No action	To ensure a cohesive townscape and respect the character and amenity of adjacent properties it is considered reasonable and in line with the tall buildings evidence to reduce heights on the edge of the cluster. Terrace at 1-44 Holdenhurst is considered worthy of protection.	NA
0282	Historic England	BC.4	Suggest wording change to be clear heights should step down.	Objection		No action	Agree - amend iv to read '... with heights dropping down significantly to lower scale townscape with buildings in the region of nine storeys (approximately 30 metres), including on the eastern edge of the area opposite 2-20 St Swithun's Road South...'	NA
0282	Historic England	BC.4	Suggest wording change to be clear heights should step down.	Objection		No action	Agree - amend iv to read '... with heights dropping down significantly to lower scale townscape with buildings in the region of nine storeys (approximately 30 metres), including on the eastern edge of the area opposite 2-20 St Swithun's Road South...'	NA
0403	Elizabeth Lucas	BC.5	Parking is needed to support retail and commercial functions in the town centre.	Objection	No	No action	The Council is preparing a town centre parking study to consider which car parks should remain to support the retail and commercial function of the town centre.	NA
0282	Historic England	BC.6	Potential to amend boundary to match consent.	Objection		No action	A decision notice has not been issued for the scheme on the existing car park. If the scheme does not go ahead an alternative configuration could be brought forward that considers a different red line.	NA
0403	Elizabeth Lucas	BC.6	Parking is needed to support retail and commercial functions in the town centre.	Objection	No	No action	The Council is preparing a town centre parking study to consider which car parks should remain to support the retail and commercial function of the town centre.	NA

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0282	Historic England	BC.7	HIA identifies auditorium as non designated heritage asset, policy should seek to retain and reuse if possible.	Objection		No action	The retention of the auditorium would mean that the 35 homes would not be achievable. Given the housing needs its my view that the plan has already weighed the balance in favour of housing provision. Current application under consideration.	NA
0403	Elizabeth Lucas	BC.7	Parking is needed to support retail and commercial functions in the town centre.	Objection	No	No action	The Council is preparing a town centre parking study to consider which car parks should remain to support the retail and commercial function of the town centre.	NA
0403	Elizabeth Lucas	BC.8	Parking is needed to support retail and commercial functions in the town centre.	Objection	No	No action	The Council is preparing a town centre parking study to consider which car parks should remain to support the retail and commercial function of the town centre.	NA
0282	Historic England	BC.9	Positive building with the CA that should be retained if possible. Sensitive location that would benefit from height guidance.	Objection		Modification	Agree	Amend to highlight role of the building and provide height guidance
0403	Elizabeth Lucas	BC.9	Objects to allocation of Beales, commercial space needed, area liable to flood.	Objection	Yes	No action	The allocation requires an active ground floor retail, commercial, leisure or cultural use to be provided. Any potential impact on flooding would be considered at the planning application stage.	NA
0073	Andrew Kennedy	BC.10	Object to restrictive wording regarding number of homes and building heights, ten storey would be more suitable, lack of justification for lower height, not effective use of a town centre site, negatively impact viability and deliverability, significant uplift should be achieved, minimum of 50 homes possible,	Objection	Yes	No action	The context building height (shown on the interactive map) is between six and eight storey and the area is identified in the Building Heights Study as being somewhat sensitive to tall buildings. The Heritage Impact Assessments notes potential heritage impacts and that heights up to four storey would minimise heritage impacts. The site is relatively small compared to neighbouring plots with taller buildings. The allocation does not preclude a taller element but given the size of the site and proximity to neighbouring buildings the allocation wording is considered appropriate.	NA
0139	Ken Parke on behalf of various clients 4	BC.11	Site should be referenced at 14 Bath Road. No hotel on site for number of years, permissions including replacement hotel not viable. Staying visitors declining. No demand for hotels. Lack of viability evidence for hotel. Vacant appearance detracts from town centre. The site can deliver high density residential development with public ground floor use. Site should not be allocated for a hotel. No need for height restrictions within allocations.	Support with changes		No action	Hotel visitor accommodation research indicates a strong interest and demand for high quality hotels in Bournemouth. No viability evidence to suggest that use of part of the site for accommodation is not viable. Criteria surrounding height provides certainty in the sensitive context of the site regarding the expectations, avoiding protracted negotiations at planning application stage. Criteria does not prevent a taller element on part of the site.	NA
0258	Royal London Mutual Insurance Society Ltd	Bc.11	The site has remained vacant since 2018. Extant consent on site but not viability to provide a hotel, test of Tourism SPD have been met and requirement to deliver hotel removed. With no hotel site could accommodate 250 homes. Wording of criteria (i) is amended to: 'Provide up to 250 residential flats'. Heights should reflect extant consent. Sustainability Appraisal would support these changes, site should receive a high positive impact ranking for criteria 6.2 'access to centres of employment', not a slight adverse impact. It is considered that the above demonstrates the site as an optimal location for a substantial quantum of housing.	Objection	Yes	No action	Hotel visitor accommodation research indicates a strong interest and demand for high quality hotels in Bournemouth. No viability evidence to suggest that use of part of the site for accommodation is not viable. Criteria surrounding height provides certainty in the sensitive context of the site regarding the expectations, avoiding protracted negotiations at planning application stage. The extant consent is primarily seven storey in height in line with the draft allocation with one taller section.	NA
0521	Martin Miller	BC.11	BC.11 is a development site, however the scale of the development required (3-7 storeys) does not match that of previously granted permissions, nor an implemented consent at 11 storeys.	Objection	No	No action	The required is to be predominantly 3-7 storey which matches the consent, this wording does not preclude some increased heights on parts of the site.	NA
0282	Historic England	BC.12	The existing tree planting within St Peters Cemetery should be specifically mentioned in the policy.	Objection		Modification	Agree	Amend to reference trees within the site



ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0282	Historic England	BC.14	HIA identifies the building onsite as a non designated heritage asset which should be retained if possible.	Objection		No action	The policy does not prevent any issues with potential non designated heritage assets being explored at application stage.	NA
0282	Historic England	BC.17	The policy should require efforts to retain the frontage building as a non-designated heritage asset.	Objection		No action	The policy seeks to retain the mural on the frontage building.	NA
0079	The Society for Poole	P6	Policy P6 is sound and effective in serving the public interest as seeks to rectify severe infrastructure issues.	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0150	Ken Parke on behalf of various clients 3	P6	Unclear how 140 dwellings figure has been derived, or if it reflects the ward's housing need. Unclear whether development is expected to comply with Policy H2. High reliance on windfall sites when focus restricted to local opportunity areas and streets - question achievability. No need for prescriptive approach to building heights - do not take permitted development rights into account. Unclear whether development outside local opportunity areas and streets is permissible	Objection		No action	All the wards collectively contribute to the delivery of housing. Each ward has its own characteristics and constraints which impact the number of homes which can be delivered. The figure for the number of homes is calculate from a combination of existing commitments, proposed allocations and windfall sites. The windfall figure has been calculated using historical averages for the number of homes typically delivered within the ward. Development would be expected to comply with other plan policies include H2 Affordable Housing. LOA/LOS identify where windfall can be focused and increased heights achieved but this does not prevent windfall in other locations. Approach to heights seeks to provide clarity about the design expectations.	NA
0457	Joan Cardy	P6	With exception of Care Home on Dunyeats Road, no buildings are more than three storeys on the Broadway, many are two storey detached dwellings. Four storey development would be out of character and visually obtrusive. Similar issues on Lower Blandford Road. Windfall results in infilling, and there should be strict control over proximity and overall density to avoid overcrowding and deterioration of area. Vague phrases used in policy with little explanation.	Objection	No	No action	Properties on the Broadway vary in height and include some larger properties. To support the strategy and protect the Green Belt some urban intensification is required. Infilling will take place in some locations and general policies within the plan such as the townscape and natural environment policies will shape the design of these proposals.	NA
0061	Broadstone Neighbourhood Forum	B.2	Lack of reference to Neighbourhood Forum, lack of engagement with the Forum, question housing target for the area and the balance of housing types. Allocation of site B2 should allow for mixed use development. Support LOA/LOS, concerned with phase context height as the context could evolve.	Objection		Modification	Agree	Amend to reference neighbourhood forum and set housing requirement
0072	Moonfleet Development	P7	No detail where 130 homes will be built, no potential for 30-40 windfall plots, Winkton should be a settlement boundary and removed from Green Belt to facilitate small scale infill with a lower affordable housing threshold. CIL could benefit local Winkton community	Objection		No action	Some of 130 homes are commitments, others on the allocated sites set out. The HELAA identifies potential windfall sites and based on past trends this level of windfall can be accommodated across the plan period. Green Belt boundaries are not being altered through the Local Plan.	NA
0082	Christchurch Harbour Ornithological Group	P7	Supportive of policy and approach not to release Green Belt around Burton.	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0093	David J Barker	P7	No detail where 130 homes will be built, no potential for 30-40 windfall plots, Winkton should be a settlement boundary and removed from Green Belt to facilitate small scale infill with a lower affordable housing threshold. CIL could benefit local Winkton community	Objection		No action	Some of 130 homes are commitments, others on the allocated sites set out. The HELAA identifies potential windfall plots and based on past trends this level of windfall can be accommodated across the plan period. Green Belt boundaries are not being altered through the Local Plan.	NA
0100	Ken Parke on behalf of a landowner 1	P7	Land at Shaw Park should be allocated to provide 40 homes, potentially including affordable homes. Site is previously developed land within the Green Belt. Needed to contribute to housing supply. Objects to spatial strategy and Green Belt should be released.	Objection		No action	In accordance with the NPPF the Plan does not propose to release Green Belt to meet housing needs.	NA
0150	Ken Parke on behalf of various clients 3	P7	Unclear how 130 dwellings figure has been derived, or if it reflects the ward's housing need. Unclear whether development is expected to comply with Policy H2. High reliance on windfall sites when focus restricted to local opportunity areas and streets - question achievability. No need for prescriptive approach to building heights - do not take permitted development rights into account. Unclear whether development outside local opportunity areas and streets is permissible. Unclear why size of local community shops is restricted and they are restricted to some parts of the ward.	Objection		No action	All the wards collectively contribute to the delivery of housing. Each ward has its own characteristics and constraints which impact the number of homes which can be delivered. The figure for the number of homes is calculate from a combination of existing commitments, proposed allocations and windfall sites. The windfall figure has been calculated using historical averages for the number of homes typically delivered within the ward. Development would be expected to comply with other plan policies include H2 Affordable Housing. LOA/LOS identify where windfall can be focused and increased heights achieved but this does not prevent windfall in other locations. Approach to heights seeks to provide clarity about the design expectations.	NA

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0171	Mrs P Bower and Mr R Blunden	P7	Green belt boundaries should be altered to allow for allocation of land at Salsbury Road for the delivery of family housing in a sustainable location. Site is well contained and would not impact on green belt purposes.	Objection		No action	In accordance with the NPPF the Plan does not propose to release Green Belt to meet housing needs.	NA
0195	Christchurch Town Council Neighbourhood Plan Working Group	P7	Supporting text: The LOA is limited to the south side of the road which has implications in terms of sense of enclosure and walking/cycling alternatives that should be discussed here. LOAs and LOSs should be non-strategic allowing neighbourhood plans to identify development opportunities. Policy P7: should be non strategic, or split into strategic (allocations over 1ha) and non-strategic parts. 1)Sustainable neighbourhoods – would help to include ref to retention of employment areas and allowing flexible redevelopment to meet future business needs. 1.d). should include importance of link across Avon into Christchurch Town at Knapp Mill in function of strategic greenway. 5.a.ii) criteria – must enhance local centre's retail and community facility offer - retail centre in LOA is Somerford West but most of LOA outside – unclear how area outside retail centre will enhance the centre. LOA and Los should be non-strategic. Heights need to be in line with local Design Codes and Character Areas.	Objection		No action	The NPPF considers strategic policies as those Policies and site allocations which address strategic priorities for the development and use of land in the area, and that such policies should set out an overall strategy for the pattern, scale and design quality of places making sufficient provision for housing, employment, retail, leisure, infrastructure, community facilities and for the conservation and enhancement of the natural, built and historic environment. This is the essence of what the ward policies are seeking to achieve, and as such are strategic. While the ward policies and site allocations do include a reasonable degree of detail this is necessary to meet our strategic priorities and provide clarity about our expectations for places. Not all areas have neighbourhood plans in preparation and appropriate policy is required. Policy for retention of employment areas elsewhere in the plan	NA
0235	Wyatt Homes	P7	Site promotion of Land at Higher Clockhouse Farm through the current BCP Local Plan and through past local plan processes with the former Christchurch Borough Council.	Comment		No action	In accordance with the NPPF the Plan does not propose to release Green Belt to meet housing needs.	NA
0235	Wyatt Homes	P07	P7 should be revised to include additional site allocation of Land at Higher Clockhouse Farm. Site is unconstrained other than position in the Green Belt. Contribution to Green Belt, particularly in west of site, is largely weak. Provides logical extension to Bransgore in a sustainable location with provision of additional 300 dwellings, including affordable housing and 3+bed family homes, and a SANG/public open space. Development would address objectives within emerging Local Plan. Further development site to the north within New Forest District Council which has full planning permission for 100 homes and new public open space. Site within BCP provides only feasible opportunity for Bransgore to expand in the future, as constrained in other directions.	Objection	Yes	No action	The BCP area has significant constraints which mean the level of growth set out in the standard methodology cannot be achieved. In accordance with the NPPF the Plan does not propose to release Green Belt to meet housing needs. Details of duty to cooperate arrangements are set out in the duty to cooperate compliance statement.	NA
0248	Hathor Property	P7	Draft plan is flawed as it fails to meet the conurbation's identified need for housing calculated using the standard method and provides no exceptional circumstance to justify a departure from this approach. Large deficit of housing provision, and suitable sites available to deliver new homes and address housing need. Omission of Land North of Salisbury Road at Burton from an allocation is disappointing, and urged to reconsider. Council has failed to meet identified need - 18,000 households will be without a home by end of plan. Plan relying on old allocations that have yet to be brought forward, providing no certainty of delivery of these sites. Plan fails test of soundness, and fails to deliver sustainable development in aspirational and deliverable way. Significant housing need and limited availability of urban sites demonstrates exceptional circumstances exist to justify further release of land from Green Belt, such as Burton. Burton site provides additional benefits and there is an identified local need for additional homes. Discrepancy between housing need figures in Burton and Grange ward from neighbourhood plan work undertaken and that identified in draft local plan. Neighbourhood plan figures significantly higher than that in local plan, and is further justification for allocation of additional land at Burton to meet needs. Land north of Salisbury Road, Burton, should be removed from Green Belt and allocated in the plan for around 100 homes. Site is sustainable and suitable with public benefits. Site makes no or weak contribution to the Green Belt in 4 out of 5 categories. Where there is a need for land to meet housing need, and limited capacity in the urban area, land in countryside must be considered for development. Exceptional circumstances to warrant release of Green Belt as BCP cannot meet its objectively assessed need through other means. Unmet housing need, and unsustainable development on the far side of the Green belt to address BCP's housing need provides the exceptional circumstances for amending Green belt boundaries in this plan.	Objection		No action	The BCP area has significant constraints which mean the level of growth set out in the standard methodology cannot be achieved. In accordance with the NPPF the Plan does not propose to release Green Belt to meet housing needs. The Local Plan will set the housing requirement for neighbourhood plan areas.	NA
0275	Gervis Properties Ltd / Hinton Admiral Estate	P7	Burton is a sustainable settlement with a range of facilities. Propose the release of land to the west of Salsbury Road from the Green Belt to deliver housing needs. Support Hinton Admiral Estate rep which proposals expanding Burton to deliver a range of benefits.	Objection		No action	The BCP area has significant constraints which mean the level of growth set out in the standard methodology cannot be achieved. In accordance with the NPPF the Plan does not propose to release Green Belt to meet housing needs.	NA
0297	Sir Christopher Chope MP	P7	Policy does not reference importance of maintaining agricultural land/uses around Burton and should due to concern of loss of agricultural land to solar farms. Also policy does not reference importance of Avon Valley public footpath and should to ensure it is retained/maintained for recreation/amenity.	Support with changes		No action	Avon Valley Path is referenced in 1.d of Policy P7. Agricultural land is around Burton is protected by virtue of its green Belt designation and policy c4 considers agricultural land in relating to solar development.	NA

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0502	McDonnell	P7	Plan does not address poor / inadequate public transport links, insufficient safe footpaths through the village, housing needs inappropriately constrained, and need for Green belt review in Winkton area - gives rise to multiple issues (such as reliance on private vehicles, unsustainable for pubs and under-supply of housing). <b>Need to preserve separation between villages and public open spaces.</b>	Objection	Yes	No action	The plan supports the improvement of public transport and more detail can be considered as part of LTP4. The Council do not have control over the provision of bus services. The Plan does not propose the release of Green Belt.	NA
0529	Michael Connolly	P7	Supports protection of Green Belt, Conservation Areas and Green Spaces including Conservation Area and sports field at Winkton which provides natural barrier between Burton and Winkton preventing urban sprawl. Open space and sports fields important for health, recreation, wildlife and environment including designations. Concerns of impact of development on phosphates and local sewerage/water treatment facility, and also condition of local roads and pollution.	Support	No	No action	Support noted	NA
0040	Natural England	P7	Support P7 4 a) vi) requiring a footpath link from site BG1 to Roeshot SANG. For Avon Valley footpath mention need to adjust the route as climate change is resulting in greater levels and frequency of flooding in the valley, with the path avoiding areas where new habitats and wetlands are establishing.	Support with changes		Modification	Agree	Amend to add more detail on Avon Valley Path
0597	Hampshire County Council	P7	The level of anticipated windfall sites and committed development within wards bordering Hampshire does not appear to have been assessed for cumulative impacts. Transport Assessment needed.	Objection		Follow up	Our transport planners are in dialogue with Hampshire County Council over cross boundary flow data emerging from the new updated 2022 Satum model for Dorset. A Statement of Common Ground will be prepared and submitted to the examination.	
0642	Timothy Hallpike	P7	Text erroneously states that local community shops include a Post Office (post office no longer exists) & anyone wishing to see a GP will soon have to go into Christchurch (Burton Practice is about to shut down)	Objection	No	Modification	Agree	Amend supporting text to update about existing facilities.
0072	Moonfleet Development	BG.1	Site previously Green Belt and has characteristics of Green Belt, development will exacerbate flood risk, unsuitable access, would substantially harm conservation area, site cannot accommodate 40 homes	Objection		No action	Site has been previously removed from the Green Belt. Work is ongoing to understand flood risk and mitigation is considered possible.	NA
0093	David J Barker	BG.1	Site previously Green Belt and has characteristics of Green Belt, development will exacerbate flood risk, unsuitable access, would substantially harm conservation area, site cannot accommodate 40 homes	Objection		No action	The site at Burton has been previously removed from the Green Belt. Work is ongoing to understand flood risk and mitigation is considered possible.	NA
0093	David Barker	BG.1	Policy allocates BG.1 for development despite it forming part of what would have been considered Green Belt land, partially developed for agricultural use, and could not b considered a genuine infill site. Development would exacerbate flood risk to nearby homes. Access would be prone to flooding, and additional congestion on Martins Hill from additional traffic flow. Would cause harm to conservation area. Once all considerations met, would only be able to accommodate 20 homes. Ward as a whole will only accommodate 30-40 windfall plots, and these may not be viable or available. Winkton should be enclosed within a settlement boundary, and 15-20 units could be added here, reduce affordable housing threshold in Winkton from 10 to 5 units, providing much needed housing. Several small sites that do not meet Green Belt criteria and surrounded by built form and lack constraints.	Objection	No	No action	The site is not within the Green Belt. Additional work is being completed in relation to flood risk which would inform future proposals. Any development would need to preserve or enhance the character of the conservation area. Green Belt boundaries are not being altered in this Local Plan.	NA
0164	Environment Agency	BG.1	Extent of flood risk may impact ability to accommodate scale of development proposed by buildings only in low risk areas. Requirements should be altered to ensure development is only located in areas at low risk of fluvial and tidal flooding.	Support with changes		No action	Work is ongoing to understand flood risk and mitigation is considered possible.	NA
0252	Scott and Jill Carr	BG.1	Abnormally that site has not been excluded from Green Belt boundaries, exclusion curtails the easy delivery of homes on the site. Site make no contribution to purposes of Green Belt. Site is 0.29ha and could deliver 4 additional dwellings or if part of the allocation facilitate an additional 12-13 dwellings and would allow access via Martins Hill Lane. .	Objection	Yes	No action	Green Belt boundaries are not being altered through the Local Plan.	NA

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0284	Gervis Properties Ltd / Hinton Admiral Estate	BG.1	Estate are major landowners for areas around Burton and engaged with parish but struggled to progress neighbourhood plan and are producing masterplan for Burton to provide basis for neighbourhood plan. Estate challenges the lower strategic housing requirements set by the plan and considers Burton as a sustainable location to accommodate a proportion of uplift for both residential and commercial development to contribute to local and strategic need. Opportunities at Burton could be progressed independently but Estate considers a more comprehensive and holistic long-term approach more appropriate. Estate has cross-boundary land ownership in wider area and National Park which will help to approach more cohesively. Estate and masterplan would not constrained time wise like Local Plan process, and delivered in timely measured manner. Masterplan would include matters: burial space (para 4.16); sustainable neighbourhood boundary (fig 4.2 Key Diagram); Creation and support for sustainable neighbourhoods (strategic policies S2, S3 (also H8, T1 and other Plan objectives); strategic policy P7: Burton and Grange; Land south of Burton (BG.1) but could include other benefits. Focus on development opportunities, SANGs, gravel extraction, mitigation, burial land, Green Belt boundaries, renewable energy development, sports and recreation and protection of character areas. Considers a minor change to Green Belt boundaries may be appropriate around Burton linked to supporting a comprehensive vision which could be detailed in the masterplan	Support with changes		No action	Masterplan approach could be positive but no changes to Green Belt boundaries are proposed through the Local Plan. Green Belt would be suitable for some uses e.g. SANG	NA
0610	Wessex Water	BG.1	Dwellings/other sensitive uses in BG.1 to be outside Christchurch Wastewater Recycling Centre odour consultation zone to protect amenity/enable continued operation. Railway embankment may prevent odour to receptors but odour assessment in line with following Wessex Water Odour Assessment procedure and IAQM guidance required to demonstrate	Support with changes	No	Follow up	Consider providing additional text surrounding odour consultation zone.	
0164	Environment Agency	BG.2	Support policy approach to flood risk at BG.2.	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0456	Highcliffe & Walkford Parish Council	BG.2	More detail needed on infrastructure especially sewerage capacity. More GPs, healthcare facilities, school places and crossing points needed on A35.	Objection		No action	Infrastructure can be funded in accordance with the Infrastructure delivery plan via CIL. As set out in the Plan the Council cannot fun GPs and school places can be managed within the existing estate. CIL can be utilised to support the expansions/provision of healthcare facilities. Water Companies are responsible for sewerage capacity and working separately on this infrastructure.	NA
0529	Michael Connolly	BG.2	Excessive amount of homes proposed on allocated Roeshot Hill site. Will add to problems in the area, particularly infrastructure and road network. Increased pollution from increased number of cars. Loss of green space. Existing flooding on nearby routes which impacts on traffic. There is a need to protect the River Avon due to its poor phosphate state and wildlife, extending down to Christchurch Harbour. Lack of services and school places in area to accommodate a new development.	Objection	No	No action	Number of homes on Roeshot Hill has been agreed through an outline planning consent. Various mitigation for transport projects and contributions for infrastructure have been agreed.	NA
0615	Friars Cliff Residents Association	BG.2	Allocated housing number unsound, as no additional infrastructure identified to support growth (lack of school, healthcare and highway capacity), and phosphate mitigation not possible for number of homes	Objection	Yes	No action	Infrastructure to support the proposal have been identified through the outline planning approval.	NA
0148	FCERM	P8	Clarification required on presence of flood risk and coastal change risk and approach to addressing these issues (including where Policy C5 is applicable), that policy text on Sandbanks Peninsular relates to coastal erosion as well as flood risk, and that criteria a - c are required due to erosion.	Support with changes		No action	Do not consider that it is necessary for this ward policy to contain information regarding coastal erosion and sea cliff stability risk zones or for a cross-reference to Policy C5 to be included. Consider Policy C5 sufficiently addresses this issue, the plan will be read as a whole and it is unnecessary to duplicate policy requirements.	NA
0150	Ken Parke on behalf of various clients 3	P8	Unclear how 775 dwellings figure has been derived, or if it reflects the ward's housing need. Unclear whether development is expected to comply with Policy H2. High reliance on windfall sites when focus restricted to local opportunity areas and streets - question achievability. No need for prescriptive approach to building heights - do not take permitted development rights into account. Unclear whether development outside local opportunity areas and streets is permissible. Unclear why size of local community shops is restricted and they are restricted to some parts of the ward.	Objection		No action	All the wards collectively contribute to the delivery of housing. Each ward has its own characteristics and constraints which impact the number of homes which can be delivered. The figure for the number of homes is calculate from a combination of existing commitments, proposed allocations and windfall sites. The windfall figure has been calculated using historical averages for the number of homes typically delivered within the ward. Development would be expected to comply with other plan policies include H2 Affordable Housing. LOA/LOS identify where windfall can be focused and increased heights achieved but this does not prevent windfall in other locations. Approach to heights seeks to provide clarity about the design expectations.	NA

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0189	Sandbanks Community Group	P8	Supports some aspects of P8 ward policy (Exploring opportunities to reconfigure parking bays on Banks Road, opposite Sandbanks car park adjacent to the shops and restaurants, and along Haven Road within the local centre to allow for outdoor seating and pavement widening, subject to sufficient parking to support local businesses; Enabling infrastructure for the provision of a water taxi service along the seafront; Exploring opportunities to enhance the public realm and improve pedestrian and cycling infrastructure and safety at/around the following streets, roads and locations (or surrounding routes): - Shore Road and Banks Road, including improvements to drainage; and Supporting proposals to develop new infrastructure or enhance existing infrastructure including community facilities, schools, health services, open spaces and play areas, including: - Sandbanks Pavilion). But objects to aspects about flood risk and disputes that there is little benefit in funding sea defences as not just about number of homes but also includes world renowned beaches and key to BCP tourism. Also through route to Purbeck. Lack of investment for sea defences is short sighted and would impact economy.	Objection		No action	Funding of flood defences has not currently been secured but will continue to be explored	NA
0223	Fortitudo Ltd	P8	Objects to P8 point 6 regarding Sandbanks Peninsula development restrictions. Opportunity to redevelop sites with flood resilient measures is reduced with no net increase in dwellings on sites. Premature to restrict development when Environment Agency haven't produced a model for Sandbanks yet with regards to wave overtopping and tidal events.	Objection		No action	Policy approach to Sandbanks has been agreed with the environment agency. Issues go beyond individual properties and also involve access and egress.	NA
0301	Sandbanks Neighbourhood Forum	P8	Considers policy to be in direct conflict with SAND 10 policy of the Sandbanks Neighbourhood Plan due to wording around the loss of hotels.	Objection		No action	Policy P8 does not reference hotels and these are considered under the visitor accommodation policy.	NA
0302	Branksome Park & Canford Cliffs Residents Association	P8	Planning restrictions and guidance is required around the chines. Flood resilience is required in the roads around the chine. Canford Cliffs Ward needs better public transport to beaches and road safety reviewed	Comment		No action	The chines are protected as open spaces. The plan supports implementation of SuDs but schemes affecting existing areas and highways will be considered outside of the scope of the Local Plan. Public transport is addressed in part 1 of the policy	NA
0342	Anthony Vickery	P8	Should be presumption against replacing family homes with second homes (high proportion/small flats unsuitable for families, as changes character, family homes needed, and represents poor use of existing facilities like schools, libraries and doctors surgeries. Second homes problem needs addressing. "Homes" should be defined. Concerned about impacts of windfall housing requirement	Objection	No	No action	Homes is an unit which acts as a dwelling, this could be a house or a flat. The issue of second homes has been considered through the plan making process, restricting second homes on new properties could have unintended consequences on existing stock and other mechanisms are needed to manage second homes. Windfall development is needed to support urban intensification.	NA
0360	Carol Bogle	P8	Should not be seeking to increase areas of retail, but enhance the existing retail area at Westbourne and Haven Road. It is not financially viable to increase numbers of areas of retail. Not necessary to dilute offering of town centre (Poole) by having more centres, and focus should be on supporting Poole town centre.	Objection	No	No action	The plan supports strengthening the viability of Westbourne District Centre. It does not allocate any new retail sites but does set out it would support small retail/community uses in some locations where these facilities are currently lacking.	NA
0450	Janet Shenton	P8	Consultation difficult to complete. Inconsistencies exist, no definition of retail areas in Canford Cliffs, Parkstone has them defined. Large number of homes proposed for Poole town centre is disproportionate. Speedway track and the swimming pool need to be replaced. Infrastructure is needed GP surgeries, sewerage, schools, play areas.	Objection	No	No action	Canford Cliffs local centre is referenced and defined on the policies map.	NA
0614	National Trust	P8	Development on Sandbanks Peninsula has potential to impact Brownsea Island and The Purbecks. Support restriction of some development until flood risk strategy in place. Development must have careful regard to National Landscape and Poole Harbour setting, including Brownsea Island. Policy should refer to importance of ferry services to Studland and Brownsea Island - should be protected/maintained (due social and economic benefits, and access to countryside via different modes). Pedestrian and cycling infrastructure within Canford Cliffs area and Sandbanks Peninsula should be strengthened - improved access to the assets and reduced reliance on private vehicles.	Objection	No	No action	National Landscapes are protected under NPPF requirements. Policy already includes references to improving pedestrian and cycle infrastructure	NA

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0260	Dorset Lake Community	P8	Prevent excessive off-street parking in front of houses and the loss of front gardens. Evening Hill needs to be accessible to all, cycle lane prevents parking and impacts road users, disabled parking too far away, support better access with safe parking, review junction of Alington Road/Sandbanks Road. Include criteria to support parking at sailing club/boat access -cycle lane prevents safe access, cycle lane needs to be redesigned to support parking. Ward Plans should recognize the important footpaths and open spaces and protect and maintain them. Plan should highlight the importance of access to the water and repair and replacement of local slipways. Plan should recognise the unique setting and views both from and to the Harbour and the need to control over-development of the shoreline and the rising topography behind its shores. Character of the area is medium density buildings nestled below the tree line, development/extensions needs to be appropriate to its setting and preserve/enhance character. Development should respect the predominant pitched roof interwar development and avoid using unsustainable materials such as concrete and hard landscaping. Maintain existing vegetation. Protect unique character and nature of the area. Ensure small flats and small poorly designed houses which are only suited for use as second homes should be discouraged. The Ward is characterised by family homes, and this is the housing provision which is needed. Greater emphasis should be made in Ward Plans to support biodiversity and prevent the loss of green garden corridors. Development should only be permitted where they conserve and enhance biodiversity. Proposals should demonstrate they retain, protect and enhance features of biodiversity, comply with the mitigation hierarchy, incorporate features for native wildlife species and seek to remove any invasive non-native species. The requirement for windfall puts pressure on splitting sites outside of Conservation Areas where there is less space. Some plots are proscribed by local covenants and there needs to be recognition of the historical importance in the design and layout of these areas warranting the inclusion of these covenants. Building on gardens results in loss of space for wildlife. Development puts pressure on infrastructure. Development which results in the loss/harm to the ecological or landscape value of public spaces and private gardens and/or which results in the loss of mature healthy trees should not be permitted. Plan need to focus on	Objection	Yes	Modification	These issues are covered by other policies in the plan regarding townscape and parking. Footpaths and open spaces are addressed in part 1 of the policy. Many of the aspects raised are addressed elsewhere in the plan such as policy NE5, NE6, H3, BE2 and the Natural Environment Chapter (Chapter 6). Windfall development is required and this can be achieved in different ways. Proposals will need to accord with policies in chapter 6 to conserve and enhance the natural environment, including securing a net gain in biodiversity. The loss of any hotels would be considered in accordance with the visitor accommodation policy. Amend policy to include references to Sandbanks Road and sailing club. Evening Hill (Shore Road) already referenced. Amend to reference junction between Sandbanks Road, Lilliput Road and Anthonys Avenue. Bike parking location too detailed for local plan consideration. Public realm improvements at Lilliput centre already referenced in P25 as area falls within adjacent ward. Plan seeks to support improved public transport. Specific services and delivery is outside the scope of the local plan.	Amend to reference Leicester Road and Sandbanks Road (junction with the sailing club and the junction with Lilliput Road/Anthony Avenue)
0651	Vicky Moss	P8	1c. Fails to address road safety issues (Leicester Rd - pavements required on both sides; Western Rd/Leicester Rd Junction - layout improvement required). 1f. Fails to address inadequate surface water drainage from Penn Hill to Branksome Chine. CC.1 likely to provide 2nd homes unsellable if council tax raised. CC.2 car parking essential for restaurants and shops, transport hub for school buses	Objection	Yes	Modification	Add reference to Leicester Road. Inadequate drainage on the highway can be addressed outside of the local plan.	Amend to add reference to Leicester Road.
0260	Dorset Lake Community	CC.1	Large increase in visitors to Branksome beach year round, beach road car park needs to provide sufficient year round parking.	Objection	Yes	No action	Some parking will be retained at Beach Road	NA
0302	Branksome Park & Canford Cliffs Residents Association	CC.1	Objects to allocation as there is no clear guidance about development or associated improvements	Objection		No action	Proportionate criteria are set out for the allocations. Further detail would be considered at application stage. Numbers in the ward are made up of existing commitments, site allocations and continued windfall development based on previous trends.	NA
0460	John Challinor	CC.1	The Beach Road car park should be retained and remodelled to support local economy given the vital role it plays for parking for visitors to the local beach and businesses	Objection	No	No action	Some parking is retained at Beach Road.	NA
0651	Vicky Moss	CC.1	CC.1 likely to provide 2nd homes unsellable if council tax raised.	Objection	Yes	No action	Beach Road car park will provide new homes. The plan does not seek to control second home ownership as it is considered that this is better dealt with through other mechanisms as it could increase pressure on existing properties for use for second homes.	NA
0011	Dominic Land	CC.1	Objects to allocation of site for housing due to loss of car parking and lack of car parking to serve tourists and support tourism.	Objection		Modification	Make amendment to set out that the residential use is subject to a review of car parking usage and if the site is considered surplus it should be used for residential development.	Make amendment to set out that the residential use is subject to a review of car parking usage and if the site is considered surplus it should be used for residential development.

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0148	FCERM	CC.1	Proposals on CC.1 will need to be complete Coastal Vulnerability Assessment and demonstrate will not impact/be impacted by sea cliff stability.	Support with changes		Modification	Agree.	Amend to add reference to Coastal Vulnerability Assessment
0342	Anthony Vickery	CC.1	CC.1 should not be allocated - parking needed to serve retail and beaches.	Objection	No	Modification	Some parking is retained at Beach Road. Consider modification to Penn Hill car park to ensure parking is surplus to requirements.	Make amendment to set out that the residential use is subject to a review of car parking usage and if the site is considered surplus it should be used for residential development.
0369	Christopher Richards	CC.1	Loss of Penn Hill Car park would exacerbate existing parking problems for Penn Hill which occur mostly at night, and will be forced to use limited on-street parking. Current problems with illegal parking in area. Plan is unsound as does not take in to account impact the loss of the car park would have on existing situation.	Objection	No	Modification	Make amendment to set out that the residential use is subject to a review of car parking usage and if the site is considered surplus it should be used for residential development. Some parking is retained on Beach Road.	Make amendment to set out that the residential use is subject to a review of car parking usage and if the site is considered surplus it should be used for residential development.
0386	David Glasbrook	CC.1	Objects to the development of Beach Road car park as parking is required for residents and visitors.	Objection	No	Modification	Make amendment to set out that the residential use is subject to a review of car parking usage and if the site is considered surplus it should be used for residential development. Some parking is retained on Beach Road.	Make amendment to set out that the residential use is subject to a review of car parking usage and if the site is considered surplus it should be used for residential development.
0079	The Society for Poole	CC.2	Policy P8 is ineffective and unsound, as it proposed 60 dwellings on CC.2, a car park which is at the gateway to Branksome Chine and is not known to be surplus. However, support no net increase in dwellings being allowed on Sandbanks Peninsula. Policy should not allow change of use at site of harbour mouth in order to maintain unique visitor attraction.	Objection		No action	Part of Beach Road car park is considered surplus and some parking will be retained on part of the site. Proposals at the Haven Hotel at the Harbour entrance on the Sandbanks peninsular are currently being considered through the planning application process.	NA
0302	Branksome Park & Canford Cliffs Residents Association	CC.2	Objects to allocation as there is no clear guidance about development or associated improvements	Objection		No action	Proportionate criteria are set out for the allocations. Further detail would be considered at application stage. Numbers in the ward are made up of existing commitments, site allocations and continued windfall development based on previous trends.	NA
0385	David Cowie	CC.2	Blank	Support	No	No action	Support noted	NA
0005	Marilyn Amos	CC.2	Objects to allocation of site for housing due to loss of car parking.	Objection		Modification	Make amendment to set out that the residential use is subject to a review of car parking usage and if the site is considered surplus it should be used for residential development.	Make amendment to set out that the residential use is subject to a review of car parking usage and if the site is considered surplus it should be used for residential development.
0006	Lesley Watkins	CC.2	Objects to allocation of site for housing due to loss of car parking.	Objection		Modification	Make amendment to set out that the residential use is subject to a review of car parking usage and if the site is considered surplus it should be used for residential development.	Make amendment to set out that the residential use is subject to a review of car parking usage and if the site is considered surplus it should be used for residential development.
0007	Patsy Jane	CC.2	Objects to allocation of site for housing due to loss of car parking and lack of parking for locals and visitors.	Objection		Modification	Make amendment to set out that the residential use is subject to a review of car parking usage and if the site is considered surplus it should be used for residential development.	Make amendment to set out that the residential use is subject to a review of car parking usage and if the site is considered surplus it should be used for residential development.
0008	Mark Steele	CC.2	Objects to allocation of site for housing due to loss of car parking and lack of car parking to serve Penn Hill Local Centre.	Objection		Modification	Make amendment to set out that the residential use is subject to a review of car parking usage and if the site is considered surplus it should be used for residential development.	Make amendment to set out that the residential use is subject to a review of car parking usage and if the site is considered surplus it should be used for residential development.
0009	Christian and Annie Bugiel	CC.2	Objects to allocation of site for housing due to loss of car parking and lack of car parking to serve Penn Hill Local Centre.	Objection		Modification	Make amendment to set out that the residential use is subject to a review of car parking usage and if the site is considered surplus it should be used for residential development.	Make amendment to set out that the residential use is subject to a review of car parking usage and if the site is considered surplus it should be used for residential development.
0012	Marcelle King	CC.2	Objects to allocation of site for housing due to loss of car parking and lack of car parking to serve Penn Hill Local Centre. Install EV charging points to support EV users.	Objection		Modification	Make amendment to set out that the residential use is subject to a review of car parking usage and if the site is considered surplus it should be used for residential development.	Make amendment to set out that the residential use is subject to a review of car parking usage and if the site is considered surplus it should be used for residential development.

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0015	Fiona Gregson	CC.2	Objects to allocation of site for housing due to loss of car parking, parking pressures on surrounding streets, loss of an area for school buses and coaches to pick up/drop off and lack of car parking to serve Penn Hill Local Centre.	Objection		Modification	Make amendment to set out that the residential use is subject to a review of car parking usage and if the site is considered surplus it should be used for residential development.	Make amendment to set out that the residential use is subject to a review of car parking usage and if the site is considered surplus it should be used for residential development.
0017	Paul Collins	CC.2	Objects to allocation of site for housing due to loss of car parking, likely increase of dangerous parking in the area and lack of car parking to serve Penn Hill Local Centre.	Objection		Modification	Make amendment to set out that the residential use is subject to a review of car parking usage and if the site is considered surplus it should be used for residential development.	Make amendment to set out that the residential use is subject to a review of car parking usage and if the site is considered surplus it should be used for residential development.
0172	Paul Gill	CC.2	Object to allocation of Penn Hill car park, adverse impact on local businesses and economy, noise and congestion caused by parking on nearby roads.	Objection		Modification	Make amendment to set out that the residential use is subject to a review of car parking usage and if the site is considered surplus it should be used for residential development.	Make amendment to set out that the residential use is subject to a review of car parking usage and if the site is considered surplus it should be used for residential development.
0260	Dorset Lake Community	CC.2	Need parking at Penn Hill car park for safe school drop off, residents and use of neighbourhood shops. Loss of parking will result in illegal parking in the area at peak times and reduce trade for retailers.	Objection	Yes	Modification	Make amendment to set out that the residential use is subject to a review of car parking usage and if the site is considered surplus it should be used for residential development.	Make amendment to set out that the residential use is subject to a review of car parking usage and if the site is considered surplus it should be used for residential development.
0342	Anthony Vickery	CC.2	CC.2 should not be allocated - parking needed to serve retail and beaches.	Objection	No	Modification	Some parking is retained at Beach Road. Consider modification to Penn Hill car park to ensure parking is surplus to requirements.	Make amendment to set out that the residential use is subject to a review of car parking usage and if the site is considered surplus it should be used for residential development.
0386	David Glasbrook	CC.2	Objects to the development of Penn Hill car park as parking is required for residents and visitors.	Objection	No	Modification	Make amendment to set out that the residential use is subject to a review of car parking usage and if the site is considered surplus it should be used for residential development.	Make amendment to set out that the residential use is subject to a review of car parking usage and if the site is considered surplus it should be used for residential development.
0395	Denise Richards	CC.2	Object to development of Penn Hill car park. Issues with potential impact on trees, negative impacts on traffic flows and poor parking in surrounding area. No need for further flats.	Objection	No	Modification	Make amendment to set out that the residential use is subject to a review of car parking usage and if the site is considered surplus it should be used for residential development.	Make amendment to set out that the residential use is subject to a review of car parking usage and if the site is considered surplus it should be used for residential development.
0450	Janet Shenton	CC.2	Object to loss of Penn Hill car park, it is well used and supports local businesses	Objection		Modification	Make amendment to set out that the residential use is subject to a review of car parking usage and if the site is considered surplus it should be used for residential development.	Make amendment to set out that the residential use is subject to a review of car parking usage and if the site is considered surplus it should be used for residential development.
0460	John Challinor	CC.2	Penn Hill Car Park should be removed as development site and retained for parking given vial role it plays in supporting businesses in the area	Objection	No	Modification	Make amendment to set out that the residential use is subject to a review of car parking usage and if the site is considered surplus it should be used for residential development.	Make amendment to set out that the residential use is subject to a review of car parking usage and if the site is considered surplus it should be used for residential development.
0635	Teresa Wellwood	CC.2	Insufficient public consultation and parking surveys to justify sale of site for housing. Car park required to sustain local businesses, sufficiently used to retain, will not decrease car use, will create parking problems on side/congested roads, will not enhance area, detrimental to area if any trees felled.	Objection	No	Modification	Make amendment to set out that the residential use is subject to a review of car parking usage and if the site is considered surplus it should be used for residential development.	Make amendment to set out that the residential use is subject to a review of car parking usage and if the site is considered surplus it should be used for residential development.
0651	Vicky Moss	CC.2	CC.2 car parking essential for restaurants and shops, transport hub for school buses	Objection	Yes	Modification	Make amendment to set out that the residential use on Penn Hill is subject to a review of car parking usage and if the site is considered surplus it should be used for residential development.	Make amendment to set out that the residential use is subject to a review of car parking usage and if the site is considered surplus it should be used for residential development.
0342	Anthony Vickery	CC.A	CC.A at odds with conservation area	Objection	No	No action	Specific mention to Conservation Area is included. A number of applications have been approved in the area, including 1-3 Lindsey Road which was considered at Public Enquiry where the intensification of plots was not considered harmful to the character of the conservation area.	NA
0040	Natural England	P9	4. b) is correct to reference the 400m restriction on residential developments.	Support		No action	Support noted	NA



ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0079	The Society for Poole	P9	Policy P9 is sound and effective in serving the public interest, as 'greening' and infrastructure improvements are sought.	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0150	Ken Parke on behalf of various clients 3	P9	Unclear how 110 dwellings figure has been derived, or if it reflects the ward's housing need. Unclear whether development is expected to comply with Policy H2. High reliance on windfall sites when focus restricted to local opportunity areas and streets - question achievability. No need for prescriptive approach to building heights - do not take permitted development rights into account. Unclear whether development outside local opportunity areas and streets is permissible	Objection		No action	All the wards collectively contribute to the delivery of housing. Each ward has its own characteristics and constraints which impact the number of homes which can be delivered. The figure for the number of homes is calculate from a combination of existing commitments, proposed allocations and windfall sites. The windfall figure has been calculated using historical averages for the number of homes typically delivered within the ward. Development would be expected to comply with other plan policies include H2 Affordable Housing. LOA/LOS identify where windfall can be focused and increased heights achieved but this does not prevent windfall in other locations. Approach to heights seeks to provide clarity about the design expectations.	NA
0040	Natural England	P10	There is insufficient SANG planned for sites CT4&5 (540 dwellings) at Town Common.	Objection		No action	Delivery of SANG is difficult as these are brownfield sites in multiple ownership. Council will deliver SANG to mitigate any impact as it does for brownfield sites in the BCP area.	NA
0082	Christchurch Harbour Ornithological Group	P10	Need to consider whether all of the allocations in Christchurch Town Centre should be allocated. Concerned not possible to absorb recreational impacts from development proposed in Christchurch Town Centre - exceeds capacity of SANGs in vicinity. Unclear how impacts to be mitigated and may result in additional recreational pressure and disturbance to wildlife (Stanpit Marsh (Christchurch Harbour SSSI) and heathlands (including Town Common). Two Riversmeet SANG capacity already used up by granted applications. Significant additional capacity required (8.4ha) and unclear how could be accommodated in reasonable proximity of town centre (in light of evidence locals use Town Riversmeet SANG and high density development with limited private gardens/open space generating significant recreational demand). Unlikely Two Riversmeet can be improved to absorb additional pressure (overall need greater in size than any existing SANG), and Stour Valley south of Spur Road unlikely to accommodate as already used as public space and doing so could harm wildlife interest (including Solent Marine SPA).	Objection		No action	The Council is working to secure additional heathland mitigation within Christchurch as part of the Dorset Heathlands strategy to deliver within a timely manner with development.	NA
0141	Amirez Ltd	P10	Extent of sequential test area should be widened to include Purewell, no reason why the area cannot be extended.	Objection		No action	Disagree that it is appropriate to extend the Christchurch Sequential Test Area to include the Purewell Sustainable Neighbourhood. It is also incorrect that there is no justification for the current sequential test area's boundaries. The boundaries reflect the locations with the greatest opportunity for regeneration (i.e. the Stony Lane area).	NA
0148	FCERM	P10	Correct statement	Support with changes		No action	Support noted	NA
0150	Ken Parke on behalf of various clients 3	P10	Unclear how 610 dwellings figure has been derived, or if it reflects the ward's housing need. Unclear when sites subject to Strategic Flood Risk Assessment L2 assessment are expected to be delivered, if this is possible. Unclear whether development is expected to comply with Policy H2. High reliance on windfall sites when focus restricted to local opportunity areas and streets - question achievability. No need for prescriptive approach to building heights - do not take permitted development rights into account. Unclear whether development outside local opportunity areas and streets is permissible.	Objection		No action	All the wards collectively contribute to the delivery of housing. Each ward has its own characteristics and constraints which impact the number of homes which can be delivered. The figure for the number of homes is calculate from a combination of existing commitments, proposed allocations and windfall sites. The windfall figure has been calculated using historical averages for the number of homes typically delivered within the ward. Development would be expected to comply with other plan policies include H2 Affordable Housing. LOA/LOS identify where windfall can be focused and increased heights achieved but this does not prevent windfall in other locations. Approach to heights seeks to provide clarity about the design expectations. Sites subject to SFRA Level 2 are identified subject to resolution of the flood risk issues.	NA

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0156	Christchurch Residents Association	P10	Policy P10 is unsound and not consistent with NPPF. Flood risks in Christchurch are moderate to high and Christchurch is significantly older than Boumemouth and Poole with narrower roads and older utility pipes, but the plan makes no note of these differences. 2a. Mixed use good aspiration but should be limits on numbers of businesses of same type. Flood risk assessments show increased vulnerability so other retail areas should be maintained. 3. A mix of residential units types acceptable subject to not impacting retail outlets to point of town centre becoming economically unviable. Travel to employment areas is limited. 4a. Stour Road allocation - Number and scale of development out of character. Location is at risk of flooding. 4d. Stony Lane South allocation – high flood zone. Allowing housing here is unsound. Loss of parking would affect leisure centre viability and could undermine this provision. 5a. Barrack Road (south of railway) – area contains four health services – more housing could result in losing these services. 5c. Christchurch Retail Park – provides strong mix of businesses, convenient and separate from town centre. High flood risk. Housing use proposal is flawed	Objection	No	No action	The plan describes the overall character and quality of different areas. General policies within the plan will ensure flood risk issues and the potential loss of community facilities are considered. Sites and areas have been identified to ensure the efficient use of land.	NA
0164	Environment Agency	P10	Sites meet the sequential test and no issue with flood risk assessment being required at application stage as part of exception test. SFRA L2 and flood risk management strategies may determine it is not possible for these sites to meet part 2 of the exception test, particularly where flood risk management infrastructure improvements required to make development (including access) safe for its lifetime are not viable.	Support		No action	Support and uncertainty regarding viability of funding strategies noted.	NA
0164	Environment Agency	P10	Appropriately represents flood risk position and uncertainties around delivering flood defences. Support policy preventing development coming forward until strategic flood risk matters resolved. Policy is sound.	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0287	Network Rail	P10	Need to engage with NRIL to ensure the safety of the railway is maintained, e.g. sites CT1, CT2, CTA and CTB. Seek opportunities to provide safe access and improve overall accessibility to Christchurch rail station. Delay to SFRA 2 concerning due to proximity of sites to the railway station and so policy wording should include a thorough assessment of the flood risk.	Support with changes	Yes	No action	Agree access improvements are important. The policy prevents development coming forward without flood risk mitigation.	NA
0334	Peter Fenning	P10	Ward policies should be non-strategic in terms of building design and height, local signage and car parking. Christchurch Town Council own freehold of several ward assets.	Objection	No	No action	The ward policies are considered strategic, these policies and site allocations address strategic priorities for the development and use of land in the area, and set out an overall strategy for the pattern, scale and design quality of places making provision for the conservation and enhancement of the natural, built and historic environment. While the ward policies and site allocations do include a reasonable degree of detail this is necessary to meet our strategic priorities and provide clarity about our expectations for places.	NA
0541	Carolyn Guest	P10	P10 marked as strategic policy, but should be local. Ward policies should be non-strategic.	Objection		No action	The ward policies are considered strategic, these policies and site allocations address strategic priorities for the development and use of land in the area, and set out an overall strategy for the pattern, scale and design quality of places making provision for the conservation and enhancement of the natural, built and historic environment. While the ward policies and site allocations do include a reasonable degree of detail this is necessary to meet our strategic priorities and provide clarity about our expectations for places.	NA
0560	Peter McGowan	P10	Broadly support – sensible vision for town and seeks effective use of vacant and underused brownfield sites. Site allocations generally supported, assuming available in plan period and where business uses present do not have detrimental impacts on employment/commercial objectives. Essential leisure centre in CT.4 retained in full operation and development doesn't impinge on its function. CT.3 under construction so allocation may not be required. CT.A not effective, justified or sound, as largely already flatted/retirement complex development and 3 to 4 storeys high, and due to CT.A policy requirements, so no opportunity for development/redevelopment. Boundary also inconsistent – sites potentially with more potential to east excluded. No justification of rationale behind illogical boundary in plan or evidence base.	Objection	No	No action	Further opportunities exist within the Barrack Road area, its boundary is drawn to consider the adjacent conservation area, areas of flood risk and properties along the road frontage	NA

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0104	Beagle	P10	Contradiction between supporting text and policy. Supporting text states commercial and residential development within flood risk area will not require sequential test. Policy states these sites are required to deliver housing and pass sequential test. The Beagle site is allocated for 85 homes. Deliverability is questionable due to need for flood defences and mitigation. In the meantime, the policy wording would prevent any alterations to existing buildings to facilitate ongoing use for the existing factory or other commercial use.	Support with changes		Modification	Agree, provide consistency between policy and supporting text	Amend to reference housing and commercial development
0195	Christchurch Town Council Neighbourhood Plan Working Group	P10	Christchurch town supporting text - opening section confusing as mixes up Christchurch Town ward and Christchurch town centre (which makes up only part of ward). Should the Christchurch retail park and Grovely Road employment area be mentioned here as they do not form part of the retail hierarchy. The rivers should be included in the text (particularly the Avon which bisects the ward). Sustainable neighbourhoods – refers to town centre but doesn't include any text about it. Purewell – should also mention GP surgery? Active travel, infrastructure etc section – also poor in part due to the severance / funnelling of routes caused by the River Avon. Land at Stour Road (CT1) and Avon Trading Park frontage (CT2) – both less than 1ha so should be non-strategic. Magistrates Court – would be helpful to note planning permission and that work has commenced. Also reference loss of town centre car park. Stony Lane South – should also reference bowling club and town centre car parks. Local opportunity areas and Streets should be designated as non strategic parts of the Policy as they relate to small areas. Flood risk Christchurch sequential test area – may be helpful to confirm this is broadly the same as the allocated site area. Reference to need for uses other than housing and commercial within the Christchurch Sequential Test Area to carry out a sequential test – should this not apply only to more vulnerable uses? Town Centre Archaeology – would It not be clearer to refer to Christchurch Central Conservation Area rather than Town Centre Heritage Conservation Area?	Support with changes		Modification	The text and supporting map shows the location of the sustainable neighbourhoods and the town centre boundary. Christchurch retail park is listed as part of the retail hierarchy in chapter 9. Grovely Road is an existing employment area. Supporting text has to be proportionate but could be amended to mention the river and Purewell GP surgery in the supporting text. All sites are considered strategic and contribute towards meeting our housing requirement. Text references that the Magistrates Court has planning permission. Reference could be added to reference bowls club. LOA/LOS are part of the overall strategy and are considered strategic. Details about the sequential test are set out in chapter 5 of the plan. Reference to heritage conservation is to avoid any confusion with nature conservation sites.	Amend supporting text to reference the River Avon and GP surgery at Purewell
0273	Churchill Retirement Living	P10	Support inclusion of CT 4 - significant benefits. 150 home housing target supported. Support conclusion passes sequential test. No justification for building height range required - will not help make best use of land. Question requirement for active frontage on Bridge Street - not mentioned in HIA although this mentions enclosure considerations - ground floor frontage inappropriate due to flood risk requiring raised flood levels. Should not be subject to SFRA L2, FCERM strategy and funding plan - can be addressed by site specific flood risk assessment. Undefined date for delivering these not supported - delaying housing delivery. Requirements regarding exception test overly restrictive as current application demonstrates can be made safe for lifetime without increasing flood risk. Data indicating site in Flood Zone 3b questioned and should be made available. Requirement for S106 contribution towards flood defences in all cases unjustified - costs not calculated, preventing delivery when not in IDP, not tested through Viability Assessment and no timeframe.	Objection		Modification	The requirement for heights to be predominantly 2 and 4 storeys is justified, given the character of Christchurch Town Centre and its historic environment. It should be noted that the current wording does not preclude some limited elements of the development being over 4 storeys if this would be appropriate. Agree, that the policy would be beneficial in relation to the reference to active frontages on Bridge Street to reduce ambiguity, as this relates to the need for buildings to face street and provide overlooking, rather than commercial units being required. The site must be subject to an SFRA L2 and FCERM strategy given the need to properly understand flood risk issues across the wider area and address these comprehensively in order to achieve developments that are acceptable in safety and design terms. In light of the uncertainty regarding the delivery of defences, the sites does not form part of the plan's housing supply figures. A requirement for contributions towards defences is needed due to the need to help protect the wider area alongside the site and ensure a good quality scheme, and is appropriate as policy does not allow development to come forward until defences have been costed.	Amend reference to active frontages active frontages on site CT4
0282	Historic England	P10	Typo	Objection		Modification	Agree	Amend typo
0082	Christchurch Harbour Ornithological Group	CT.1	No objections to proposed allocation as previous concerns addressed.	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0108	H Bulstrode	CT.1	Support allocation of site at Stour Road. Application on site previously withdrawn due to phosphate issues. Allocation for 'in the region of 20 dwellings' too restrictive, indicative layout could provide 34 apartments. Need to make best use of previously developed land, opportunity for high density housing in sustainable location. Poor record of housing delivery and large amount of constraints	Support		No action	Some concern with the scale and layout of the withdrawn application, in the region of 20 homes considered more realistic.	NA

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0195	Christchurch Town Council Neighbourhood Plan Working Group	CT.1	4a (CT.1) As under 1ha this is a non-strategic allocation. Whilst residential use acceptable, some mixed use (particularly on the ground floor) should Development of this site should also consider future development of the area to the east.	Objection		No action	All allocations within the plan (over 15 homes) are considered strategic and necessary to meet housing needs. Site is not within a centre and criteria for mixed use ground floor not necessary (although not prevented by the policy). Site to the east trading and not known to be available.	NA
0211	Susan Suliman	CT.1	Contrary to policies BE2 (1a.) and BE4 (1a. (as max height contrary to draft neighbourhood plan, contrary to BE4)) regarding existing building lines, and BE6 regarding heritage assets (as max heights do not protect heritage assets or address objections raised by officers to submitted outline proposal).	Objection	Yes	No action	Built environment policies set out that heights are specified in allocations. The site is situated adjacent to the railway station and suitable for development between two and four storey. Some urban intensification in sustainable locations is required to support the development strategy. A blanket approach to three storey in Christchurch has not been tested through an examination process.	NA
0384	David Allen	CT.1	Object to site allocation Land at Stour Road - four storeys is too high	Objection	Yes	No action	Part of the site is adjacent to the main Christchurch station and is considered a sustainable location for higher density development. The distribution of heights would need to be considered at planning application stage as some parts of the site will be better suited to two storey development.	NA
0653	Christchurch Town Council	CT.1	Strategic policies should not extend to detailed matters (infrastructure and community facilities, design principles etc) - should be addressed by neighbourhood plans. Town council should have flexibility to decide what to do with facilities/amenities in its ownership. Policies for small sites (CT.1) should be non-strategic so town council can determine appropriate typologies	Objection	No	No action	Site allocations are considered strategic to meet housing needs. Neighbourhood plans can provide further detail in relation to some facilities/amenities if required.	NA
0656	Wei Allen	CT.1	Allocation conflicts with BE4 (1b.), BE2, and BE1. Height would not be sympathetic or take design cues from existing buildings. Density too high to create pleasant place for new and existing residents.	Objection	Yes	No action	Part of the site is adjacent to the main Christchurch station and is considered a sustainable location for higher density development. The distribution of heights would need to be considered at planning application stage as some parts of the site will be better suited to two storey development.	NA
0082	Christchurch Harbour Ornithological Group	CT.2	No objections to proposed allocation as previous concerns addressed.	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0195	Christchurch Town Council Neighbourhood Plan Working Group	CT.2	4.b. Avon Trading Park frontage (CT2) Site <1ha and should be treated as non-strategic. Mixed use with some commercial / community would also be acceptable, particularly given location of scout hut (or is that excluded from the site on land to the rear - in which case should it be included?)	Objection		No action	All allocations within the plan (over 15 homes) are considered strategic and necessary to meet housing needs. Site is not within a centre and criteria for mixed use ground floor not necessary (although not prevented by the policy). Scout hut is not within site allocation.	NA
0211	Susan Suliman	CT.2	Max 3 storeys requested by majority of public at consultation events, so conflict with public's wishes. Concerned about limited opportunity to influence. Contrary to policies BE2 (1a.) and BE4 (1a. (as max height contrary to draft neighbourhood plan, contrary to BE4)) regarding existing building lines, and BE6 regarding heritage assets (as max heights do not protect heritage assets )	Objection	No	No action	Built environment policies set out that heights are specified in allocations. The site is in a sustainable location on a busy arterial route with other three storey properties in the vicinity. Some urban intensification in sustainable locations is required to support the development strategy. Allocation is for predominantly for three and half storey (three storey with rooms in a roof space). A blanket approach to three storey in Christchurch has not been tested through an examination process.	NA
0236	John Beauchamp & Co Ltd	CT.2	Support allocation. Site is in a highly sustainable location and can accommodate between 30 and 40 homes, this would optimise the use of land in accordance with the intentions of the Plan and government policy.	Support with changes		No action	Support noted	NA
0653	Christchurch Town Council	CT.2	Strategic policies should not extend to detailed matters (infrastructure and community facilities, design principles etc) - should be addressed by neighbourhood plans. Town council should have flexibility to decide what to do with facilities/amenities in its ownership. Policies for small sites (CT.2) should be non-strategic so town council can determine appropriate typologies	Objection	No	No action	Site allocations are considered strategic to meet housing needs. Neighbourhood plans can provide further detail in relation to some facilities/amenities if required.	NA
0282	Historic England	CT.2	Site contains Scheduled Monument (pillbox and tank traps), policy should reflect this.	Objection		Modification	Agree	Amend CT2 to reference scheduled monument.

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0082	Christchurch Harbour Ornithological Group	CT.3	No objections to proposed allocation as previous concerns addressed.	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0195	Christchurch Town Council Neighbourhood Plan Working Group	CT3	4c. Magistrates Court should also specify amount of parking to be retained	Support with changes		No action	The commercial units are likely to attract shoppers/patrons already using existing town centre parks or as part of linked trips and therefore no specific general parking for these units is required.	NA
0211	Susan Suliman	CT.3	New supply (170 homes already being built) so should not be included. 30 additional homes at 43-47 Barrack Road now included despite a party having no intention to sell home. 4 storeys contrary to policies BE2 and BE4 and draft neighbourhood plan, inconsistent with height of development being built out, and would not protect or enhance Town Centre Conservation Area.	Objection	Yes	No action	Commitments are included as they represent a valid source of housing supply.	NA
0082	Christchurch Harbour Ornithological Group	CT.4	Historic England have raised concern about proposal for scheme on site that reflects capacity allocated due to scale and massing, suggests capacity cannot be delivered without harm to heritage. Unclear how flood risk will be overcome, question whether should be allocated as undeliverable. If can be resolved management measures may reduce capacity. Two Riversmeet car park to the west of the leisure centre (25 homes allocated) may not pass sequential test as higher risk than car park to east, and would fail to meet criterion bi of Policy C1.	Objection		No action	Making efficient use of town centre sites is required to support the overall strategy. The capacity is at a density considered reasonable for the town centre and the detail scale, bulk and massing will be linked to the type and mix of accommodation proposed. There are some uncertainties regarding how flood risk issues on these sites will be addressed; the policy reflects this, as does exclusion of the allocated dwellings from the plan's housing supply figures. The sites are key regeneration sites and have an important role to play in meeting the Christchurch area's housing needs when solutions become available, hence their allocation. The Stony Lane area as a whole passes the sequential test; however, a sequential approach to the location of development will be required once issues regarding defences are addressed.	NA
0164	Environment Agency	CT.4	Given challenges around infrastructure delivery in Christchurch, it is appropriate for SFRA L2 and agreed funding strategy to be delivered prior to determining application in the regeneration areas.	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0164	Environment Agency	CT.5	Given challenges around infrastructure delivery in Christchurch, it is appropriate for SFRA L2 and agreed funding strategy to be delivered prior to determining application in the regeneration areas.	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0211	Susan Suliman	CT.4	Max 3 storeys requested by majority of public at consultation events, so conflict with public's wishes. Concerned about limited opportunity to influence. Contrary to policies BE2 (1a.) and BE4 (1a. (as max height contrary to draft neighbourhood plan, contrary to BE4)) regarding existing building lines, and BE6 regarding heritage assets of Town Centre and Purewell conservation areas (as max heights do not protect heritage assets or address objections raised by officers and Historic England to submitted outline proposal). Flood risk and contaminated land also present. In particular, flood risk too high for housing at Civic Offices site where permeable land is needed. Two Riversmeet Car Park required for long stay parking for shoppers and visitors, as agreed by BCP Council, following loss of other long stay parking. Required for economy.Civic offices car park required for Bridge Street businesses and Kings Arms Hotel.	Objection	Yes	No action	Built environment policies set out that heights are specified in allocations. The site is in a sustainable location within a central area. Some urban intensification in sustainable locations is required to support the development strategy. A blanket approach to three storey in Christchurch has not been tested through an examination process. Policy clearly sets out flood risk issues.	NA
0297	Sir Christopher Chope MP	CT.4	Policy does not reference former Civic Centre offices which should be retained even with alternative use. Objects to allocation for 25 homes on the car park due to concerns of loss of parking in the town centre.	Objection		No action	Civic offices form part of CT4 allocation. Are contains other parking options to provide for leisure centre and sports facilities	NA
0334	Peter Fenning	CT.5	Stoney Lane allocation should not result in loss of important employers and a retail park. Conflict with Policy E1(b) which requires safeguarding of existing employment areas for employment uses.	Objection	No	No action	The reconfiguration of parking would not result the loss in employment uses safeguarded by policy E1(b). The allocation seeks to retain parking to support the leisure uses in the area. A wide range of other town centre car parks exist.	NA

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0195	Christchurch Town Council Neighbourhood Plan Working Group	CT.4	4.d. Stony Lane South (CT4) i. minimum of 240 homes – make clear this may also include a wider mix of town centre uses ii. parking here has wider function in supporting marina businesses and town centre – existing level of parking should be retained as per findings of CTC study. vi. need reference to bus/coach drop-off point being retained. vii. not practical given south side pavement ceases at current crossing- would create hazard for pedestrians trying to cross near bridge. Vehicles would be suddenly confronted by crossing just over bridge creating hazard.	Support with changes		Modification	Consider modification to reference the bus/coach pick up point. The policy references retention of parking to serve the leisure centre. Other town centre parking sites exist to serve the wider town centre. The relocation of the pedestrian crossing has been suggested by Council highways colleagues. Focus of development in the area considered to be for new homes but other uses not precluded if the number of homes can be delivered alongside other uses.	Amend site CT.4 to reference bus/coach pick up
0211	Susan Suliman	CT.5	Max 3 storeys requested by majority of public at consultation events, so conflict with public's wishes. Concerned about limited opportunity to influence. Contrary to policies BE2 (1a.) and BE4 (1a. (as max height contrary to draft neighbourhood plan, contrary to BE4)) regarding existing building lines, and BE6 regarding heritage assets of Town Centre and Purewell conservation areas (as max heights do not reflect their building lines). High risk of flooding so unclear why suitable for housing. Unclear why Beagle site included as successful business with no intention to move. Loss of Currys, B&Q etc. will result in loss of employment for local residents, reduces need for longer car journeys to Castlepoint/Tower Park (important to elderly and environment).	Objection	No	No action	Built environment policies set out that heights are specified in allocations. The site is in a sustainable location within a central area. Some urban intensification in sustainable locations is required to support the development strategy. A blanket approach to three storey in Christchurch has not been tested through an examination process. Policy clearly sets out flood risk issues. Sites within the area have been promoted as part of the plan making process or been subject to developer interest.	NA
0082	Christchurch Harbour Ornithological Group	CT.5	CT.5 recreational pressures: Two Riversmeet SANG's capacity has been used - should assign any additional capacity created to CT.4 as it is closer to Stanpit Marsh and SANG. CT.5 immediately adjacent to Purewell Meadows SSSI which will experience pressure. CT.5 loss of employment land: Should be retained as employment site. Needed to provide jobs for expanding population and support economic growth. No strategic employment sites in Christchurch built-up area. Unclear how flood risk will be overcome, question whether should be allocated as undeliverable. If can be resolved management measures may reduce capacity. Two Riversmeet car park to the west of the leisure centre (25 homes allocated) may not pass sequential test as higher risk than car park to east, and would fail to meet criterion bi of Policy C1.Sustainable location for use and issues with flood risk and recreational pressures make unsuitable for housing.	Objection		Modification	Heathland mitigation for a development is not attributed to particular SANGs or counted as capacity as people travel 5km to heathland so visit multiple heathlands and HIPS. The policy wording does not preclude a wider range of uses providing the minimum housing numbers are met but a reference to mix of uses would provide more clarity. There are some uncertainties regarding how flood risk issues on these sites will be addressed; the policy reflects this, as does exclusion of the allocated dwellings from the plan's housing supply figures. The sites are key regeneration sites and have an important role to play in meeting the Christchurch area's housing needs when solutions become available, hence their allocation. The Stony Lane area as a whole passes the sequential test; however, a sequential approach to the location of development will be required once issues regarding defences are addressed.	Amend site CT.5 to reference a mix of uses
0195	Christchurch Town Council Neighbourhood Plan Working Group	CT.5	4.e. Stony Lane (CT.5.) First section i. Should make clear could include a wider mix of town centre uses not just residential. Second section – should there be reference to masterplan/design code to enable development to come forward in phases (similar to wording for Christchurch Retail Park)? . LOAs and LOSs should be non strategic. Proposed heights should be tested in relation to views of the Priory in particular, in line with local design codes. LOSs should be non strategic.	Objection		Modification	Potential to modify the policy to reference a wide range of uses. New homes can be delivered alongside other uses. Sites within the area are discrete and wider masterplaning may not be required if each site follows established urban design principles. The policies are considered strategic to plan for development within the wards.	Amend site CT.5 to reference a mix of uses
0282	Historic England	CT.5	Policy should require efforts to retain non-designated heritage assets and reflect HIA.	Objection		Modification	Agree	Amend to reference non designated heritage assets
0211	Susan Suliman	CT.A	Max 3 storeys requested by majority of public at consultation events, so conflict with public's wishes. Concerned about limited opportunity to influence. Contrary to policies BE2 (1a.) and BE4 (1a. (as max height contrary to draft neighbourhood plan, contrary to BE4)) regarding existing building lines, and BE6 regarding heritage assets (as max heights do not protect heritage assets )	Objection	No	No action	Built environment policies set out that heights are specified in allocations. The site is in a sustainable location on a busy arterial route with other three storey properties in the vicinity. Some urban intensification in sustainable locations is required to support the development strategy. Allocation is for predominantly for three and half storey (three storey with rooms in a roof space). A blanket approach to three storey in Christchurch has not been tested through an examination process.	NA
0195	Christchurch Town Council Neighbourhood Plan Working Group	CT.C	LOAs should be non-strategic Christchurch Retail park (CT.C) Local opportunity Area – not clear why identified but Meteor Retail Park in the Mudeford area is not?	Objection		No action	LOA are considered as part of the strategic approach. Neighbourhood plans could identify additional areas.	NA

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0211	Susan Suliman	CT.C	Max 3 storeys requested by majority of public at consultation events, so conflict with public's wishes. Concerned about limited opportunity to influence. Contrary to policies BE2 (1a.) and BE4 (1a. (as max height contrary to draft neighbourhood plan, contrary to BE4)) regarding existing building lines, and BE6 regarding heritage assets (as max heights do not protect heritage assets )	Objection	No	No action	Built environment policies set out that heights are specified in allocations. The site is in a sustainable location on a busy arterial route with other three storey properties in the vicinity. Some urban intensification in sustainable locations is required to support the development strategy. Allocation is for predominantly for three and half storey (three storey with rooms in a roof space). A blanket approach to three storey in Christchurch has not been tested through an examination process.	NA
0211	Susan Suliman	CT.C	Wording is vague about possible proposals. 600+ new homes would cause traffic congestion, and existing congestion is not caused by the retail park. Objects to building homes on top of the retail park. Parking for homes would need to be created in addition to the retail spaces, not allow for retail spaces to be used. Site does not feel well-thought through. Providing local retail units is important for choice and less car journeys, and would go against climate change policy. Building height is too high and not consistent with those around it or policies regarding building lines. Draft neighbourhood plan specifies maximum of 3 storeys.	Objection	No	No action	600 homes are anticipated across the ward over the entire plan period. Christchurch is sustainable location with good access to facilities and services. Actions to address traffic congestion set out in Chapter 10 and through LTP4. Christchurch neighbourhood Plan has not been tested at examination.	NA
0334	Peter Fenning	CT.C	No need for cycle and pedestrian improvements for Christchurch Retail Park, uncertain as to what 'fine grained character' means, proposed building heights too high, buildings face inwards at present, and area is well landscaped at present. Requirements not correct for site.	Objection	No	No action	The area at present is typical of an out of town retail park with low scale buildings and large car parks, if the site were to be developed more efficient use of land could be made through increased heights and an improved layout.	NA
0150	Ken Parke on behalf of various clients 3	P11	Unclear how 240 dwellings figure has been derived, or if it reflects the ward's housing need. Unclear whether development is expected to comply with Policy H2. Unclear why allocated housing on the two allocated sites is not included in the overall housing figures. High reliance on windfall sites when focus restricted to local opportunity areas and streets - question achievability. No need for prescriptive approach to building heights - do not take permitted development rights into account. Unclear whether development outside local opportunity areas and streets is permissible	Objection		No action	All the wards collectively contribute to the delivery of housing. Each ward has its own characteristics and constraints which impact the number of homes which can be delivered. The figure for the number of homes is calculate from a combination of existing commitments, proposed allocations and windfall sites. The windfall figure has been calculated using historical averages for the number of homes typically delivered within the ward. Development would be expected to comply with other plan policies include H2 Affordable Housing. LOA/LOS identify where windfall can be focused and increased heights achieved but this does not prevent windfall in other locations. Approach to heights seeks to provide clarity about the design expectations.	NA
0164	Environment Agency	P11	Sites appear to be just outside future flood zone.	Comment		No action	Comment noted	NA
0286	Bournemouth University	P11	Welcomes P11 (e) in so far that it supports retention and improvement to existing sporting facilities at Chapel Gate but objects as it does not go far enough in provide explicit support BU ambition for delivering sports and co-located academic and research facilities to create financially sustainable operation to benefit education and access to sport. Suggests removing site from Green Belt to help planning and investment process. Also recommends changes to wording of policy.	Objection	Yes	No action	The Council has chosen not to amend Green Belt boundaries through the local plan process.	NA
0169	Malmesbury Estate	P11	Underplays role of Commons area in providing employment, leisure, mineral extraction and infrastructure and solar farms. Potential for more solar farms. Plan must support these activities and provide strategy to meet all development needs. Object to policy as fails to support employment, recreation, tourism and infrastructure needs. Revised wording proposed.	Objection	Yes	Modification	Agree, amend to provide further detail surrounding the range of activities in the ward. Leave out reference to solar, as potential sites need to be assessed under other policies in the plan.	Agree, amend to provide further detail surrounding the range of activities in the ward

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0195	Christchurch Town Council Neighbourhood Plan Working Group	P11	Not clear what results in Mudeford & Stanpit and Jumpers Common & St Catherine's Hill Sustainable Neighbourhoods being identified as less sustainable than others, or how proximity to different facilities/amenities has been weighted in overall sustainability scoring. GIS layers that informed sustainable neighbourhoods should be 'live' to help inform neighbourhood plans and decision making. Access to dental surgeries and allotments should also be taken into account. Supporting text: mentions scout hut but not other community venues such as Hall on the Hill. Open spaces and recreational facilities – recommend also mention Stour Valley Park project. Employment areas – clarify 'adjoining the airport'. LOAs and LOSs should be designated as non strategic. Proposed heights should be in line with local design codes and character areas. Policy P11 should change to non-strategic or split strategic and non strategic.1.d. not clear what is proposed for Bernards Mead, Littledown Greenway or Sheepwash. Also believe Littledown Greenway and Sheepwash are not in Commons ward? 3.a. Queens mead Fairmile Road (Co1) – under 1ha – should be non-strategic unless specific community need (e.g. school)- should it say reserved for educational use but that residential would be possible if educational use not required? 4. and 5. LOAs and LOSs should be designated non-strategic. Proposed heights should be in line with local design codes and character areas	Support with changes		Modification	Ward policies are considered strategic and sites required to meet housing requirement. Amend policy to reference community halls. Detail of potential projects outside the scope of the local plan. More detail regarding the GIS map layers can be shared with NP groups outside the local plan process	Amend policy to reference community halls.
0233	University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust	P11	More flexibility required in relation to building heights at Christchurch hospital .	Objection	Yes	Modification	Agree, amend to increase height given the height of existing buildings and size of the site	Amend P11.3b (co.2)amend to set out buildings should be predominantly between two and three storeys and up to five storeys (approximately 15 metres) in the centre of the site.
0653	Christchurch Town Council	Co.1	Strategic policies should not extend to detailed matters (infrastructure and community facilities, design principles etc) - should be addressed by neighbourhood plans. Town council should have flexibility to decide what to do with facilities/amenities in its ownership. Policies for small sites (Co.1) should be non-strategic so town council can determine appropriate typologies	Objection	No	No action	Site allocations are considered strategic to meet housing needs. Neighbourhood plans can provide further detail in relation to some facilities/amenities if required.	NA
0297	Sir Christopher Chope MP	Co.2	Policy should emphasise importance of expanding current hospital facilities including (Macmillan Caring Locally Hospice) to deliver Government's New Hospitals Programme.	Support with changes		No action	The text already sets out that the hospital is an important facility	NA
0079	The Society for Poole	P12	Policy P12 is ineffective and unsound, as loss of Western Park and Ride site appears to be envisaged.	Objection		No action	The Plan seeks to safeguard the existing park and ride at Creekmoor which is on the west side of the BCP area.	NA
0150	Ken Parke on behalf of various clients 3	P12	Unclear how 210 dwellings figure has been derived, or if it reflects the ward's housing need. Unclear whether development is expected to comply with Policy H2. High reliance on windfall sites when focus restricted to local opportunity areas and streets - question achievability. No need for prescriptive approach to building heights - do not take permitted development rights into account. Unclear whether development outside local opportunity areas and streets is permissible	Objection		No action	All the wards collectively contribute to the delivery of housing. Each ward has its own characteristics and constraints which impact the number of homes which can be delivered. The figure for the number of homes is calculate from a combination of existing commitments, proposed allocations and windfall sites. The windfall figure has been calculated using historical averages for the number of homes typically delivered within the ward. Development would be expected to comply with other plan policies include H2 Affordable Housing. LOA/LOS identify where windfall can be focused and increased heights achieved but this does not prevent windfall in other locations. Approach to heights seeks to provide clarity about the design expectations.	NA
0225	Dorset Council	P12	Creekmoor park and ride site should be safeguarded within the Local Plan with a commitment for reopening in plan period. 210+ dwellings in Creekmoor plus associated development will impact the Dorset Council managed Upton Gateway Roundabout and A35 Upton bypass, so highway mitigation measures will need to be considered.	Support	Yes	No action	Cross boundary impacts will be considered jointly by the two highways authorities. Creekmoor Park and Ride can be reconsidered through the LTP.	NA
0251	Bloor Homes Southern	P12	Land at Bere Farm could offer a strategic solution to a range of issues, it should have a role in strategy with a more strategic approach being taken to the functional economic area across boundaries. Site has numerous benefits.	Objection	yes	No action	Site is not within the BCP Council area	NA
0428	Harry Tonkes	P12	Support allocation for recreation and sport, lack of current space and many benefits eg youth development, community asset, clubs can survive and grow eg Poole Town FC.	Support	No	No action	Support noted. Reference to Poole Town to be added in chapter 11	NA
0559	Peter Leppington	P12	Increased sports provision important for youth development, community enhancement (addressing shortage of suitable accommodation for clubs and organisations with parking and associated community benefits) and supporting clubs who need new grounds/facilities locally.	Support	No	No action	Support noted	NA



ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0592	Robin Lockyer	P12	Blank	Support	No	No action	Support noted	NA
0040	Natural England	P12	Confirmation needed about expanding Upton SANG to avoid adverse impacts on Upton Heath from 150 dwellings on these 2 sites.	Objection		Modification	Agree	Amend to reference SANG expansion
0148	FCERM	P12	Clarification required on presence of flood risk and coastal change risk and approach to addressing these issues (including where Policy C5 is applicable).	Support with changes		Modification	Agree that text should be included approach to flood risk for this ward, as it is located within the Poole SFRA L2 study area and there are many properties towards Poole Harbour that are at risk. Do not consider that it is necessary for this ward policy to contain information regarding coastal erosion and sea cliff stability risk zones or for a cross-reference to Policy C5 should be included. The plan will be read as a whole and it is unnecessary to duplicate policy requirements.	Amend to add additional criteria to end of policy that covers the approach to flood risk in Creekmoor
0299	Diana Butler	P12	Creekmoor Local Centre does not need 'strengthening' (p131). Milne Road Local Centre could be enhanced. Upgrade the route from Longmeadow Lane via the underpasses to Upton Country Park. Land north of A35 CR3 due to 400m Heathland 'consultation area' the western most section should not be considered for any development. The Park & Ride was never a good idea better use for health uses or wildlife.	Objection		Modification	Agree, amend to reference improved access to Upton Country Park. The park and ride site is safeguarded and will be considered further through the LTP. Any proposals on the land north of A35 will need to accord with policy NE2 which includes heathlands.	Amend text at 1.b to reference the need to improve pedestrian and cycle access to Upton Country Park
0227	The Gale Foundation Trust, YMCA and Poole Town Football Club	Cr.2	Support P12 and Cr.3. Want make vision for sports, recreation, education and community uses a reality. Would provide much needed located for Poole Town Football Club and community sports. Site is suitable, available and well located. Opportunity to improve connections. Propose to retain Northmead Copse and enhance, provide BNG and other benefits. Chronic shortage of community and sports space that could be provided. Community building would be provided with play facilities, rooms etc. Land could accommodate 6,000 capacity stadium and associated facilities. Proposed layout include 3G pitches, MUGA, sports centre, community building. Proposal would bring many community benefits, enhanced public open space, improved connectivity, community and sport facilities, kids initiative, free football coaching, holiday clubs, equipment, courses and school connections. potential for P&R site to provide additional parking for the site or NHS staff	Support	Yes	No action	Support noted. Note the allocation isn't specified for and end user. Due council process and procurement procedures would need to be followed in considering future occupier of the site. Add reference to Poole town to infrastructure table in chapter 11.	NA
0033	Daniel Wilson	Cr.3	Supports allocation at Land north of Creekmoor, better facilities for Poole Town FC would boost participation and local economy.	Support	No	No action	Support noted. Note that the allocation isn't specified for and end user. Due council process and procurement procedures would need to be followed in considering disposal and a future occupier of the site. Add reference to Poole Town FC in infrastructure table in chapter 11.	NA
0034	Ryan Petford	Cr.3	Supports allocation at Land north of Creekmoor, better premises are needed for sports and athletes and this would improve access to such facilities.	Support	No	No action	Support noted. Note the allocation isn't specified for and end user. Due council process and procurement procedures would need to be followed in considering disposal and a future occupier of the site.	NA
0035	Jake Daniels	Cr.3	Supports allocation at Land north of Creekmoor, accessible facilities have decreased and likely to decrease further, Poole Town FC deserve a location to grow as a club and support community sports activities.	Support	No	No action	Support noted. Note that the allocation isn't specified for and end user. Due council process and procurement procedures would need to be followed in considering disposal and a future occupier of the site. Add reference to Poole Town FC in infrastructure table in chapter 11.	NA
0041	James Morgan	Cr.3	Supports allocation at Land north of Creekmoor, lack of facilities in the area.	Objection	No	No action	Support noted	NA
0080	Joe Roach	Cr.3	NA		No	No action	No comment	NA
0081	David Warhurst	Cr.3	Use land north of A35 for Poole town football club and community, would be great community asset. Strongly support this facility.	Support	Yes	No action	Support noted. Note the allocation isn't specified for an end user. Due council process and procurement procedures would need to be followed in disposing of the site and establishing a future occupier of the site. Add reference to Poole Town FC to infrastructure table in chapter 11.	NA

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0109	Michael Winchester	Cr.3	Current Poole Town facilities inadequate, site at Creekmoor ideal for Poole Town.	Support	No	No action	Support noted. Note the allocation isn't specified for and end user. Due council process and procurement procedures would need to be followed in considering future disposal and occupation of the site. Add reference to Poole Town FC to infrastructure table in chapter 11.	NA
0309	A Quinn-Spurgeon	Cr.3	Support 3G/5G pitch sports provision on site for children	Support	No	No action	Support noted	NA
0310	Aaron Atkinson	Cr.3	Support football facilities on site for grassroots football and associated benefits	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0311	Aaron Power	Cr.3	Support football sports provision on site for community benefits and uptake	Support	No	No action	Support noted	NA
0312	Adam Daniels	Cr.3	Support sports facility provision for community benefits/accessibility	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0318	Alan Lay	Cr.3	Support football sports facility provision due to benefits for children and other facilities being at capacity	Support	No	No action	Support noted	NA
0327	Andrew Harrison	Cr.3	Support proposed sports facility provision due to benefits for children and grassroots football	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0332	Andy White	Cr.3	Supports site for new facility for Poole Town FC as well as wider community functions such as a nursery and further learning.	Support		No action	Support noted. Note the allocation isn't specified for and end user. Due council process and procurement procedures would need to be followed in considering future occupier of the site. Add reference to Poole town to infrastructure table in chapter 11.	NA
0341	Anthony Hill	Cr.3	Suitable quantity of sports provision required, for youth development, community enhancement, shortage/demand, and club sustainability reasons	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0343	Barney Greenway	Cr.3	Proposal will increase youth football in Poole, and adult coaching arability and skills. It would provide venue for other teams/clubs, and a base for Poole Town FC.	Support	No	No action	Support noted. Reference to Poole Town to be added in chapter 11	NA
0345	Ben Ely	Cr.3	Blank	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0359	Carl Hadfield	Cr.3	A new facility would help support young people involved with football and encourage others to get involved. Exercise is good for improving behaviour, social interaction, and learning essential life skills. Potential for uplift in local economy from football club doing well. Poole Town FC cannot grow in their current location. Women's football could be a key area of growth in a new facility. Demand is growing, and will ease demand on other facilities in the area. It could be a true home and provide a proper identity for Poole Town FC, and would assist the wider community.	Support		No action	Support noted. Reference to Poole Town to be added in chapter 11	NA

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0367	Charlotte Hoare	Cr.3	Proposal will bring fantastic opportunities to youth sports groups and is a positive change for the community	Support	No	No action	Support noted	NA
0368	Christopher Gregory	Cr.3	Supports new stadium for Poole Town FC. Would give Poole a proper identity in sport, as well as Poole Pirates. A community stadium could be built that would benefit all, and include other activities. Would be good for economy of town.	Support	No	No action	Support noted. Reference to Poole Town to be added in chapter 11	NA
0382	Darren Rose	Cr.3	Blank	Support	No	No action	Support noted	NA
0399	Eddie O'Gorman	Cr.3	Football facilities needed to support local football team and youth development	Support	No	No action	Support noted	NA
0401	The Shine Project	Cr.3	Support allocation at Creekmoor for sports, recreation and community facilities, would support team sports and have positive impacts for young people	Support	No	No action	Support noted	NA
0412	Fiona Neville	Cr.3	Poole has poor quality football facilities and better facilities are needed.	Support	No	No action	Support noted	NA
0417	Gary Ward	Cr.3	There are many sports clubs in the area in urgent need of new grounds and facilities, including Poole Town FC.	Support		No action	Support noted. Reference to Poole Town to be added in chapter 11	NA
0420	George Fullerton	Cr.3	Lack of existing sports and community space. Such space needed to support youth development and the community.	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0426	Grant Cormack	Cr.3	Support allocation, sports village would provide much needed sports and recreation facilities. A number of leisure / D2 operators have had longstanding requirements for the BCP area but have struggled to find suitable space.	Support	No	No action	Support noted	NA
0433	Helen Noble	Cr.3	Support provision of sports facilities, benefit to children and the community, could provide a permanent home to the town's football team.	Support	No	No action	Support noted. Reference to Poole Town to be added in chapter 11	NA
0444	Jake Daniels	Cr.3	Support allocation for sports and community use, there are a lack of local facilities and Poole Town FC are without a suitable ground.	Support	No	No action	Support noted. Reference to Poole Town to be added in chapter 11	NA
0446	James Aldham	Cr.3	Support allocation for sport, recreation, education and community uses. Increasing sport provision in the local area is hugely important for the area and current lack of suitable space. Site would benefit Poole Town Football Club.	Support	No	No action	Support noted. Reference to Poole Town to be added in chapter 11	NA
0451	Jasmine Kent	Cr.3	Support new facilities, beneficial to children.	Support		No action	Support noted	NA

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0454	Jemima Fricker	Cr.3	Blank	Support	No	No action	Support noted	NA
0463	Jon Winson	Cr.3	Supports on basis of youth football provision.	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0478	Kam Morgan	Cr.3	Allocation of site at Creekmoor for sport, recreation education and community uses is fully justified given lack of adequate facilities in the area. Consistent with national policy aims, and prevents anti-social behaviour.	Support	No	No action	Support noted	NA
0485	Kevin Hoare	Cr.3	Blank	Support	No	No action	Support noted	NA
0490	Kristy Lidgard	Cr.3	Objection to allocation of this site as a Gypsy and traveller site. It would be better used as a recreational area for the community and young people.	Support	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0497	Linda Hesford	Cr.3	Facility has full backing - beneficial for community and kids' development.	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0503	Lucy Geary	Cr.3	There is a shortage of suitable sports accommodation in the area. It will be good for children's mental health and fitness.	Support	No	No action	Support noted	NA
0506	Lyndsay Baker	Cr.3	Proposed stadium and training complex will provide essential facilities for the area, promote healthy lifestyle and improve mental health. Proposal would support Poole Town FC, as current site not fit for purpose. Great asset to local community.	Support		No action	Support noted. Reference to Poole Town to be added in chapter 11	NA
0517	Mark Vincent	Cr.3	Supports sport provision for town and community, accessible site.	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0531	Michael Hurst	Cr.3	Allocation of site for proposed use and football would be an asset to community.	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0534	Michael J Hawkins	Cr.3	Supports allocation of site for sports as it will improve physical and mental health for young people.	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0552	Paul Bray	Cr.3	Allocation of site for proposed use and football would be an asset to community.	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0564	Philip Sansom	Cr.3	Support. Permanent home and facilities for football club. Club supports community and is inclusive. Beneficial for whole of Poole and community.	Support	No	No action	Support noted	NA

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0566	Pippa Daniels	Cr.3	Support community sporting facility provision due to: potential youth development, lack of suitable accommodation for clubs, community enhancement, ideal location.	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0573	Rebecca Smith	Cr.3	Proposal will support youth teams, community cohesion and sports clubs.	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0575	Rebekah Rose	Cr.3	Stadium required for Poole Town, to draw more supporters, provide improved facilities, provide hireable facilities, attract players, include car parking, be located on bus route, strengthen community, support clubs.	Support	No	No action	Support noted. Reference to Poole Town to be added in chapter 11	NA
0581	Rob Bayston	Cr.3	Support increased sports facilities to address lack of accommodation with parking, community enhancement, youth development, supporting local economy, supporting clubs	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0594	Rose Cowan	Cr.3	More sports and recreational facilities (specifically 3G pitches) needed for young people in Hamworthy and Creekmoor. Football important for community cohesion.	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0598	The Cornerstone Academy	Cr.3	Increasing sport, education, recreation and community uses supported (beneficial for football clubs, community and inactive children)	Support	No	No action	Support noted	NA
0602	Sarah White	Cr.3	Support - great opportunity for community	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0609	Shelley Wilson	Cr.3	Support new sports facility due to benefits for young people and sports club	Support	No	No action	Support noted	NA
0621	Steve Hurst	Cr.3	Blank	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0624	Steven Hesford	Cr.3	Sports facility desperately required for youth development due to lack of capacity	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0633	Tasha Lynch	Cr.3	Lack of community spaces and youth centres/groups. Existing clubs that can support local youth needs should be supported and increased to continue provide low cost activities for all.	Support	No	No action	Support noted	NA
0634	Terdy St Helen	Cr.3	Blank	Support	No	No action	Support noted	NA
0636	Trenic Taekwondo Academies Poole	Cr.3	Allocation for sport, recreation, education and community uses justified and sound as would address lack of facilities in area, meet national policy/strategy requirements, and for health, sport participation, recreation and community enhancement reasons. Would help disadvantaged people.	Support	No	No action	Support noted	NA

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0638	Terry Wilson	Cr.3	Support as facilities would support young people.	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0645	Tom Alleyne	Cr.3	Blank	Support	No	No action	Support noted	NA
0647	Tom Spurgeon	Cr.3	Support proposed sports facility provision due to benefits for children and grassroots football	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0655	Wayne Nippard	Cr.3	Beneficial to increase sports provision in local area, due to youth development, community enhancements (lack of capacity in current facilities and beneficial for clubs/children), supporting clubs, and accessibility.	Support	No	No action	Support noted	NA
0082	Christchurch Harbour Ornithological Group	P13	Support designation of Coastal Nature Park. Policy needs to reflect the wider objectives of the Stour Valley River Corridor Project, in particular the need to conserve and enhance the wildlife habitats at Hengistbury Head and the Stour Valley Corridor, rather than just focusing on improvements to recreation.	Support with changes		No action	Details about the Stour Valley Corridor project as set out in chapter 6 (Natural Environment).	NA
0150	Ken Parke on behalf of various clients 3	P13	Unclear how 290 dwellings figure has been derived, or if it reflects the ward's housing need. Unclear whether development is expected to comply with Policy H2. High reliance on windfall sites when focus restricted to local opportunity areas and streets - question achievability. No need for prescriptive approach to building heights - do not take permitted development rights into account. Unclear whether development outside local opportunity areas and streets is permissible	Objection		No action	All the wards collectively contribute to the delivery of housing. Each ward has its own characteristics and constraints which impact the number of homes which can be delivered. The figure for the number of homes is calculate from a combination of existing commitments, proposed allocations and windfall sites. The windfall figure has been calculated using historical averages for the number of homes typically delivered within the ward. Development would be expected to comply with other plan policies include H2 Affordable Housing. LOA/LOS identify where windfall can be focused and increased heights achieved but this does not prevent windfall in other locations. Approach to heights seeks to provide clarity about the design expectations.	NA
0148	FCERM	P13	Clarification required on coastal change/sea cliff stability risks and approach to addressing these issues (including Policy C5 applicability). Clarification also needed on approach to flood risk in the ward.	Support with changes		Modification	Agree that text should be included approach to flood risk for this ward, as many properties near the River Stour are at risk and the area at risk could be covered by the Christchurch SFRA L2. Do not consider that it is necessary for this ward policy to contain information regarding coastal erosion and sea cliff stability risk zones or for a cross-reference to Policy C5 should be included. The plan will be read as a whole and it is unnecessary to duplicate policy requirements.	Amend to add additional criteria to end of policy to include information about the approach to flood risk in East Southbourne & Tuckton
0148	FCERM	EST.1	Proposals on BC.1 will need to be complete Coastal Vulnerability Assessment and demonstrate will not impact/be impacted by sea cliff stability.	Support with changes		Modification	Agree. Reference should be made to the need for development to be informed by a Coastal Vulnerability Assessment and demonstrate it will not impact or be impacted by sea cliff stability in line with Policy C5, given the site's allocation.	Amend site EST.1 to reference Coastal Vulnerability Assessment
0148	FCERM	EST.B	Proposals on BC.1 will need to be complete Coastal Vulnerability Assessment and demonstrate will not impact/be impacted by sea cliff stability.	Support with changes		Modification	Agree. Reference should be made to the need for development to be informed by a Coastal Vulnerability Assessment and demonstrate it will not impact or be impacted by sea cliff stability in line with Policy C5, given the site's allocation.	Amend area EST.B to reference Coastal Vulnerability Assessment
0057	East Cliff and Springborne Residents Group	P14	Concern regarding the impact of the Parking SPD and the lack of residential parking provided by new development in the ward, the 450 windfall figure in the ward, lack of good public transport, need more family houses not flats, loss of job opportunities through Southcote Road allocation, lack of mention of social housing, second homes, student accommodation, how electrical vehicle charging points can be accommodated for flats.	Objection		No action	A number of these issues are covered by other policies in the plan such as housing mix and affordable housing. Windfall figures reflect historic trends and the HELAA identified further windfall opportunities. Parking SPD seeks to support modal shift and supports lower parking provision in the most sustainable locations. A proportion of Southcote Road employment area retained.	NA

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0148	FCERM	P14	Clarification required on coastal change/sea cliff stability risks and approach to addressing these issues (including Policy C5 applicability). Clarification also needed on approach to flood risk in the ward.	Support with changes		No action	Do not consider that it is necessary for this ward policy to contain information regarding coastal erosion and sea cliff stability risk zones or for a cross-reference to Policy C5 to be included. Consider Policy C5 sufficiently addresses this issue, the plan will be read as a whole and it is unnecessary to duplicate policy requirements. Text regarding approach to flood risk is only included in ward policies where this is not adequately covered by generic flood risk policy/flood risk is a significant issue for development near the coast/river/harbour in the ward. It is considered that generic flood risk policy adequately addresses the approach to flood risk in this ward and that text regarding flood risk is therefore not required in this ward policy.	NA
0150	Ken Parke on behalf of various clients 3	P14	Unclear how 700 dwellings figure has been derived, or if it reflects the ward's housing need. Unclear whether development is expected to comply with Policy H2. High reliance on windfall sites when focus restricted to local opportunity areas and streets - question achievability. No need for prescriptive approach to building heights - do not take permitted development rights into account. Unclear whether development outside local opportunity areas and streets is permissible	Objection		No action	All the wards collectively contribute to the delivery of housing. Each ward has its own characteristics and constraints which impact the number of homes which can be delivered. The figure for the number of homes is calculate from a combination of existing commitments, proposed allocations and windfall sites. The windfall figure has been calculated using historical averages for the number of homes typically delivered within the ward. Development would be expected to comply with other plan policies include H2 Affordable Housing. LOA/LOS identify where windfall can be focused and increased heights achieved but this does not prevent windfall in other locations. Approach to heights seeks to provide claritv about the design expectations.	NA
0200	Meyrick Estate	P14	Question overall effectiveness, soundness and deliverability of policy. Differing characters of East Cliff and Springbourne should be reflected in the plan. Site centred policy approach not suitable. Plan should include clear infrastructure requirements, otherwise no incentive for it to be provided. No firm proposals or delivery objectives, and no mechanism to link improvements under criterion 1f to development or other funding. Achievability and deliverability of development in local opportunity areas unclear. Will result in ad hoc, piecemeal development, and do not provide sufficient vision or guidance for any meaningful change to benefit neighbourhoods. Enhancements (such as maintenance of parks, events etc.) across whole neighbourhood should be sought, rather than only in local opportunity areas. Must identify links between character, sense of place, heritage, linkages and infrastructure and how they should and will be enhanced. Should include improved links to seafront and town centre, well-designed walkways and rampos. quality sea front infrastructure and cliff railway	Objection	Yes	No action	References already exist to improving links tin the area, detailed proposals would be developed/considered outside of the local plan process. Differing character areas reflected in townscape character work and thrust of design policies in chapter 7.	NA
0284	Gervis Properties Ltd / Hinton Admiral Estate	P14	Estate are major landowners in East Cliff area. Considers development limits should only be imposed where there are clear and compelling reasons and release of Green Belt areas is crucial to accommodate strategic growth. Questions whether policies impacting East Cliff have been considered with potential impact on Green Belt management. Considers East Cliff and Springbourne areas to be distinctly different and should be reflected in policy/plan. Policy/policy is too focussed on individual proposals (allocated sites and opportunity areas) which will facilitate ad hoc/piecemeal development rather than benefitting entire neighbourhood and key diagram does not provide comprehensive planning for area for future. Discussed other policies in relation to P14 including H7, H8, BE6, E14, C5, NE5 and NE1 which are logged against those policies.  Considers plan to be justified as necessary but not positively prepared and effective. Considers plan to be aligned with national policy and NPPF but more clarity is needed regarding relationship between different sections of plan and individual policies and cross referencing between vision and objectives.	Objection	Yes	No action	The Council has chosen not to amend Green Belt boundaries through the local plan process. The plan recognises the different character areas in the supporting text referencing the different sustainable neighbourhoods and broad townscape characteristics.	NA
0371	Clifford Morse	P14	No consideration of impact of tourist traffic and resulting congestion. Second homes are not mentioned, but big issue for the ward, particularly within proposed East Cliff Sustainable Neighbourhood.	Objection	No	No action	Measures to management peak tourist traffic are managed outside of the Local Plan process. The general transport policies in chapter 10 support reducing congestion. There would only be the potential to manage second homes on new development but this could have a knock on impact on existing stock. Other mechanisms are considered to be more suitable to managing second homes.	NA
0576	Richard Cleveland	P14	Some road traffic improvements not taken into consideration (Springbourne roundabout and station roundabout)	Objection	No	no action	Holdenhurst Road is specifically mentioned in the ward policy as is the area around the train station	NA

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0597	Hampshire County Council	P15	Cobbs Quay and Dawkins Road should be allocated as employment sites. Consideration should be given to local transport, traffic, parking etc.	Objection		No action	Dawkins Road is allocated as an existing employment site. Cobbs Quay is a marina and any proposals impacting it would be assessed under policy NE5 Coastline which seeks to prevent the loss of any existing boat yards/storage areas. New proposals for employment uses would consider parking and traffic impacts under the transport policies in chapter 10.	NA
0079	The Society for Poole	P15	Policy P15 is not necessarily sound and likely ineffective in serving the public interest, as reference is made to possible masterplan for Former Power Station site - this is overdue and essential to demonstrate soundness / practicality. However, support requirements concerning recreation ground at Turlin Moor (H.3)	Objection		No action	The Council development team is progressing the development of the former Power station site and exploring masterplan options.	NA
0148	FCERM	P15	Need to add clarification regarding coastal erosion and sea cliff stability risk zones and applicability of Policy C5 in these areas.	Support with changes		No action	Do not consider that it is necessary for this ward policy to contain information regarding coastal erosion and sea cliff stability risk zones or for a cross-reference to Policy C5 to be included. Consider Policy C5 sufficiently addresses this issue, the plan will be read as a whole and it is unnecessary to duplicate policy requirements.	NA
0150	Ken Parke on behalf of various clients 3	P15	Unclear how 2,060 dwellings figure has been derived, or if it reflects the ward's housing need. Unclear whether development is expected to comply with Policy H2. Low reliance on windfall sites, but question whether allocated sites and sites with permission will come forward in a reasonable timeframe due to their complexities. Question reliance on windfall sites when focus restricted to local opportunity areas and streets - question achievability. No need for prescriptive approach to building heights - do not take permitted development rights into account. -Unclear whether development outside local opportunity areas and streets is permissible	Objection		No action	All the wards collectively contribute to the delivery of housing. Each ward has its own characteristics and constraints which impact the number of homes which can be delivered. The figure for the number of homes is calculate from a combination of existing commitments, proposed allocations and windfall sites. The windfall figure has been calculated using historical averages for the number of homes typically delivered within the ward. Development would be expected to comply with other plan policies include H2 Affordable Housing. LOA/LOS identify where windfall can be focused and increased heights achieved but this does not prevent windfall in other locations. Approach to heights seeks to provide clarity about the design expectations. On Council owned sites the Council is working to ensure the delivery of sites.	NA
0164	Environment Agency	P15	Sites meet the sequential test and no issue with flood risk assessment being required at application stage as part of exception test. SFRA L2 and flood risk management strategies may determine it is not possible for these sites to meet part 2 of the exception test, particularly where flood risk management infrastructure improvements required to make development (including access) safe for its lifetime are not viable.	Support		No action	Support and uncertainty regarding viability of funding strategies noted.	NA
0164	Environment Agency	P15	Support update to SFRA L2, required to understand flood risk now and in future alongside and required interventions. SFRA L2 needs to be in place prior to determination of any applications that cannot manage whole of the risk, including access. Financial contributions may be required to secure any require long term improvements.	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0287	Network Rail	P15	Concern over delayed SFRA2 especially for site allocations H1, H2 and H4 and unknown impact upon the rail network. Supports H1 (ix) contribution towards a high frequency bus route to Poole rail station, but this should be applied to all allocations in P15.	Support with changes	Yes	No action	We have commissioned SFRA2 aiming to complete and publish it during the examination. This will provide the necessary protections to the railway from new development and can also be applied to any developments that come forward before adoption. Recognise that if this is delayed the policy wording for P15 Hamworthy may need amending to highlight issue of ensuring that flood risk to the railway is avoided. Agree bus measures are necessary across the ward, but reference in H2 is only highlighted to the significant amount of development.	NA
0293	Dorset County Football Association	P15	Hamworthy Recreation Ground is listed as public open space, has previously been used as a football pitch but now hardly used. Site should be considered for a 3G development - located next to existing facility and would help to meet demand for football.	Comment	No	No action	The recreation ground is a public open space and is located adjacent to the former Power Station site which will be developed for in the region of 900 homes. The policy on public open space seeks to protect these areas but does allow development to take place if replacement space is provided or the benefits of alternative sports or recreation provision out weight the loss of the current use.	NA
0335	Ann Smeaton	P15	Incorrect fact - no local centre in Hamworthy, and lacking in shopping facilities.	Objection	No	No action	Hamworthy local centre is defined in the plan and on the policies map. Policies exist to support and strengthen the role of the centre.	NA



ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0447	Poole Quays Forum	P15	Hamworthy has poor access to shops. Cycling and walking only serves the young and the fit but large number of retired people. Bus Services are unreliable and infrequent. P15(1ei) There are no high frequency bus routes to be maintained, they should be im-proved Significant congestion on Blandford Road. Lengthy walk to catch buses. Some areas no bus service after 18:00. P15(3aiii&iv) Parking will be needed for staff and customers. P15(3dii) Development should not exceed seven storeys, site not suitable for a tall building. Delete the word predominantly. P15(3v) Wording should be stronger to provide an arts facility. Parking will be needed for staff and customers. P15(3vi) Parking will be needed for staff and customers.	Objection		No action	The Plan seeks to balance the demands on different modes of transport and support walking, cycling and public transport use. P15(1ei) Development of former Power Station site will contribute towards improving bus services in the Hamworthy area. P15(3aiii&iv) Parking will be secured in accordance with the parking SPD. P15(3dii) Consider modification to reflect the planning approval which is predominantly between three and six storey. P15(3v) The provision of an arts facilities needs further exploration and market testing. P15(3vi) Parking will be secured in accordance with the parking SPD.	NA
0579	Richard Terry	P15	Density of proposals on water's edge at Poole and Hamworthy will not be able to preserve or enhance coastline and landscapes. H.1 partially covered by existing ecological network (although not shown on BCP mapping) so does not protect and enhance the ecological network. Also forms part of the Dorset Landscape Network but not shown on plan so cannot offer protection to this. No room for meaningful urban greening at proposed densities (150-300dph). Unclear how biodiversity net gain will be achieved at densities of 150-300dph	Objection	No	No action	BCP Council have used the DLNP work to inform the ecological networks defined in the local plan. Any review will be informed by the forthcoming LNRS mapping. Urban Greening and Biodiversity net gain can still be achieved at higher densities. More detailed assessment in relation to BNG for allocated sites will form part of planning applications as the sites come forward.	NA
0040	Natural England	P15	Due to scale and complexity of the site and its ecological sensitivities some sections appear to conflict, so consider minor rewording to insert "along the Backwater Channel" to a) (vii). The same might be applied to sites H.2 v) and H.4. v).	Support with changes		Modification	Agree, add clarity to route along the Backwater Channel	Amend to reference continuous walking route along the Backwater Channel
0223	Fortitudo Ltd	H.2	Extant permission on site is for buildings up to 14 storeys, however policy requires proposals to be predominately between 3 and 7 storeys. Policy permits heights half that already permitted.	Objection		No action	The policy wording sets out the scheme should be predominantly between three and seven storey, which reflects the consent. This does not preclude an element of limited taller structures.	NA
0282	Historic England	H.2	Policy should require stepping down in height towards adjacent low rise buildings.	Objection		Modification	Agree	Amend to reference reduced height adjacent to low rise buildings
0351	Sport England	H.3	Support protection of playing fields. Have worked with BCP to support delivery of housing in area.	Support	No	No action	Support noted	NA
0040	Natural England	H.3	Previous Natural England advice about avoidance and mitigation measures are not included and the policy is therefore insufficient at this time.	Objection		Modification	Agree	Amend site H3 to ensure wildlife and habitats in Poole Harbour are protected
0282	Historic England	H.4	Adjust wording as no listed buildings opposite the site	Objection		Modification	Agree	Amend to removed reference to Listed Buildings opposite the site
0018	Sandra McCombe	P16	Supports maintaining green spaces and trees.	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0148	FCERM	P16	Clarification required on coastal change/sea cliff stability risks and approach to addressing these issues (including Policy C5 applicability). Clarification also needed on approach to flood risk in the ward.	Support with changes		No action	Do not consider that it is necessary for this ward policy to contain information regarding coastal erosion and sea cliff stability risk zones or for a cross-reference to Policy C5 to be included. Consider Policy C5 sufficiently addresses this issue, the plan will be read as a whole and it is unnecessary to duplicate policy requirements. Text regarding approach to flood risk is only included in ward policies where this is not adequately covered by generic flood risk policy/flood risk is a significant issue for development near the coast/river/harbour in the ward. It is considered that generic flood risk policy adequately addresses the approach to flood risk in this ward and that text regarding flood risk is therefore not required in this ward policy.	NA

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0150	Ken Parke on behalf of various clients 3	P16	Unclear how 545 dwellings figure has been derived, or if it reflects the ward's housing need. Unclear whether development is expected to comply with Policy H2. High reliance on windfall sites when focus restricted to local opportunity areas and streets - question achievability. Unclear why size of local community shops is restricted and they are restricted to some parts of the ward. No need for prescriptive approach to building heights - do not take permitted development rights into account. Unclear whether development outside local opportunity areas and streets is permissible	Objection		No action	All the wards collectively contribute to the delivery of housing. Each ward has its own characteristics and constraints which impact the number of homes which can be delivered. The figure for the number of homes is calculate from a combination of existing commitments, proposed allocations and windfall sites. The windfall figure has been calculated using historical averages for the number of homes typically delivered within the ward. Development would be expected to comply with other plan policies include H2 Affordable Housing. LOA/LOS identify where windfall can be focused and increased heights achieved but this does not prevent windfall in other locations. Size of shops is restricted to avoid an adverse impact on existing retail areas/centres and the locations highlighted where there is a current lack of facilities. Approach to heights seeks to provide clarity about the design expectations.	NA
0223	Fortitudo Ltd	P16	Without allocating Green Belt, the Council is not meeting numerical housing need, and not providing appropriate mix of family housing.	Objection		No action	In accordance with the NPPF the Plan does not propose to release Green Belt to meet housing needs.	NA
0297	Sir Christopher Chope MP	P16	Policy should specifically reference conditions for rear infill development on larger plots. Concerned that 410 windfall homes will threaten the quality and character of the residential neighbourhood whilst high density over development damages the environment.	Objection		No action	Windfall development will be subject to other policies in the plan including those on townscape character and the natural environment.	NA
0323	Alison Killen	P16	Housing requirement for Highcliffe too high, due to inadequate healthcare facilities, road infrastructure, and capacity for in-migration	Objection	No	No action	Housing requirement reflects historic trends. CIL is collected to spend on the provision of infrastructure.	NA
0353	Brenda Wilson	P16	Overdevelopment in ward and infrastructure concerns.	Objection	No	No action	Housing requirement reflects historic trends. CIL is collected to spend on the provision of infrastructure.	NA
0419	Geoff Bantock	P16	Support new homes in the ward and hope these will be two or three bed	Support	No	No action	Support noted	NA
0019	Nigel Brooks	P16	Windfall figure for Highcliffe and Walkford is too high and encourages building of flats which will result in an unbalanced community. Waterford Road is not suitable as a Local Opportunity Street. The Saulfland Place neighbourhood parade of shops is in the neighbouring Ward of Mudeford, Stanpit & West Highcliffe. Building heights approach needs to prevent, a three- storey home being built next to a bungalow resulting in a loss of privacy and overlooking.	Objection	Yes	Modification	The overall strategy of urban intensification will require denser forms of development within the urban area. The windfall figures are based on historical trends and the HELAA demonstrates further windfall opportunities exist. Windfall development will be subject to policies regarding townscape and living conditions. Agree amend reference to Saulfland Place.	Remove reference to Saulfland Place.
0133	Brentland	P16	Jesmond Avenue should be allocated for residential use. Site should not be allocated as open space, no right of access. Former safeguarded Highcliffe by-pass route, no recreation value, one footpath crosses the site as a functional link. Site is not tranquil and nor rich in wildlife. Previous pre app supported principle of residential purposes. Sustainable location, can deliver much needed family housing, health centre car park, open spaces and play areas.	Objection		Follow up	Planning history demonstrates difficulties with bringing forward residential on the site. Allocated sites have a threshold of 15 or more units, unlikely this could be achieved on the site with the various constraints. Review mapping to ensure open space is correctly and consistently shown.	Review mapping to ensure open space is correctly and consistently shown.
0298	Michael Holmes	P16	Definition / explanation of what is mean by "building context height" is needed	Objection	Yes	Modification	Amendment text in built environment chapter to provide further clarity.	Amend supporting text in para 7.37 to clarify building context heights
0597	Hampshire County Council	P16	The level of anticipated windfall sites and committed development within wards bordering Hampshire does not appear to have been assessed for cumulative impacts. Transport Assessment needed.	Objection		Follow up	Our transport planners are in dialogue with Hampshire County Council over cross boundary flow data emerging from the new updated 2022 Saturn model for Dorset. A Statement of Common Ground will be prepared and submitted to the examination.	Follow up through statement of common ground
0449	James Findlay	P16	Windfall figure is unrealistic, could result in more flat development. Building heights must not adversely affect character or local residents. Housing that does not require parking is not suitable.	Objection	No	No action	Housing requirement reflects historic trends. Townscape policy in place to support good design outcomes. Some additional flatted development will be required to support the strategy of urban intensification and protection of the Green Belt.	NA
0456	Highcliffe & Walkford Parish Council	P16	Support and object to P16. Support part 1 Sustainable Neighbourhoods, 2 Retail and 1 Local Opportunity areas. Challenge housing figures as windfall proposals would entail the loss of gardens and amenity land. Proposals will need to preserve the setting of the grade II* listed Greystones. Concerned that additional height on some buildings will have a negative impact on the street scene.	Objection		No action	The policy makes a specific reference to preserving the setting of Greystones. Urban intensification is required to support the overall strategy and some increases in height will be required. Windfall development will continue and this will need to comply with the general development management policies on townscape, living conditions and natural environment.	NA

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0458	Joan Rose	P16	The proposed housing figure of 545 homes in the ward is unacceptable and unrealistic. The neighbourhood plan concluded there are no development sites available. Currently more apartment blocks than required as evidenced by number still for sale. Infill housing creates cramped plots. 4.a.(i) encourages building up to 3 and a half storeys which is unacceptable. Buildings at this height would not meet 4.a.(iii and (iii) as will not enhance historic characteristics or district centre's retail, cultural and community facility offer.	Objection	Yes	No action	Housing requirement reflects historic trends. Townscape policy in place to support good design outcomes. Some additional flattened development will be required to support the strategy of urban intensification and protection of the Green Belt.	NA
0474	Deborah Saunders	P16	Windfall figure in the ward is too high and will have a detrimental impact on character and infrastructure/amenities. Likely to be flattened development. Enhancements to green spaces needs more detail and should not impact negatively on wildlife.	Objection	No	No action	Housing requirement reflects historic trends. Townscape policy in place to support good design outcomes. Some additional flattened development will be required to support the strategy of urban intensification and protection of the Green Belt.	NA
0508	Maggie Puttick	P16	Considers windfall 410 to be too much and recent development is imbalanced between flats and family homes. Considers plots will be cramped and flats will impact on character, add pressure to local services. In Local Opportunity Streets does not consider additional floors will enhance quality and character and is for council tax generation. New flat developments purchased as holiday homes and not for local people or contribute to social/affordable housing which is needed.	Objection	No	No action	Housing requirement reflects historic trends. Townscape policy in place to support good design outcomes. Some additional flattened development will be required to support the strategy of urban intensification and protection of the Green Belt.	NA
0518	Mark Youngson	P16	No evidence provided to show accommodation of housing proposed in ward, taking in to account services and infrastructure consideration. No guarantees of considering character of area for new builds. Too many flats and larger developments replacing single properties, and would not want this to continue, but no confirmation from policy. No details provided for development of infrastructure, and what impact on area would be, and proposed uses need to be stated. Plan should state if it intends to change make-up of population by development intended.	Objection	No	No action	Housing requirement reflects historic trends. Townscape policy in place to support good design outcomes. Some additional flattened development will be required to support the strategy of urban intensification and protection of the Green Belt.	NA
0577	Richard Dickinson	P16	Unclear how dwellings will be accommodated. Not based on understanding of Highcliffe area's restrictions, including strain on infrastructure (doctors surgeries and highway issues). Policies only address future housing demand - not current residents' quality of life.	Objection	No	No action	Housing requirement reflects historic trends. CIL is collected to spend on the provision of infrastructure.	NA
0040	Natural England	P17	Welcome the policy restrictions for allocations K.1 & K.2.	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0079	The Society for Poole	P17	Policy P17 is sound and effective in serving the public interest as it seeks to rectify infrastructure issues.	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0150	Ken Parke on behalf of various clients 3	P17	Unclear how 255 dwellings figure has been derived, or if it reflects the ward's housing need. Unclear whether development is expected to comply with Policy H2. High reliance on windfall sites when focus restricted to local opportunity areas and streets - question achievability. Development will also likely be constrained by proximity to Dorset Heathlands. No need for prescriptive approach to building heights - do not take permitted development rights into account. Unclear whether development outside local opportunity areas and streets is permissible	Objection		No action	All the wards collectively contribute to the delivery of housing. Each ward has its own characteristics and constraints which impact the number of homes which can be delivered. The figure for the number of homes is calculate from a combination of existing commitments, proposed allocations and windfall sites. The windfall figure has been calculated using historical averages for the number of homes typically delivered within the ward. Development would be expected to comply with other plan policies include H2 Affordable Housing. LOA/LOS identify where windfall can be focused and increased heights achieved but this does not prevent windfall in other locations. Approach to heights seeks to provide clarity about the design expectations.	NA

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0245	Miller Homes and Bellway Homes (Wessex)	P17	Kinson Manor Farm has close relationship with Kinson Sustainable Neighbourhood which is a sustainable location in walking distance of numerous facilities and amenities, as shown on key diagram. Plan notes bus journey times to Bournemouth Town Centre require improvement, but public transport connectivity in area is exceptional for an out of town site, and will improve due to planned Merley/Bearwood to Bournemouth Town Centre public transport improvements. 80% of delivery in Kinson expected via windfall - unclear whether windfall capacity exists in Kinson. Development supported in local opportunity areas and streets just windfall rebranded as could happen without designations. Ringwood Road retail area car park frontages and need to amalgamate small existing residential curtilages on Wimborne Road suggest supply from these uncertain at best and unlikely to deliver significant numbers of private or affordable homes. Kinson Manor Farm site could deliver all sustainable neighbourhood ambitions in policy and provide sustainable housing development - aspirations undeliverable without large number of homes coming forward as no alternative sources of material funding available in Kinson and financial contributions from development further afield will not meet funding NPPF tests. - Kinson Manor Farm contiguous with northern edge of Kinson sustainable neighbourhood. Constraints include flood zones, OHP lines, Green Belt. Largely flat and has number of access points. Offers phased delivery of part of Stour Valley Park in beneficial location, with opportunity for visitor hub and new public access, and strategic SANG and Biodiversity Net Gain that could mitigate site and other development. See Developable Area Plan, should be considered strong candidate for allocation	Objection	Yes	No action	Windfall figures based on historical trends and further windfall potential identified through the HELAA. In accordance with the NPPF the Plan does not propose to release Green Belt to meet housing needs.	NA
0402	Elizabeth and Richard Larcombe	K.1	Kinson Baths site should be used for young peoples recreation activities, a community centre, play area or community garden. Close to heathland and not suitable for residential. Site was gifted to local people for enjoyment.	Objection	No	No action	Allocation provides for a range of different potential uses.	NA
0583	Rob Macallan	K1	Unsuitable for care home due to proximity to watercourse, cemetery and SSSI. Provision of safe place for community, such as community or day centre, would be appropriate.	Objection	No	No action	Allocation provides for a range of different potential uses.	NA
0150	Ken Parke on behalf of various clients 3	P18	Unclear how 140 dwellings figure has been derived, or if it reflects the ward's housing need. Unclear whether development is expected to comply with Policy H2. High reliance on windfall sites when focus restricted to local opportunity areas and streets - question achievability. Unclear why size of local community shops is restricted and they are restricted to some parts of the ward. No need for prescriptive approach to building heights - do not take permitted development rights into account. Unclear whether development outside local opportunity areas and streets is permissible	Objection		No action	All the wards collectively contribute to the delivery of housing. Each ward has its own characteristics and constraints which impact the number of homes which can be delivered. The figure for the number of homes is calculate from a combination of existing commitments, proposed allocations and windfall sites. The windfall figure has been calculated using historical averages for the number of homes typically delivered within the ward. Development would be expected to comply with other plan policies include H2 Affordable Housing. LOA/LOS identify where windfall can be focused and increased heights achieved but this does not prevent windfall in other locations. Size of shops is restricted to avoid an adverse impact on existing retail areas/centres and the locations highlighted where there is a current lack of facilities. Approach to heights seeks to provide clarity about the design expectations.	NA
0233	University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust	P18	Amendments needed to reflect the Trusts aspirations and the significantly more homes could be provided.	Objection	Yes	Follow up	Discuss any potential to amend Wessex Fields policy in employment chapter though a statement of common ground.	Follow up through statement of common ground
0257	AFC Bournemouth	P18	Support policy intent, suggest amendments. Seek enhanced stadium capacity at Kings Park. AFC Bournemouth, has lowest capacity stadium in Premier League. Athletic stadium could be relocated to alternative location - policy should not preclude this. All training moving to new facility. Club has many economic and community benefits. AFC Bournemouth makes a tangible contribution to LP objectives. Concerns about reduced vehicle access on operations.	Objection	Yes	Follow up	Discuss any potential amendment surrounding the stadium through a statement of common ground	Follow up through statement of common ground
0282	Historic England	P18	Policy should require efforts to retain non-designated heritage assets.	Objection		Modification	Agree	Amend to reference heritage assets

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0150	Ken Parke on behalf of various clients 3	P19	Unclear how 160 dwellings figure has been derived, or if it reflects the ward's housing need. Unclear whether development is expected to comply with Policy H2. High reliance on windfall sites when focus restricted to local opportunity areas and streets - question achievability. No need for prescriptive approach to building heights - do not take permitted development rights into account. Unclear whether development outside local opportunity areas and streets is permissible	Objection		No action	All the wards collectively contribute to the delivery of housing. Each ward has its own characteristics and constraints which impact the number of homes which can be delivered. The figure for the number of homes is calculate from a combination of existing commitments, proposed allocations and windfall sites. The windfall figure has been calculated using historical averages for the number of homes typically delivered within the ward. Development would be expected to comply with other plan policies include H2 Affordable Housing. LOA/LOS identify where windfall can be focused and increased heights achieved but this does not prevent windfall in other locations. Approach to heights seeks to provide clarity about the design expectations.	NA
0082	Christchurch Harbour Ornithological Group	P20	Support allocation at Roeshot Hill.	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0150	Ken Parke on behalf of various clients 3	P20	Unclear how 1,365 dwellings figure has been derived, or if it reflects the ward's housing need. Unclear whether development is expected to comply with Policy H2. High reliance on windfall sites when focus restricted to local opportunity areas and streets - question achievability. Unclear why size of local community shops is restricted and they are restricted to some parts of the ward. No need for prescriptive approach to building heights - do not take permitted development rights into account. Unclear whether development outside local opportunity areas and streets is permissible.	Objection		No action	All the wards collectively contribute to the delivery of housing. Each ward has its own characteristics and constraints which impact the number of homes which can be delivered. The figure for the number of homes is calculate from a combination of existing commitments, proposed allocations and windfall sites. The windfall figure has been calculated using historical averages for the number of homes typically delivered within the ward. Development would be expected to comply with other plan policies include H2 Affordable Housing. LOA/LOS identify where windfall can be focused and increased heights achieved but this does not prevent windfall in other locations. Size of shops is restricted to avoid an adverse impact on existing retail areas/centres and the locations highlighted where there is a current lack of facilities. Approach to heights seeks to provide clarity about the design expectations.	NA
0040	Natural England	P20	MSWH.3 (80 units) should provide SANG, and considered in-combination with MSWH.2 which is making provision for an unspecified number of dwellings.	Objection		Modification	Agree	Amend to include reference of HIP/SANG
0148	FCERM	P20	Clarification required on coastal change/sea cliff stability risks and approach to addressing these issues beyond site MSWH.4 (including Policy C5 applicability). Clarification also needed on approach to flood risk in the ward. Development will not be permitted within coastal erosion and sea cliff stability risk zones (including on MSWH.4) until full funding to secure sites is secured	Support with changes		Modification	Agree that text should be included approach to flood risk for this ward, as many properties near Christchurch Harbour are at risk and the area at risk could be covered by the Christchurch SFRA L2. Do not consider that it is necessary for this ward policy to contain information regarding coastal erosion and sea cliff stability risk zones or for a cross-reference to Policy C5 should be included. The plan will be read as a whole and it is unnecessary to duplicate policy requirements.	Amend to add additional criteria to end of policy to address the approach to flood risk in Mudeford, Stanpit & West Highcliffe
0597	Hampshire County Council	P20	The level of anticipated windfall sites and committed development within wards bordering Hampshire does not appear to have been assessed for cumulative impacts. Transport Assessment needed.	Objection		Follow up	Our transport planners are in dialogue with Hampshire County Council over cross boundary flow data emerging from the new updated 2022 Saturn model for Dorset. A Statement of Common Ground will be prepared and submitted to the examination.	Follow up through statement of common ground
0195	Christchurch Town Council Neighbourhood Working Group	P20	Not clear what results in Mudeford & Stanpit and Jumpers Common & St Catherine's Hill Sustainable Neighbourhoods being identified as less sustainable than others, or how proximity to different facilities/amenities has been weighted in overall sustainability scoring. GIS layers that informed sustainable neighbourhoods should be 'live' to help inform neighbourhood plans and decision making. Access to dental surgeries and allotments should also be taken into account. Friars Cliff and the Runway – could mention potential for neighbourhood plan to identify locations for a local centre or expansion of the existing parade, and also mention employment areas. Employment area – could part of this support mixed use development to help with lack of local centre – but would this conflict with E7? Steamer Point – if retained could include summary of planning history and reflect current application for 10 homes.	Support with changes		No action	These issues could be looked at by NP but no specific reference required in the local plan. While current application is for ten large homes, previous applications have sought a greater quantum of development. No objection from land owner to proposed quantum of development. More detail regarding the GIS map layers can be shared with NP groups outside the local plan process.	NA
0297	Sir Christopher Chope MP	P20	Objects to allocation of Roeshot Nursery for residential use at expense of current allotments which is valued local amenity in demand. Suggests allocation should be withdrawn.	Objection		No action	Roeshot nursery site does not form part of the adjacent allotment area.	NA
0336	Anne Gayler	P20	Roeshot Hill - Improvements to services and infrastructure required to support new housing. Overhead cables must be laid in ground to prevent 'sink estate'. Proximity to sewerage treatment works and resulting smell. Increase in cars will cause further congestion problems, and area needs a bypass.	Objection	No	No action	Roeshot Hill also has an outline planning consent approved where these issues have been debated. Various contributions will be collected for infrastructure improvements.	NA
0419	Geoff Bantock	P20	More consideration needed to infrastructure and facilities eg schools, doctors, dentists and the road/transport system.	Objection	No	No action	Infrastructure requirements are detailed in the infrastructure delivery plan. CIL payments are collected to help support new infrastructure	NA

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0578	Raymond Nottage	P20	Plan should have objective to designate Christchurch Harbour as SPA due to harm from pollution and to habitats. Plan not legally compliant, as does not provide greater protection to Christchurch Harbour beyond SPA and SSSI status given harm arising from criminal activity by Wessex Water	Objection	Yes	No action	Designation of a new SPA is an issue outside of the planning system.	NA
0597	Hampshire County Council	BG.2	The Hilton Admiral railway station is not referenced. Existing pedestrian and cycle access is poor. Roeshot Hill could potentially help secure improvements to Hilton Admiral railway station by active travel modes. The traffic forecast report (September 2023) suggests additional traffic flows on roads in Hampshire. Roeshot Hill could potentially help secure improvements needed to A35 Lymington Road, Ringwood Road and part of Lynhurst Road A35. Proposed site allocations Roeshot Hill (BG.2), Roeshot Nursery (MSWH.1), and Hoburne Farm Estate fall within the buffer zone of Roeshot Quarry, wording requiring potential mitigation measures and appropriate consideration of the site required. The River Mude river crossing must not restrict the flow of the watercourse and will require a Flood Risk Activity Permit from the Environment Agency.	Objection		Modification	Agree. The Hilton Admiral railway station is referenced in the supporting text but suggest modification to include reference within the policy. Amend to reference Roeshot Quarry, provide additional detail about routes for improvement and the function of the River Mude.	Amend to reference Hinton Admiral railway station, Roeshot Quarry, provide additional detail about routes for improvement and the function of the River Mude.
0306	Gervis Property Company	MSWH.1	Meyrick Estate Management is the managing agent for entities of Hinton Admiral Estate. Troubled over wording of allocation of MSWH.1 to include specialist housing as currently allocated for conventional housing. Site is deliverable and should be allocated for mix of uses including family housing with 40% affordable housing. BCP's unconstrained Local Housing Need exceeds constraint based capacity and highlighting need to maximise yield from sites capable of delivering housing for it to be sound and progress. Also Planning Inspectorate confirmed Council's present housing land supply is 4.1 years so more need for conventional housing to cover shortfall. Considers it to be unjustified, and not sound or effective to restrict development to specialist housing and also unevidenced and inconsistent with NPPF. Also raised issue regarding planning permissions on site and associated Section 106 agreements relating to delivery of a SANG.	Objection	Yes	Modification	Policy does not preclude the delivery of non specialist housing but amend to reference family homes. Affordable housing to be delivered in accordance with policy H2.	Amend MSWH.1 to reference homes suitable for families.
0597	Hampshire County Council	MSWH.1	Proposed site allocations Roeshot Hill (BG.2), Roeshot Nursery (MSWH.1), and Hoburne Farm Estate fall within the buffer zone of Roeshot Quarry, wording requiring potential mitigation measures and appropriate consideration of the site required.	Objection		Modification	Agree	Amend to add additional supporting text about the quarry and add wording to BG2, MSWH1 and MSWH.3 to reference the quarry and any necessary mitigation.
0456	Highcliffe & Walkford Parish Council	MSWH.1	Object to Roeshot nursery allocation as the site is a green corridor	Objection		No action	The site has been previously allocated for development as part of the wider Roeshot Hill allocation but falls under a different ownerships. Proposals on the site will have to meet the requirement of natural environment policies.	NA
0138	Burry and Knight	MSWH.2	Hoburne Park is available for development but an alternative location would be needed for the holiday park operation. Amend policy to specify number of park homes that can be used for residential or how viability will be assessed.	Objection		No action	The number of homes that could be used for residential would need to not undermined the operation of the park for tourist accommodation (unless an alternative location was found). This would need to be assessed depending on the nature of the proposal and information about the business operation.	NA
0138	Burry and Knight	MSWH.3	Quantum of homes does not represent an efficient use of land, the quantum should reflect the current live application.	Support with changes		No action	Various issues identified by consultees with live application raising concerns with the suitability of a higher number of homes.	NA
0282	Historic England	MSWH.3	Part of the site a conservation area, careful design and retention of trees needed.	Objection		Modification	Agree	Amend to reference trees and heritage assets
0597	Hampshire County Council	MSWH.3	Proposed site allocations Roeshot Hill (BG.2), Roeshot Nursery (MSWH.1), and Hoburne Farm Estate fall within the buffer zone of Roeshot Quarry, wording requiring potential mitigation measures and appropriate consideration of the site required.	Objection		Modification	Agree	Amend to add additional supporting text about the quarry and add wording to BG2, MSWH1 and MSWH.3 to reference the quarry and any necessary mitigation.
0027	Pennyfarthing Homes	MSWH.4	Objection to detailed wording of Steamer Point allocation (MSWH.4) and suggested rewording provided relating to ecology and biodiversity; preservation of trees; surface water drainage; flood risk assessment; and remediation and de-contamination.	Objection	Yes	Modification	Agree to review and update the wording for clarification where required	Amend MSWH.4 to retain the ecological buffer, important trees and address the need for remediation and decontamination of the site

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0148	FCERM	MSWH.4	Development on this site can only be permitted once overall funding to secure the site (in light of coastal erosion and cliff stability issues) has been secured. There is a typo in policy wording.	Support with changes		Modification	Amend typo	Delete extra ii)
0195	Christchurch Town Council Neighbourhood Plan Working Group	MSWH.4	Should split strategic and non strategic. Sustainable neighbourhoods – helpful to include reference to retaining employment areas allowing their flexible redevelopment to meet future business needs. Steamer Point should change from 'to deliver in the region of 20 homes' to '10 homes' to reflect current planning application.	Objection		No action	As detailed elsewhere ward policies are considered strategic. While current application is for ten large homes, previous applications have sought a greater quantum of development. No objection from land owner to proposed quantum of development.	NA
0615	Friars Cliff Residents Association	MSWH.4	Allocated housing number unsound, as at appeal proposal for this number refused due to density, design, loss of trees, light pollution amongst other factors, 10 dwellings suitable due to location sensitivity and site size. Neighbourhood plan should set figure.	Objection	Yes	No action	The current application is for ten large properties, a different type of accommodation such as semi detached dwellings could achieve twenty homes without an harmful impact	NA
0071	Goadsby on behalf of various clients	P21	Green Belt release required to meet housing needs. Land at north Bournemouth should be allocated for an urban extension for 345 homes and supporting infrastructure. Key diagram should be amended for an urban extension	Objection	Yes	No action	Site is within the Green Belt and in accordance with the NPPF the Plan does not propose to release Green Belt to meet housing needs. In accordance with the NPPF the Plan does not propose to release Green Belt to meet housing needs.	NA
0150	Ken Parke on behalf of various clients 3	P21	Unclear how 160 dwellings figure has been derived, or if it reflects the ward's housing need. Unclear whether development is expected to comply with Policy H2. High reliance on windfall sites when focus restricted to local opportunity areas and streets - question achievability. No need for prescriptive approach to building heights - do not take permitted development rights into account. Unclear whether development outside local opportunity areas and streets is permissible.	Objection		No action	All the wards collectively contribute to the delivery of housing. Each ward has its own characteristics and constraints which impact the number of homes which can be delivered. The figure for the number of homes is calculate from a combination of existing commitments, proposed allocations and windfall sites. The windfall figure has been calculated using historical averages for the number of homes typically delivered within the ward. Development would be expected to comply with other plan policies include H2 Affordable Housing. LOA/LOS identify where windfall can be focused and increased heights achieved but this does not prevent windfall in other locations. Approach to heights seeks to provide clarity about the design expectations.	NA
0231	Castlepoint LP	P21	comprehensive redevelopment of the Centre as a whole is not a likely option over the proposed Plan period (i.e. up to 2039). However, Castlepoint LP is considering the potential for focussed refurbishment, development, extension and asset management to maintain and enhance the vitality, viability and diversity of the Centre. Design Code not needed as comprehensive redevelopment not proposed.	Support with changes		Modification	Agree, update to reflect not all development proposed will be connected with comprehensive redevelopment	Amend MSP.A to set out a masterplan or design code would only be required for a comprehensive redevelopment proposal
0232	Brookfield Gospel Hall Trust	P21	Number of homes is insufficient. Urban extension required, include Breheren meeting hall in sustainable neighbourhood boundary.	Objection	Yes	No action	Site is within the Green Belt and in accordance with the NPPF the Plan does not propose to release Green Belt to meet housing needs.	NA
0267	Richborough Estates	P21	Land North of Townsend site's exclusion on basis of flood risk inappropriate. Highly sustainable location, well connected by road and footpath. Residential could be accommodated in Flood Zone 1. Designated heritage assets can accommodate change with minimal harm. Vision for successful, sustainable, characterful, mixed use, enjoyable and well-connected place while provided much needed community led housing and senior living/care. Loss of green belt can be offset by enhancements. Potential for strong green infrastructure, large SANG, parkland, BNG, permeability, retention of trees/hedgerows, high quality landscape, SuDs, new habitats, legible streets/spaces, open spaces, positive relationship with Holdenhurst Village. Meets objectives of plan and would help ensure plan is sound.	Comment		No action	Site is within the Green Belt and in accordance with the NPPF the Plan does not propose to release Green Belt to meet housing needs.	NA
0291	Yvonne McTeague	P21	1 acre site at the corner of Mill Road and Careys Road should not be in Green Belt, as only placed within it for cancelled Castle Lane Relief Road plan and was never designated for an "environmental protection".	Objection	Yes	No action	The Plan does not propose to release Green Belt or amend Green Belt boundaries.	NA
0079	The Society for Poole	P22	Policy P22 could be made sound and is effective in serving the public interest, as seeks to rectify lack of trees and mitigate high traffic volumes. However, further 'back garden' developments will reducing opportunities to retain/plant trees. To promote the continuing commercial activity of Ashley Road, this policy should be specifically required to be supported by policies P24 and P25.	Support with changes		No action	All policies in the plan need to be read together and specific cross referencing is not required. Any windfall development proposed on back gardens will need to conform with policies in the Plan including those relating to design and the natural environment.	NA

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0149	Charles Trent	P22	Objects to policy due to ambiguity over future land use that would be acceptable for land owned by Charles Trent which is within the local opportunity area. The new policy is ambiguous. Supporting text refers to residential built forms (mansion blocks, villa blocks or houses) suggesting an expectation of residential development, but does not specify the land use. The landowner has never promoted the site for residential development this site and it is not included in the SHLAA. A current application includes evidence to demonstrate residential is not viable. Policy is not positively prepared as it is ambiguous and it is not confirmed the site is available of the proposed use. The policy is not justified or effective for viability reasons as the site is not available or deliverable. The local opportunity area should be removed. All previously developed land should be assessed on its own merits. The policy should be reworded to refer to the opportunity for residential development or, for existing employment sites, business or commercial uses within Class E.	Objection		No action	The large majority of the site, with the exception of a frontage forecourt unit is within an existing employment area and therefore the future land use should be consistent with the employment area designation and policy. The LOA extends along the whole frontage to support intensification within the area, of which there have been previous examples.	NA
0150	Ken Parke on behalf of various clients 3	P22	Unclear how 480 dwellings figure has been derived, or if it reflects the ward's housing need. Unclear whether development is expected to comply with Policy H2. High reliance on windfall sites when focus restricted to local opportunity areas and streets - question achievability. Unclear why size of local community shops is restricted and they are restricted to some parts of the ward. No need for prescriptive approach to building heights - do not take permitted development rights into account. -Unclear whether development outside local opportunity areas and streets is permissible.	Objection		No action	All the wards collectively contribute to the delivery of housing. Each ward has its own characteristics and constraints which impact the number of homes which can be delivered. The figure for the number of homes is calculate from a combination of existing commitments, proposed allocations and windfall sites. The windfall figure has been calculated using historical averages for the number of homes typically delivered within the ward. Development would be expected to comply with other plan policies include H2 Affordable Housing. LOA/LOS identify where windfall can be focused and increased heights achieved but this does not prevent windfall in other locations. Size of shops is restricted to avoid an adverse impact on existing retail areas/centres and the locations highlighted where there is a current lack of facilities. Approach to heights seeks to provide clarity about the design expectations.	NA
0079	The Society for Poole	P23	Policy P23 is sound and effective in serving the public interest as it seeks to rectify infrastructure issues.	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0150	Ken Parke on behalf of various clients 3	P23	Unclear how 120 dwellings figure has been derived, or if it reflects the ward's housing need. Unclear whether development is expected to comply with Policy H2. High reliance on windfall sites when focus restricted to local opportunity areas and streets - question achievability. No need for prescriptive approach to building heights - do not take permitted development rights into account. Unclear whether development outside local opportunity areas and streets is permissible.	Objection		No action	All the wards collectively contribute to the delivery of housing. Each ward has its own characteristics and constraints which impact the number of homes which can be delivered. The figure for the number of homes is calculate from a combination of existing commitments, proposed allocations and windfall sites. The windfall figure has been calculated using historical averages for the number of homes typically delivered within the ward. Development would be expected to comply with other plan policies include H2 Affordable Housing. LOA/LOS identify where windfall can be focused and increased heights achieved but this does not prevent windfall in other locations. Approach to heights seeks to provide clarity about the design expectations.	NA
0148	FCERM	P23	Clarification required on presence of flood risk and coastal change risk and approach to addressing these issues (including where Policy C5 is applicable).	Support with changes		Modification	Agree that text should be included approach to flood risk for this ward, as it is located within the Poole SFRA L2 study area and there are many properties towards Poole Harbour that are at risk. Do not consider that it is necessary for this ward policy to contain information regarding coastal erosion and sea cliff stability risk zones or for a cross-reference to Policy C5 should be included. The plan will be read as a whole and it is unnecessary to duplicate policy requirements.	Ament to add additional criteria to end of policy to address approach to flood risk in Oakdale
0282	Historic England	O.1	Building is locally listed and efforts should be made to retain and convert the building.	Support with changes		No action	As set out in the supporting text a balanced judgement has been made regarding the allocation of the site which will see the total loss of the heritage asset. This has considered the significance of the asset, its state of repair and viability of bringing the building back into use.	NA
0079	The Society for Poole	P24	Policy P24 could be made sound and is effective in serving the public interest, as seeks to rectify infrastructure issues and protect the character and appearance of former Poole Civic Centre. To promote the continuing commercial activity of Ashley Road, this policy should be specifically required to be supported by policies P22 and P25.	Support with changes		No action	Support noted	NA



ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0150	Ken Parke on behalf of various clients 3	P24	Unclear how 980 dwellings figure has been derived, or if it reflects the ward's housing need. Unclear whether development is expected to comply with Policy H2. High reliance on windfall sites when focus restricted to local opportunity areas and streets - question achievability. No need for prescriptive approach to building heights - do not take permitted development rights into account. Unclear whether development outside local opportunity areas and streets is permissible.	Objection		No action	All the wards collectively contribute to the delivery of housing. Each ward has its own characteristics and constraints which impact the number of homes which can be delivered. The figure for the number of homes is calculate from a combination of existing commitments, proposed allocations and windfall sites. The windfall figure has been calculated using historical averages for the number of homes typically delivered within the ward. Development would be expected to comply with other plan policies include H2 Affordable Housing. LOA/LOS identify where windfall can be focused and increased heights achieved but this does not prevent windfall in other locations. Approach to heights seeks to provide clarity about the design expectations.	NA
0127	Elms Estate Management	P24	Proposals on Elms estate should be single family homes with a garden, reference size, mass, density and height, uphold high residential standards, maintain status of Turks Lane, no further commercial properties, ensure developer contributions for roads and pavement, manage permitted development, agree policies with Harbour Commissioners to ensure conservation of Blue Lagoon, preservation and management of Elms and Pearce recreation ground be to recognised in the plan.	Support with changes		Modification	Amend to reference Elms and Pearce recreation ground and Blue Lagoon. Proposals for development will be assessed against other policies in the plan such as those on townscape character and housing mix	Amend P24 to add two new bullets under 1.3 to reference Elms and Pearce recreation ground and Blue Lagoon.
0137	Primetower Properties	P24	Park Place, North Road should be allocated for residential/care provision and benefits from extant planning permission.	Objection		No action	While we accept the site already has planning consent and may merit an allocation it is too late to include in the Local Plan at this stage as consultation on potential sites has already taken place.	NA
0148	FCERM	P24	Clarification required on presence of flood risk and coastal change risk and approach to addressing these issues (including where Policy C5 is applicable).	Support with changes		No action	Ward policy contains text regarding approach to flood risk. Do not consider that it is necessary for this ward policy to contain information regarding coastal erosion and sea cliff stability risk zones or for a cross-reference to Policy C5 to be included. Consider Policy C5 sufficiently addresses this issue, the plan will be read as a whole and it is unnecessary to duplicate policy requirements.	NA
0260	Dorset Lake Community	P24	Policies are needed to prevent excessive off- street parking in front of houses and the loss of front gardens. The Ward Plans should recognize the importance footpaths and open spaces and protect and maintain them. The Plan should highlight the importance of access to the water and repair and replacement of local slipways. The Plan should recognise the unique setting and views both from and to the Harbour and the need to control over-development of the shoreline and the rising topography behind its shores. Character of the area is medium density buildings nestled below the tree line, development/extensions needs to be appropriate to its setting and preserve/enhance character. Development should respect the predominant pitched roof interwar development and avoid using unsustainable materials such as concrete and hard landscaping. Existing vegetation needs to be maintained. BCP need to protect the unique character and nature of the area. Policy needs to ensure small flats and small poorly designed houses which are only suited for use as second homes should be discouraged. The Ward is characterised by family homes, and this is the housing provision which is needed. Greater emphasis should be made in Ward Plans to support biodiversity and prevent the loss of green garden corridors. Development should only be permitted where they conserve and enhance biodiversity. Proposals should demonstrate they retain, protect and enhance features of biodiversity, comply with the mitigation hierarchy, incorporate features for native wildlife species and seek to remove any invasive non-native species. The requirement for windfall puts pressure on splitting sites outside of Conservation Areas where there is less space. Some plots are proscribed by local covenants and there needs to be recognition of the historical importance in the design and layout of these areas warranting the inclusion of these covenants. Building on gardens results in loss of space for wildlife. Development puts press ore infrastructure. Development which results in the loss/harm to the ecological or landscape value of public spaces and private gardens and/or which results in the loss of mature healthy trees should not be permitted.	Objection	Yes	No action	These issues are covered by other policies in the plan regarding townscape and parking. Footpaths and open spaces are addressed in part 1 of the policy. Many of the aspects raised are addressed elsewhere in the plan such as policy NE5, NE6, H3, BE2 and the Natural Environment Chapter (Chapter 6). Windfall development is required and this can be achieved in different ways. Proposals will need to accord with policies in chapter 6 to conserve and enhance the natural environment, including securing a net gain in biodiversity.	NA
0450	Janet Shenton	P24	Support the retention of Ashley Cross car park. Housing (eg the Co-op development) is too close the road without any landscaping, hope large cedar tree and adjacent trees by Co-Op have tree preservation orders.	Objection		No action	Policies relating to urban greening and tree provision will support soft landscaping on new development.	NA
0164	Environment Agency	P.1	Support policy approach to flood risk at P.1.	Support		No action	Support noted	NA

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0282	Historic England	P.1	Proposals relating to the civic should be informed by understanding of the building as a whole. Annexe and Law courts are also Locally Listed and should be retained/converted.	Support with changes		Modification	Amend to provide clarification surrounding heritage issues. The inclusion of the annexe on the local list requires review.	Amend to provide clarification surrounding heritage issues.
0282	Historic England	NH.A	Water Tower site could benefit from a site allocation.	Support with changes		No action	While the water tower site had a historic consent for 17 homes, it is unknown if the consent is extant or not. The site has not been promoted.	NA
0079	The Society for Poole	P25	Policy P25 could be made sound and is effective in serving the public interest, as seeks to rectify infrastructure issues. However should require protection and improvement of green corridors. To promote the continuing commercial activity of Ashley Road, this policy should be specifically required to be supported by policies P22 and P24.	Support with changes		No action	Green corridors and open spaces protected by policies in the natural environment chapter (chapter 6). All policies in the plan need to be read together and specific cross referencing is not required.	NA
0150	Ken Parke on behalf of various clients 3	P25	Unclear how 365 dwellings figure has been derived, or if it reflects the ward's housing need. Unclear whether development is expected to comply with Policy H2. High reliance on windfall sites when focus restricted to local opportunity areas and streets - question achievability. No need for prescriptive approach to building heights - do not take permitted development rights into account. Unclear whether development outside local opportunity areas and streets is permissible.	Objection		No action	All the wards collectively contribute to the delivery of housing. Each ward has its own characteristics and constraints which impact the number of homes which can be delivered. The figure for the number of homes is calculate from a combination of existing commitments, proposed allocations and windfall sites. The windfall figure has been calculated using historical averages for the number of homes typically delivered within the ward. Development would be expected to comply with other plan policies include H2 Affordable Housing. LOA/LOS identify where windfall can be focused and increased heights achieved but this does not prevent windfall in other locations. Approach to heights seeks to provide clarity about the design expectations.	NA
0260	Dorset Lake Community	P25	Policies are needed to prevent excessive off- street parking in front of houses and the loss of front gardens. The Ward Plans should recognize the importance footpaths and open spaces and protect and maintain them. The Plan should highlight the importance of access to the water and repair and replacement of local slipways. The Plan should recognise the unique setting and views both from and to the Harbour and the need to control over-development of the shoreline and the rising topography behind its shores. Character of the area is medium density buildings nestled below the tree line, development/extensions needs to be appropriate to its setting and preserve/enhance character. Development should respect the predominant pitched roof interwar development and avoid using unsustainable materials such as concrete and hard landscaping. Existing vegetation needs to be maintained. BCP need to protect the unique character and nature of the area. Policy needs to ensure small flats and small poorly designed houses which are only suited for use as second homes should be discouraged. The Ward is characterised by family homes, and this is the housing provision which is needed. Greater emphasis should be made in Ward Plans to support biodiversity and prevent the loss of green garden corridors. Development should only be permitted where they conserve and enhance biodiversity. Proposals should demonstrate they retain, protect and enhance features of biodiversity, comply with the mitigation hierarchy, incorporate features for native wildlife species and seek to remove any invasive non-native species. The requirement for windfall puts pressure on splitting sites outside of Conservation Areas where there is less space. Some plots are proscribed by local covenants and there needs to be recognition of the historical importance in the design and layout of these areas warranting the inclusion of these covenants. Building on gardens results in loss of space for wildlife. Development puts press ore infrastructure. Development which results in the loss/harm to the ecological or landscape value of public spaces and private gardens and/or which results in the loss of mature healthy trees should not be permitted. The Plan needs to identify improvements to the junction at Lilliput Square between Sandbanks Road, Lilliput Road and Anthonys Avenue. Dangerous for pedestrians. Beryl bike parking area blocking access to the pavement at the junction on Anthonys Avenue. The Ward policy should seek to	Objection	Yes	Modification	These issues are covered by other policies in the plan regarding townscape and parking. Footpaths and open spaces are addressed in part 1 of the policy. Many of the aspects raised are addressed elsewhere in the plan such as policy NE5, NE6, H3, BE2 and the Natural Environment Chapter (Chapter 6). Windfall development is required and this can be achieved in different ways. Proposals will need to accord with policies in chapter 6 to conserve and enhance the natural environment, including securing a net gain in biodiversity. Amend to reference junction between Sandbanks Road, Lilliput Road and Anthonys Avenue. Bike parking location too detailed for local plan consideration. Lilliput centre already referenced for improvement. Plan seeks to support improved public transport. Specific services and delivery is outside the scope of the local plan.	Amend P25 1.c bullet five to reference Sandbanks Road, including the junction with Lilliput Road and Anthonys Avenue

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0148	FCERM	P25	Clarification required on presence of flood risk and coastal change risk and approach to addressing these issues (including where Policy C5 is applicable).	Support with changes		No action	Ward policy contains text regarding approach to flood risk. Do not consider that it is necessary for this ward policy to contain information regarding coastal erosion and sea cliff stability risk zones or for a cross-reference to Policy C5 to be included. Consider Policy C5 sufficiently addresses this issue, the plan will be read as a whole and it is unnecessary to duplicate policy requirements.	NA
0329	Andrew Reed	P25	Supporting text suggests housing to be delivered only through rear infill development - out of character. Unclear whether increases in height not permitted outside local opportunity streets	Objection	No	No action	Some rear infill would be possible but these would need to accord with policies on townscape and the natural environment. Increases in height elsewhere govern by building heights policy.	NA
0164	Environment Agency	PH.1	Support policy approach to flood risk at PH.1.	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0124	John Davis and Rosie Balmer	P26	Cannot support Harbourside Masterplan as this has not been completed	Objection		No action	Proposals seek to enhance the existing open space, detailed proposals will be consulted on separately.	NA
0150	Ken Parke on behalf of various clients 3	P26	Unclear how 3,735 dwellings figure has been derived, or if it reflects the ward's housing need. Unclear whether development is expected to comply with Policy H2. Relatively low reliance on windfall sites, but question whether allocated sites and sites with permission will come forward in a reasonable timeframe due to their complexities. Question reliance on windfall sites when focus restricted to local opportunity areas and streets - question achievability. No need for prescriptive approach to building heights - do not take permitted development rights into account. Unclear whether development outside local opportunity areas and streets is permissible. Unclear how an 'over-concentration' of built to rent and co-living schemes would be identified and dealt with in the Town Centre North area.	Objection		No action	All the wards collectively contribute to the delivery of housing. Each ward has its own characteristics and constraints which impact the number of homes which can be delivered. The figure for the number of homes is calculate from a combination of existing commitments, proposed allocations and windfall sites. The windfall figure has been calculated using historical averages for the number of homes typically delivered within the ward. Development would be expected to comply with other plan policies include H2 Affordable Housing. LOA/LOS identify where windfall can be focused and increased heights achieved but this does not prevent windfall in other locations. Approach to heights seeks to provide clarity about the design expectations. On Council owned sites the Council is working to ensure the delivery of sites.	NA
0164	Environment Agency	P26	Support approach to flood risk. Approach agreed with the Environment Agency regarding Poole Town Centre is for delivery of defences that protect the community and reduce risk to sites where government funding allows. Approach to SFRA L2 completion within 12 months of adoption allows uncertainty to be further explored, while areas with greater certainty can be regenerated. Sites meet the sequential test and no issue with flood risk assessment being required at application stage as part of exception test. SFRA L2 and flood risk management strategies may determine it is not possible for these sites to meet part 2 of the exception test, particularly where flood risk management infrastructure improvements required to make development (including access) safe for its lifetime are not viable.	Support		No action	Support and uncertainty regarding viability of funding strategies noted.	NA
0079	The Society for Poole	P26	Policy P26 is ineffective and unsound. PT.4 should not contain buildings in excess of 7 storeys (see use of word 'predominantly') as sensitive area to tall buildings (see Building Heights Study). Reference to future provision of masterplan for Town Centre North suggests policy will be ineffective - Masterplan is overdue and required to demonstrate soundness and practicality in a timely manner. NHS decision to concentrate all local day case treatments and facilities at Poole Hospital means car parking facilities will be inadequate at and Hospital and on Longfleet Road - plan needs to address this.	Objection		Modification	Some existing planning consents have approved development above seven storey on limited parts of sites. The approach to heights reflects this situation while seeking to ensure the typical scale of development is sensitive to the surrounding townscape. Consider amendment to provide clarity in respect of wording on town centre north. Poole hospital has an existing multistorey car park and is located on a bus route. Options to expand parking on the site are limited and have not been requested by the NHS.	Reorder policy T1 to amend references to masterplan and provide criteria for sites independently.
0092	British Speedway Promoters	P26	Speedway at the stadium should be protected, site is not surplus to requirements, should not be redeveloped except under circumstances where a replacement venue is provided within the area to an equal or better standard than the existing and that any new venue must be operational before racing ceases at the existing venue and the stadium is demolished. Leaseholder has a track record of developing sporting stadia without providing replacement	Objection		Modification	Amend text in relation to Poole Stadium to provide clarification and ensure consistency with policy E12 and the NPPF.	Reorder policy T1 to amend references to masterplan and provide criteria for sites independently. Insert separate criteria for Poole Stadium and ensure text aligns with the NPPF
0233	University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust	P26	Trust would like to bring forward key worker housing adjacent to Parkstone House, Local Opportunity Area restricts heights in this location. Heights up to four storey would not be viable.	Objection	Yes	No action	While we accept the site at land adjacent to Parkstone House may have some merit it is too late to include in the Local Plan at this stage as consultation on potential sites has already taken place.	NA
0282	Historic England	P26	Typo	Objection		Modification	Amend typo	Correct typo

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0287	Network Rail	P26	Support 1d to address access issues to Poole rail station and the connections with the town centre. Support maximising of development opportunities given its highly sustainable location supported with contributions towards improving access at the rail station. Site PT1 (iii) the rail crossing is one of the highest risk in the country, securing a solution requires a fundamental re-development scheme which should be a DPD or SPD. Support (x) to safeguard land either side of the railway for crossing and (ix) improvements in links to the railway station. Support Good yard site, see BLOC reps . Taller buildings in PT1 have potential to interfere with a GSM-R telecoms mast just north east of Poole Station that delivers radio communications between train drivers and signallers critical to the safe running of the railway network. Concerns over the delayed SFRA2 and potential impact on the rail network.	Support with changes	Yes	Modification	We are prioritising the use of CIL to fund off site improvements. Agree mast is a constraint. We have commissioned SFRA2 aiming to complete and publish it during the examination. This will provide the necessary protections to the railway from new development and can also be applied to any developments that come forward before adoption. Recognise that if this is delayed the policy wording for P15 Hamworthy may need amending to highlight issue of ensuring that flood risk to the railway is avoided.	Amend to add criteria to engage with network rail on relevant sites
0447	Poole Quays Forum	P26	(1e) Enhance the public realm, improve the High Street, Quay, Maypole Square/Guildhall Gardens, New Orchard Street (crossing) and Hill Street. (1h) The Quay needs to be vibrant space, cultural heritage is diminishing, removing cars would reduce commercial viability. Council should develop landscaping to encourage non-pedestrian visitation during the winter months e.g. multifunctioning dock space. (2b) Dolphin Centre needs to be 24 hour access. (2c) Dolphin Centre needs to be 24 hour access. (5a) Ensure that sufficient parking is retained. (5avi) Development should not exceed fifteen storeys, site is not suitable for a tall building. Delete the word predominantly. (5bii) Development should not exceed five storeys, site is only suitable for a tall building near Seldown Bridge. Delete the word predominantly. (5dii) Set a maximum of four storeys. (5dii) Development should not four storeys, site is not suitable for a tall building. Delete the word predominantly. (5c) The number of homes needs a clear definition, maximum 300. (5cvi) Set a maximum of six storeys. (5d) Development should not exceed seven storeys, site is not suitable for a tall building. Delete the word predominantly. (5diii) Set a maximum of five storeys.	Objection		Modification	(1e) Amend to include additional references to areas for public realm improvements under part 1.e of the policy. (1h) The Quay is identified as an area for public realm enhancements, the details of any potential schemes would be developed separately outside the Local Plan process. (2b) Consider amendment as part of reworking of part PT.1 Town Centre North to reference improved 24 hour access. (2c) Consider amendment as part of reworking of part PT.1 Town Centre North to reference improved 24 hour access. (5a) Policy seeks to ensure public parking is retained. (5avi) Developments of this scale have been approved in the area and providing heights step down to the edges of the area this is considered to be a suitable response to making efficient use of town centre land. (5bii) The site is considered suitable for development predominantly between two and five storey, the distribution of these heights on site would need to be designed to respect the character and living conditions of existing properties. This does not preclude a taller element near Seldown Bridge, a pattern of development which exists on adjacent sites. (5dii) The wording gives some flexibility for a larger elements which may be appropriate depending on the design and configuration of the scheme. (5dii) The wording gives some flexibility for a larger elements which may be appropriate depending on the design and configuration of the scheme. (5c) Some flexibility surrounding the number of homes is required. This provides flexibility on type and mix to achieve a sustainable development. (5cvi) The policy is drafted that heights should be between two and six storey. (5d) The wording gives some flexibility for tall elements which may be appropriate depending on the design and configuration of the scheme. (5diii) The policy clearly states that development should be up to five storey.	Amend 1.e to reference High Street, Hill Street, New Orchard, Maypole Square/Guildhall Gardens. Reordered policy T1 and reference improved access
0096	Go South Coast	P26	New homes likely to be high density flats built at the expense of space and amenity. Policy phrasing is bold given long allocated sites have not come forward.	Objection	No	No action	Proposals will need to accord with housing mix policy. Various actions underway to support or secure delivery on longstanding sites.	NA
0148	FCERM	P26	Need to add clarification regarding coastal erosion and sea cliff stability risk zones and applicability of Policy C5 in these areas.	Support with changes		No action	Do not consider that it is necessary for this ward policy to contain information regarding coastal erosion and sea cliff stability risk zones or for a cross-reference to Policy C5 to be included. Consider Policy C5 sufficiently addresses this issue, the plan will be read as a whole and it is unnecessary to duplicate policy requirements.	NA
0450	Janet Shenton	P26	Large number of homes proposed for Poole town centre is disproportionate. Speedway track and the swimming pool need to be replaced. Infrastructure is needed GP surgeries, sewerage, schools, play areas. Object to loss of Chapel lane car park, needed to support retail. Support conversion of empty shop spaces into housing. Transport hub needed with bus station, train station and coach station centralised together.	Objection	No	No action	Poole town centre, along with Bournemouth Town Centre is one of the most sustainable locations for growth and contains a large number of potential development sites. The policy seeks to replace the swimming pool and protect the stadium. Infrastructure provision is supported by the Plan either on site in larger schemes or through the collection of CIL. Capacity exists within other town centre car parks to support the loss of Chapel lane. PT.1 seeks to explore improvements to the bus and rail station but the operation and ownership of both areas are outside of council control.	NA
0572	Ray Hince	P26	Support plan for Poole Town.	Support	No	No action	Support noted	NA
0063	Christopher Saunders	PT.1	Poole Stadium is underused and decaying, site is sustainably located, redevelopment could improve sports facilities and community facilities.	Support		No action	Support noted	NA

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0096	Go South Coast	PT.1	Not all the land is available, Bus Station and depot have been discussed but never been indicated sites are available. Bus station is operationally sub optimal, welcome aspiration that a replacement bus station should enhance the operation. Current location very beneficial, proximity to Dolphin Centre and centrally in the network, not appropriate to relocate south of the railway link. Further discussion needed. Practicality difficult to locate with railway station. Cost of bus station relocation very high, costs not stated nor included in IDP. No commitment from Network Rail. Allocation is not clear or evidenced or deliverable. Bus depot is critical, optimally located, no site identified to relocate the depot, site unlikely to be available, needs to be 1000m from current site, an additional operational expenses would need to be covered from a move. No clear reason why bus depot would need to be moved. Elements set out in the proposed masterplan have significant impact on buses, criteria are not based on published evidence. More engagement needed. Strongly objects to allocation, prejudices future bus operation, no commitment to fund replacement facilities	Objection	Yes	Modification	Agree, amend PT1 to reflect intention to work with land owners to develop a masterplan but that does not preclude sites coming forward in the meantime.	Reorder policy T1 to amend references to masterplan and provide criteria for sites independently.
0170	Bloc Group / Network Rail	PT.1	Goods Yard site was previously allocated. Process of bringing site forward as commenced. Proposed allocation is spread across multiple sites and ownerships. Key constraint of radio mast site lines along railway affecting the building heights on site. Generally support allocation. Range of constraints impact site that effect viability of proposals. Viability linked to CIL rates. Developments within the allocation need to come forward individually and should not be a barrier to development.	Objection	Yes	Modification	Agree, amend PT1 to provide more certainty to landowners	Reorder policy T1 to amend references to masterplan and provide criteria for sites independently.
0220	LGIM Real Assets	PT.1	Support the ambition to regenerate Poole town centre north. Support the policies which strengthen the role of the primary shopping area, and welcome the flexibility in uses. Support improvements to Poole Train Station, Poole Bus Station. Support homes and office requirements, but not considered officers need to be 'part of mixed-use development'. Supplementary Planning Document maybe needed for a strategic approach. Support safely crossing the railway and suggest the policy is re-worded to note this is currently possible with the existing level crossing, land can be developed without a change to the crossing. Requirement for 2ha of open space is not realistic nor evidenced. and therefore cannot be supported. Does not support the use of the word 'significantly' in regards to requirements to step buildings down at the edges of the area. Does not support parking requirements and notes the Parking Strategy is not provided as evidence. Supports requirement for flood risk assessment where appropriate and management of surface water flooding on land within their control. PT.1 within sequential test area and passed ST and part 1 of exceptions test. Considers development can be undertaken outside of areas of surface water flooding.	Objection	Yes	Modification	Agree, amend PT1 to provide more certainty to landowners	Reorder policy T1 to amend references to masterplan and provide criteria for sites independently.
0237	Tokion Ltd	PT.1	Criteria to retain or upgrade the stadium is unjustified and inconsistent with policy E12. Stadium site can help meet objectively assessed needs.	Objection	Yes	Modification	Agree, amend PT1 and wording surrounding Poole stadium to provide clarification	Reorder policy T1 to amend references to masterplan and provide criteria for sites independently. Insert separate criteria for Poole Stadium and ensure text aligns with the NPPF
0282	Historic England	PT.1	Stepping down to adjacent conservation areas should be emphasised. Heritage assets should be referenced. Area would benefit from a Design Code SPD.	Objection		Modification	Agree	Amend to reflect heritage issues
0372	Clive Tyers	PT.1	Policy not specific enough in relation to upgrade or replace sporting facility. Need to ensure retention of Speedway operation and presence, and car boot sales, and focus on improving and upgrading the site rather than replacement.	Objection	Yes	Modification	Agree	Reorder policy T1 to amend references to masterplan and provide criteria for sites independently. Insert separate criteria for Poole Stadium and ensure text aligns with the NPPF
0282	Historic England	PT.A	Potential to give a steer on building heights and to refer to heritage assets	Objection		Modification	Agree	Amend to provide height criteria.

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0282	Historic England	PT.B	Important to reference the heritage assets within this area	Objection		Modification	Agree	Amend to reflect heritage issues
0223	Fortitudo Ltd	PT.3	Previous application on site was for up to 13 storeys and 454 dwellings. Adjoining site being built out is up to 11 storeys. Evidence base shows development of site is unviable with parameters in this policy, and so therefore undeliverable. Should be clear support for increased height above 6 storeys along waterfront to fit in with schemes with consent and to ensure delivery of regeneration areas and maximise homes in a highly sustainable location.	Objection		No action	The policy does not preclude some taller elements. The Council project to construct flood defences could improve the viability of the site.	NA
0282	Historic England	PT.3	Recommend specific criteria included to retain/create a view to the Church of St James.	Objection		No action	As the church is relatively low level providing a view of the Church from the former Power Station site would prevent redevelopment in the north part of the site rending a scheme undeliverable.	NA
0282	Historic England	PT.4	Development should step down towards the lower rise conservation area.	Objection		Modification	Amend to reflect position adjacent to conservation area. The site is visually and physically removed from the historic quay and therefore too emulate the vertical rhythm and plots of the quay is difficult to justify.	Amend to reflect position adjacent to conservation area.
0223	Fortitudo Ltd	PT.4	Policy states that proposals should be 3-7 storeys high, however planning permission granted for 11 storeys previously. Currently preparing application for up to 14 storeys, which has been required following building safety act and requirement for a second staircase to ensure viable scheme can be delivered. Maximum building height needs to be increased - unclear as to why council is imposing a reduced height to that which has past consent. Policy is unsound.	Objection		No action	Some consents have limited areas above seven storey. The approach to heights reflects this situation while managing the typical scale of development.	NA
0282	Historic England	PT.6	Concerned about the scale and quantum of development in relation to adjacent heritage assets.	Objection		No action	More detailed feasibility studies have been undertaken on the site to inform development quantum's and heights	NA
0282	Historic England	PT.8	Potential to reference remaining infirmary building (non designated heritage asset) within the site	Objection		Modification	Agree	Amend to reflect heritage issues
0223	Fortitudo Ltd	PT.9	Policy requires development to be 6 storeys in height. Planning permission granted in December 2019 for 7 storey building. Perverse to reduce maximum height below that approved when need for new homes has become greater.	Objection		Modification	Agree	Amend to reflect previous approval
0029	W Lennon	P27	Questions how some public realm, open spaces and community proposals in the Queen's Park ward policy will be implemented and maintained as the wording lacks detail or detailed plans. No reference to Park Private school or BH Live. Concern regarding conversion of houses to HMO's / flats.	Objection		No action	The detail of the projects would need to be developed outside the scope of the local plan. HMO policy contained elsewhere in the plan and is not repeated in the ward policy. It is not considered necessary to mention every facility within the ward.	NA
0077	Craig Hendry	P27	Additional stories in Charminster Road will increase the development of flats in this area	Objection		No action	Some urban intensification is required to support the overall strategy. Increased building heights on key routes in sustainable locations outside of conservation areas is considered a valid approach to supporting urban intensification.	NA
0150	Ken Parke on behalf of various clients 3	P27	Unclear how 180 dwellings figure has been derived, or if it reflects the ward's housing need. Unclear whether development is expected to comply with Policy H2. High reliance on windfall sites when focus restricted to local opportunity areas and streets - question achievability. No need for prescriptive approach to building heights - do not take permitted development rights into account. Unclear whether development outside local opportunity areas and streets is permissible.	Objection		No action	All the wards collectively contribute to the delivery of housing. Each ward has its own characteristics and constraints which impact the number of homes which can be delivered. The figure for the number of homes is calculate from a combination of existing commitments, proposed allocations and windfall sites. The windfall figure has been calculated using historical averages for the number of homes typically delivered within the ward. Development would be expected to comply with other plan policies include H2 Affordable Housing. LOA/LOS identify where windfall can be focused and increased heights achieved but this does not prevent windfall in other locations. Approach to heights seeks to provide clarity about the design expectations.	NA

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0239	Laura Hirst	P27	Future plans for ward should be more ambitious. Focuses mainly on corridors surrounding and not urban and transport issues within the ward. 20mph speed limit needed due to safety. Variety of shops reduced, too many café, bars and hairdressers and not enough retail. Suggests trying to balance permissions for businesses. Uneven roads and pavements make difficult mobility, no official crossings on internal roads, and limited traffic calming. Area has become rat run, too many parked cars and front gardens changed to parking without dropped kerb or sustainable drainage. Suggests enhanced cycle and walking provision, 20mph speed limit, traffic calming, signposts, bus shelter improvements, electric buses, pavement and road improvement, parking permits, resident only restricted access, SUDs. Set up neighbourhood groups to ascertain issues and solutions. Also need improvement targets, actions for reducing carbon, improved air quality. Plan compiles with requirements but weak on action and methodology.	Support with changes		No action	Suggestions are supported by the general wording of the policy but delivery would be a separate process from the local plan	NA
0150	Ken Parke on behalf of various clients 3	P28	Unclear how 150 dwellings figure has been derived, or if it reflects the ward's housing need. Unclear whether development is expected to comply with Policy H2. High reliance on windfall sites when focus restricted to local opportunity areas and streets - question achievability. No need for prescriptive approach to building heights - do not take permitted development rights into account. Unclear whether development outside local opportunity areas and streets is permissible.	Objection		No action	All the wards collectively contribute to the delivery of housing. Each ward has its own characteristics and constraints which impact the number of homes which can be delivered. The figure for the number of homes is calculate from a combination of existing commitments, proposed allocations and windfall sites. The windfall figure has been calculated using historical averages for the number of homes typically delivered within the ward. Development would be expected to comply with other plan policies include H2 Affordable Housing. LOA/LOS identify where windfall can be focused and increased heights achieved but this does not prevent windfall in other locations. Approach to heights seeks to provide clarity about the design expectations.	NA
0150	Ken Parke on behalf of various clients 3	P29	-Unclear how 470 dwellings figure has been derived, or if it reflects the ward's housing need. -Unclear whether development is expected to comply with Policy H2 -High reliance on windfall sites when focus restricted to local opportunity areas and streets - question achievability -Unclear why size of local community shops is restricted and they are restricted to some parts of the ward. -No need for prescriptive approach to building heights - do not take permitted development rights into account. -Unclear whether development outside local opportunity areas and streets is permissible	Objection		No action	All the wards collectively contribute to the delivery of housing. Each ward has its own characteristics and constraints which impact the number of homes which can be delivered. The figure for the number of homes is calculate from a combination of existing commitments, proposed allocations and windfall sites. The windfall figure has been calculated using historical averages for the number of homes typically delivered within the ward. Development would be expected to comply with other plan policies include H2 Affordable Housing. LOA/LOS identify where windfall can be focused and increased heights achieved but this does not prevent windfall in other locations. Size of shops is restricted to avoid an adverse impact on existing retail areas/centres and the locations highlighted where there is a current lack of facilities. Approach to heights seeks to provide clarity about the design expectations.	NA
0190	John Dymott	P29	Biodiversity and heritage concerns - Talbot Heath needs to be taken into account. Additional monuments to Fern Barrow exist in area alongside pre-Roman features	Objection	Yes	Modification	Agree	Amend to reflect heritage issues
0259	Arts University Bournemouth	P29	There are numerous references to the Talbot Village sites across Policies E2, E4 and P29, which are inconsistent and confusing, therefore amendments are required to ensure these policies, and the plan as a whole, are justified and effective.	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper. Some amendments proposed to ensure a future planning application addresses and mitigates contamination and safety issues.	NA
0268	Talbot Village Trust	P29	Object as should identify the section of Gillet Road encompassing Village Surgery, shops and adjoining field as a local centre	Objection	Yes	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper. Some amendments proposed to ensure a future planning application addresses and mitigates contamination and safety issues.	NA
0044	Kerry and Mark Berry	TBW.3	Objects to Branksome Triangle as Gypsy and Traveller site issues with contamination, health and safety risks, traffic and access, environment and biodiversity, failure to consult, part of the boundary in 400m of a heathland.	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0047	Becky Bertrand	TBW.3	Objects to Branksome Triangle as Gypsy and Traveller site issues with lack of consultation, access and traffic congestion, lack of space for more residents, impacts on wildlife.	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0049	Nick Way	TBW.3	Objects to Branksome Triangle as Gypsy and Traveller issues with antisocial behaviour and decline in the area, poor relationships with settled groups including businesses, impact on house prices, decline in Branksome area	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0050	Michelle Belak Humpidge	TBW.3	Objects to Branksome Triangle as Gypsy and Traveller issues with crime, effects on tourism, general decline	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0051	Tim Battcock	TBW.3	Objects to Branksome Triangle as Gypsy and Traveller issues with inadequate infrastructure, traffic congestion, poor access, risks, impact on wildlife, potential relaxation of conservation planning rules, better alternative site exist (Creekmoor Park and Ride)	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0052	Steve Howells	TBW.3	Objects to Branksome Triangle as Gypsy and Traveller issues with adverse impacts on environment and biodiversity (SNCI, High Priority Habitat, partly within heathland exclusion zone, biodiversity corridor), site is too large, failure to consult, site is a heritage asset, could be used as ecological and heritage park to service local plan objectives, better alternative sites exist (Creekmoor Park and Ride),	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0053	Joanne Lake	TBW.3	Objects to Branksome Triangle as Gypsy and Traveller issues with adverse impacts on biodiversity	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0054	Filippo Bedin	TBW.3	Objects to Branksome Triangle as Gypsy and Traveller site, area not suitable for habitation, issues within contamination, health and safety, railway heritage, wildlife and biodiversity, unhealthy and dangerous, does not support traveller lifestyle	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0055	William Lake	TBW.3	Objects to Branksome Triangle as Gypsy and Traveller issues with adverse impacts on biodiversity	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0056	Sue Sweeney	TBW.3	Objects to Branksome Triangle as Gypsy and Traveller issues with lack of consultation, close to residential area, unfair for local residents, loss of house sales/properties hard to sell, better used for ecological interests, better used for homeless, bad reputation of future users	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0058	Sue Cullen	TBW.3	Objects to Branksome Triangle as Gypsy and Traveller issues with lack of communication, health and safety issues, site stability, contamination, access and traffic, SNCI, biodiversity, better alternative sites (Creekmoor Park and Ride)	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0059	Clare Old	TBW.3	Objects to Branksome Triangle as Gypsy and Traveller issues with contamination, costly to remediate, health and safety, access, lack of clarity around site management, better used as a green space, wildlife area or community garden	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0060	Miles Gillespie	TBW.3	Objects to Branksome Triangle as issues with failure to consult, safety, health, contamination, impact on wildlife, SNCI, impact on local services, quality of life (noise), isolated location for future users, better alternative uses (renewable energy), traveller homes should be included as part of new developments, unsuitable site access, size of site is too large, number of pitches excessive, not viable to develop. Note press article regarding impact of travellers upon property prices which would thereby affect council tax income. Concerned regarding illegal expansion of site, e.g. Dale Farm.	Objection	Yes	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0062	Julian Cooper	TBW.3	Objects to Branksome Triangle as Gypsy and Traveller site, site is dangerous, cost is unjustifiable, money should be spent else where. More suitable site needed for traveller community.	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0065	Michael Old	TBW.3	Objects to Branksome Triangle as Gypsy and Traveller site, issues with contamination, health and safety, potential for unauthorised use, traffic congestion, SNCI, the site should join up with near by open spaces	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0066	Lorraine Hayward	TBW.3	Objects to Branksome Triangle as Gypsy and Traveller site, issues with contamination, cost of remediation, proximity to railway line, health and safety, area saturated, pressure on public services, traffic congestion, unsuitable access, impacts on wildlife, better alternative uses	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0067	Sarah Pidgley	TBW.3	Objects to Branksome Triangle as Gypsy and Traveller site, issues with contamination, health and safety, potential for unauthorised use, traffic congestion, SNCI, the site should join up with near by open spaces	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA



ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0069	Angela Laycock	TBW.3	Branksome Triangle is not deliverable. The use of the word 'could' does not imply the site is deliverable. Inconsistent language between paragraphs surrounding the use of the 'wording potentially'. Lack of transparency surrounding the allocation. The allocation does not comply with other objectives/policies in the plan around natural habitats, contamination, heritage, health and wellbeing, expensive remediation, alternative sites, living conditions, sustainable urban drainage and SNCIs. Site could be used for large scale renewables. Wrong policy reference. Believe reference to 400m consultation area is wrong, site not suitable because within 400m. Areas of flood risk highlighted. Site is contaminated, remediation required. Site is will have detrimental impact on health and well being and the natural environment. Branksome triangle will conflict with requirements of policy H10. Reference to Policy H11 which doesn't exist highlights policy not sound and plan not adequately checked/lacking attention to detail. Could impact soundness and legal compliance. Alternative uses for the site that are more appropriate are possible	Objection	Yes	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0074	Victor Long	TBW.3	Object to Gypsy and traveller site at Branksome Triangle as the site is not suitable, key issues are site is contaminated, remediation would be expensive, site not economically viable, no evidence of delivery, health and safety concerns, site is within 400m of a heathland, pressure on existing services (schools, medical services, public transport), increased traffic congestion, air pollution problems, no impact assessment on road network/public transport or local services, environment and biodiversity issues, SNCI, loss of biodiversity, conflict with Habitats and Species Regulations, site is too large, negative impact on railway heritage, adverse impact on local character, failure to consult, other suitable sites, no clear rational for allocation, numerous alternative uses (drop in care centre, vertical farming, nature and heritage site, renewable energy, raised allotments)	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0075	Sheila Long	TBW.3	Object to Gypsy and traveller site at Branksome Triangle.	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0079	The Society for Poole	TBW.3	Policy P29 is ineffective and unsound, as does not protect Highmoor Farm (Talbot Village) from development and is in conflict with policies NE1, NE2, NE3, NE4, NE6 and NE7.	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0083	Nora Stephens	TBW.3	Objects to Branksome Triangle Gypsy and Traveller site, issues with contamination, cost of remediation, site is too large, traffic congestion, low railway bridges, need for safety fencing, not inn keeping with local area	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0084	Julian Simpkins	TBW.3	Objects to Branksome Triangle Gypsy and Traveller site, concerns with antisocial behaviour, impact on house prices and integration of different communities.	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0085	Carol Hornsby	TBW.3	Objects to Branksome Triangle Gypsy and Traveller site, concerns with antisocial behaviour, impact on house prices, better alternative sites exist (Creekmoor Park and Ride).	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0086	Anonymous	TBW.3	Objects to Branksome Triangle Gypsy and Traveller site, concerns with contamination, cost of remediation, delivery timescales, health and safety issues, site is too large, lack of transparency in site selection process, traffic congestion, air pollution, impacts on local services, lack of detailed assessments, impact on local character, impact on railway heritage, failure to consult.	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0087	Adrian Ryan	TBW.3	Objects to Branksome Triangle Gypsy and Traveller site, highlights concerns with the consultation process and transparency of decision making and lack of detailed assessments, flawed and unequal analysis of alternative sites, site will not meet needs of gypsy and traveller community, refusal to allow independent assessments, unclear how conclusions in relation to flooding across sites have been made, lack of cost assessments, with holding information.	Objection	Yes	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0088	Ellie Sherriff and Steve Thornton	TBW.3	Objects to Branksome Triangle Gypsy and Traveller site, highlights concerns with the consultation process and transparency of decision making and lack of detailed assessments.	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0089	Catherine Parker-Smith	TBW.3	Objects to Branksome Triangle Gypsy and Traveller site, concerns with the consultation process, previous residential applications didn't happen, out of keeping with local area, contamination, health impacts, cost of remediation, health and safety, noise, unsuitable access, traffic congestion, adverse impact on wildlife	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0090	Gerald and Diana Keen	TBW.3	Objects to Branksome Triangle Gypsy and Traveller site, concerns with the consultation process, transparency of site selection, contamination, health and safety impacts, site is too large, not deliverable, unsuitable access.	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0094	Laura Badminton	TBW.3	Objects to Branksome Triangle Gypsy and Traveller site, concerns with the consultation process, traffic congestion, impact on the SNCI, out of character with neighbouring properties, impact on local services, other more suitable alternative sites (Creekmoor Park and Ride) and better alterative uses (Ambulance Point)	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0095	Thomas Queen	TBW.3	Objects to Branksome Triangle Gypsy and Traveller site, concerns with the consultation process, traffic congestion, impact on the SNCI, out of character with neighbouring properties, impact on local services, other more suitable alternative sites (Creekmoor Park and Ride)	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0097	Barry Quince	TBW.3	Objects to allocation of site for homes for gypsies and travellers.	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0098	Dave Ham	TBW.3	Objects to the allocation of Branksome Triangle for Gypsies and Travellers, local concerns have been ignored, issues with unsuitable access, traffic congestion, antisocial behaviour.	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0099	Katherine Wells	TBW.3	Objects to the allocation of Branksome Triangle for Gypsies and Travellers, concerns with harm to SNCI and the natural environment, railway heritage, lack of consultation, contaminated land, multiple hazards (electric lines, steep, unstable slopes, electrical sub stations, development is not viable, unsuitable access, traffic congestion, difficulties and expense providing essential infrastructure, better alternative use as ecological park.	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0101	Margaret Pattison	TBW.3	Objects to the allocation of Branksome Triangle for Gypsies and Travellers, concerns with access and traffic issues, contamination, hazardous structures	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0102	Jackie MacIntyre	TBW.3	Objects to the allocation of Branksome Triangle for Gypsies and Travellers, concerns with contamination, cost of remediation, electrified railway, steep banks, high viaducts, unsuitable for housing, noise, unsuitable access, traffic congestion, impacts on wildlife, impact on historical viaduct	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0107	Oliver Wronski	TBW.3	Objects to the gypsy and traveller site at Branksome to stop harm to the natural environment and the railway heritage at Branksome Triangle. No consultation with residents, site is an SNCI and critical biodiversity corridor for protected species, and scale of proposed development would destroy habitat where mitigation could not compensate. Proposal would result in viaduct being inaccessible and prevent bringing it back to life. Contamination on site, multiple hazards, site unviable, traffic concerns, infrastructure would be difficult and expensive. Would prefer to turn Branksome Triangle into Heritage and Ecological Park for all to enjoy. Affecting local house prices already.	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0111	David Mayne	TBW.3	Concerns about Branksome Triangle Gypsy and Travellers site due to the site being contaminated, proximity to the railway and safety concerns, damage to SNCI on site, the site being much larger than required which could lead to unauthorised expansion. Lack of transparency in the site selection process. Increased traffic generated by the site would exacerbate air pollution, demand on local services would result in significant strain upon them. No detailed site assessment or cost estimates that site is deliverable within 5 years. Detrimental impact on the local character of the area and railway heritage, failure to engage in consultation with local community and relevant stakeholders. Potential for public disorder if approved.	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0114	John Lewis	TBW.3	Object to Branksome triangle, site is too large	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0115	Mark Smith	TBW.3	Object to Branksome triangle, road and bridges are too narrow for adequate access	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0116	David Towing	TBW.3	Object to Branksome triangle, concerns surrounding contamination, cost of remediation, health and safety risks - electrified railway line, fall from viaducts, need for high security fencing, SNCI, protected species, flood risks, increase of water run off, impacts on the historic East Viaduct, not in keeping with surrounding architecture, road and traffic impacts, site access between narrow bridges, large vehicles cant access, restricted visibility for vehicles exiting, risk of road traffic accidents of future residents, traffic congestion, costs associated with road alteration and security measures, no survey of costs, better alternative sites, lack of engagement, site is too large, resources to tackle illegal expansion, problems of transit and settled groups mixing	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0117	Rob Holmes	TBW.3	Object to Branksome triangle, concerns surrounding contamination, dangers (live railway line, high viaducts), safer alternatives exist - Creekmoor Park and Ride, lack of consultation, heritage issues, wildlife issues, future health complications.	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0118	Monika Holmes	TBW.3	Object to Branksome triangle, concerns surrounding safety (live railway, contamination, viaduct), impact on wildlife, traffic congestion.	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0119	Guy Eccles	TBW.3	Object to Branksome triangle, concerns surrounding size of the site, impact on local services (dentists, GPs, schools), traffic congestion, limited visibility on the access, potential antisocial behaviour, contamination, flooding, ground instability, proximity to the railway line, wire fencing, electrical substation, prohibitive cost.	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0120	Claire Delve	TBW.3	Object to Branksome triangle, concerns surrounding contamination, cost of remediation, not deliverable within 5 years, disturbance of land puts residents at risk, existing cluster of health issues, dangers to future residents (electrified railway, viaducts, substation, unstable land, flooding, noise levels), sense of imprisonment of future occupants, isolated - poor community cohesion, against government guidance, traffic access and impacts, area heavily congested, junctions at capacity, low bridges on access route, access unsuitable for large vehicles, air quality impacts, impact on SNCI, priority habitats, goes against other policies within the local plan, adverse impact on heritage, site is too large, failure to consult, lack of transparency, better alternative uses - nature and heritage trail/park	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0121	Berta Mateo Crespo	TBW.3	Withdraw designation of Branksome Triangle as a permanent traveller site due to opaque process and failure to consult, failure to comply with Government guidelines, inappropriate nature of site, safety concerns, inadequate living conditions including land contamination, reduction in green space and biodiversity, not economically viable to develop for proposed purpose, traffic access and traffic impact on Bourne Valley Road, impact on local services, other more suitable sites discounted, size of site is too big, heritage of the railway, and impacts on the local character of the area.	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0122	Sophie Brady	TBW.3	Objects to traveller site in Branksome due to location being unsuitable for several reasons, including proximity to residential areas, increase in traffic, noise and disturbance, environmental and biodiversity considerations, inadequate infrastructure, and inadequate consultation with the local community. Council is urged to reconsider proposed location and explore alternative sites.	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0123	Lawrence Brady	TBW.3	Objects to traveller site in Branksome due to location being unsuitable for several reasons, including proximity to residential areas, increase in traffic, noise and disturbance, environmental and biodiversity considerations, inadequate infrastructure, and inadequate consultation with the local community. Council is urged to reconsider proposed location and explore alternative sites.	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0125	Tom Jolley	TBW.3	Object to Branksome Triangle, site is unsuitable	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0129	Esther Juliani	TBW.3	Proposed gypsy and travellers site will impact on road traffic and existing traffic problems, and the Draft Local Plan does not appear to include a thorough assessment of this. It raises safety concerns, particularly for children, and is fundamentally unsuitable. No comprehensive Health Impact Assessment or Equalities Impact Assessment have been carried out. The site would need security fencing to protect occupiers from safety hazards, which would create a sense of imprisonment. There would be an additional burden on already stretched community.	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0130	Steve and Audrey Sherriff	TBW.3	Concerns regarding proposed Gypsy and Traveller site at Branksome Triangle. Failure of BCP to consult key stakeholders until in draft form. There are alternative locations more suitable, and may offer better infrastructure and amenities, and reduced environmental hazards. Lack of consultation as failure to explore alternative sites. Site should undergo a thorough risk assessment to ensure well-being and safety of residents.	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0132	Richard Swift	TBW.3	Objects to Branksome Triangle, site is isolated, lack of gardens, issues with viaduct and railway lines, site is uninhabitable, give site back to natural environment, access, isolation of site and lack of utility services meaning there would be road closures.	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0134	Stephanie Stevens	TBW.3	Objects to Branksome Triangle issues with lack of consultation, lack of transparency, site selection process, contamination, cost of remediation, safety (high viaducts, railway lines, substation), cost of mitigating dangers, large site, isolated nature of site, better alternative uses (solar scheme).	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0135	Aran Sherriff	TBW.3	Objects to Branksome Triangle issues with environmental and biodiversity issues, size of the site (inefficient use of land, illegal expansion). Need for environmental assessments, enforcement measures and good site layout.	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0136	Richard Stevens	TBW.3	Objects to Branksome Triangle issues within traffic congestion, inadequate access, not suitable for families (adjacent to electrified railway lines, high viaducts and noise), better alternative sites exist (Creekmoor Park and Ride)	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0140	Elizabeth Luxton	TBW.3	Objects to Branksome Triangle the needs and requirements of traveller community, businesses, residents and infrastructure have not been taken into account. Issues with lack of transparency, failure to consult, site selection process, contamination, safety (high voltage substation, noise, flood risk, lack of drainage), site too small to meet pitch guidelines, lack of space of communal spaces/waste collection, incompatible with surrounding land uses, suitable living environment, constrained site access, congestion on surrounding roads, adverse impact on SNCI and protected species, site oversized for projected need, cost and lack of value for money, no evidence of deliverability, adverse impact on railway heritage, out of character with local area and conservation area, impact on local services (medical services, schools, public transport), better alternative uses exist (garden/nature reserve, car park).	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0142	Michael Burdis	TBW.3	Objects to site allocation due to lack of consultation.	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0142	Michelle Burdis	TBW.3	Objects to Branksome Triangle, unsuitable site, land contamination, enclosed, electrical substation and viaduct, not safe, better alternative uses (open space)	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0144	Avril Smith	TBW.3	Objects to the Gypsy and Travellers site allocation on Bourne Valley Road. Negative impact on traffic and congestion, not known if animals will be permitted on site, impact on local services, maintenance of the site would not be possible. A much more sustainable plan for the site which would be of benefit to the local community could be proposed.	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0147	Emma Roberts	TBW.3	Objects to Branksome Triangle, issues with heath and safety, contaminated ground, lack of consultation, better alternative sites (Creekmoor park and ride)	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0152	David and Barbara McNally	TBW.3	Site at Branksome Triangle is unsuitable due to contamination, and the associated costs to decontaminate, additional traffic and use of access to the site on Bourne Valley Road, consultation has not been done fully and openly with local residents regarding travellers sites, negative impact on wildlife on the site, impact on local infrastructure and amenities. It would be better for the site to become a local nature reserve with access across the viaduct to Talbot Heath. Draft plan should not be approved, and site should be dropped from this and future plans.	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0154	Holly Griffin	TBW.3	Objects to traveller site at Branksome Triangle. Location is inappropriate due to traffic pressure on Bourne Valley Road, half of site is SNCI, and amenities in the area already being oversubscribed. Site at Creekmoor would be more appropriate and safer for children.	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0155	Robert Sanders	TBW.3	Objection to Branksome Triangle concerns regarding traffic congestion, impact on local schools. Site should not be in such a central location.	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0157	Frances Laws	TBW.3	Objects to Branksome Triangle Gypsy and Travellers site due to concerns of contamination, health and safety, security fences required leading to sense of imprisonment, traffic access and impact, environment and biodiversity, size of site too big, development cost, failure to consult key stakeholders, railway heritage, detrimental impact to local character and visual amenity, impact on local services, and availability of other sites.	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0161	Tim Sterling	TBW.3	Objects to inclusion of Branksome Triangle site for use as a permanent gypsy and travellers site in the BCP Local Plan due to environment and biodiversity impacts, failure to consult key stakeholders, detrimental impact on local character, other more suitable sites, and BCP owning the land is a conflict with planning permission required for development.	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0163	Sally Greenwood	TBW.3	Objects to Branksome Triangle site allocation due to concerns about health and safety, proximity to electrical substations, flooding of the site, and unviable to remediate the site, integration between travellers and existing surrounding residents, the use is discriminatory as provides affordable living conditions for travellers and not others, concerns of contamination and need for decontamination and impact upon character. Not deliverable and site should be considered for alternative uses.	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0165	Susan Bond	TBW.3	Objects to Branksome Triangle site allocation due to contamination of site, proximity to electrical substations, flooding of the site, and unviable to remediate the site.	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0168	Gary Clarke	TBW.3	Much of Branksome Triangle has SNCI status, proposed residential development goes against National policy for LA's to adhere to Local Nature Recovery strategy. Branksome Triangle is part of a vitally important ecological network, connected by the railway line wildlife corridor to Talbot Heath SSSI, Upper Gardens, Puggs Hole and Meyrick Park, and are shown on Ecological Network Maps. Developing a large part of the site disregards this strategy. Draft Local Plan fails to recognise that the ecological network is of prime importance to the overall biodiversity of Bournemouth and Poole boroughs and should be safeguarded accordingly. Site has been allocated on inadequate ecological data, and certain protected species are present, but not possible to record them due to lack of site access. Siting a gypsy and travellers site or other residential development on the site would result in loss of sunny, open conditions on the habitat area, largely through erection of fences, and would result in disturbance and increased mortality to species. Risks to safety from rail tracks and tall viaducts. Impact of increased artificial light on bats. Impact on possibilities for future management by community involvement. Site could be used for BNG credits, and would assist in meeting strategic policy NE.1, and the current proposal at Branksome Triangle does not support NE.1.	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0173	Vicky Jones	TBW.3	Objects to gypsy and travellers site at Branksome Triangle due to health and safety concerns with site hazards, contamination, traffic access to site and impact on Bourne Valley Road, biodiversity on the site and site status as SNCI, and failure to consult with key stakeholders.	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0174	Cllr Karen Rampton	TBW.3	Concerns regarding Gypsy and Travellers site at Branksome Triangle - Improper consultation with councillors, other more suitable sites, biodiversity on the site and impacts on the SNCI, contamination (including concerns of presence of Japanese knotweed), noise to occupants of the site and noise from occupants to surrounding area. Congestion in the area, narrowness of Bourne Valley Road, and site access. Numerous safety concerns and hazards on and around the site, the likely need for high fencing which would not integrate new community in to existing one. The allocation is not consistent with National Policy.	Objection	Yes	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0178	Joanna Manning	TBW.3	Objecting to Gypsy and Travellers site allocation at Branksome Triangle due to concerns regarding contamination, health and safety risks, housing standards, traffic impact, environmental concerns, site size, development cost, lack of consultation, impact on local heritage, local character, impact on local services, and the availability of other more suitable sites.	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0179	Tiziano Bedin	TBW.3	Opposes development of the site into a Gypsy and Travellers site due to concerns regarding extensive wildlife presence and environmental considerations, contamination, historic lack of approval for housing on the site, strain on infrastructure, and traffic management and flow. There should be reconsideration of alternative sites which are safer and more accessible.	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0180	Peter Barrie	TBW.3	Objecting to Gypsy and Travellers site at Branksome Triangle due to concerns of traffic safety on entrance/exit of the site, additional traffic strain on Bourne Valley Road, pollution, positioning to the railway line, presence of Japanese Knotweed, environmental designation of the existing site, and lack of detail on other sites considered.	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0181	Mark Meadows	TBW.3	Objects to allocation of Branksome Triangle for a Gypsy and Travellers site due to contamination of the site, wildlife present on the site, lack of evidence for other sites considered, political concerns, and safety of children on site adjacent to railway lines.	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0182	Gillian Brookes	TBW.3	Objects to allocation of Branksome Triangle for a Gypsy and Travellers site due to the site being unsuitable due to the access on to Bourne Valley Road, contamination, pressure on infrastructure, Creekmoor Park and Ride being a more suitable site, need for continuation for peaceful and safe environment, and alternative sites not considered.	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0184	Stella Edwards	TBW.3	Objects to Branksome Triangle site as Gypsy and Traveller allocation due to not being fit for purpose, loss of value to house prices, site is contaminated, entrance to site being small and existing traffic issues on Bourne Valley Road, dangers from railway track, wildlife on site, lack of consultation, and no desire from Gypsy and Traveller community to live there.	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0185	Jonathon Eyre	TBW.3	Objects to Branksome Triangle site allocation for Gypsy and Traveller site due to concerns of lack of communication with local community and gypsy and traveller community, contamination, unsafe site, site is undeliverable in 5 year lifetime of Plan, impact on traffic in surrounding areas, and impact on services and infrastructure.	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0186	Ehsan Roudiani	TBW.3	Branksome Triangle is an SNCI, and proposed development would destroy habitat. The site has multiple hazards, restricted access and congestion on surrounding roads. Concerns over access for residents and construction traffic. Local residents were not informed of plans or given an opportunity to respond.	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0187	Midge McGee	TBW.3	Concerns about allocation of Branksome Triangle as gypsy and traveller site due to no consultation, contamination on site, proximity to electrical substation, site is unstable and prone to flooding, lack of information on other sites considered, difficulty of construction access from low bridges and volumes of traffic, access/egress to site not suitable for housing development, and expensive development for council, given site constraints.	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0188	Samantha Eyre	TBW.3	Objects to the plans for Branksome Triangle due to additional traffic generated, existing congestion on Bourne Valley Road, unsafe entrance to the site and additional congestion from its use, and additional large vehicles navigating low bridges.	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0191	Michelle Scott	TBW.3	Objects to proposed use of Branksome Triangle site due to lack of consultation, lack of transparency, doubts whether site can facilitate planning and growth for 15 years, pressure on healthcare, need for high fences, restrictive site, unsafe environment for children, contamination, and site is an SNCI.	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0192	Magdalena Lipinska	TBW.3	Objects to allocation of site for gypsy and traveller site as there are issues with access, environmental impact, and high fencing.	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0193	Zoe Parker	TBW.3	Objects to Branksome Triangle site as a Gypsy and Travellers site due to concerns of existing contamination on site which is likely to have led to numerous health conditions in nearby residents, presence of Japanese Knotweed on the site, noise, and site hazards and health and safety.	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0194	James Clarke	TBW.3	Objects to allocation of Branksome Triangle as a gypsy and travellers site due to loss of net biodiversity and wildlife, and no mitigation will resolve this loss, land is hazardous, contaminated, unsafe, and access is restricted. Branksome East Viaduct would be a stranded wasted asset. No consultation carried out, and no alternative sites included.	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
105	William Wherity	TBW.3	Objects to the allocation of Branksome Triangle for Gypsies and Travellers, Impact on SNCI and habitat, impact on historical viaduct, concerns with contamination, danger from electrified railway and electricity sub stations, viability, restricted access and congestion, unsuitable for housing	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0126	Kushti Bok	TBW.3	Issues surrounding noise, contaminated land and land stability require further investigation to ensure the site is suitable. High quality design needed with three distinct areas of 5 pitches each.	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper. Some amendments proposed to ensure a future planning application addresses and mitigates contamination and safety issues.	NA
0143	Nicola Crampton	TBW.3	Object to gypsy and traveller site at Branksome Triangle, better alternative site (next to Branksome Homepage)	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0196	John Horsby	TBW.3	Objects to designation of Branksome Triangle as a permanent gypsy and traveller site due to concerns regarding opaque process and failure to consult, breach of policy and failure to comply with government guidelines, site access, high fencing won't comply with housing standards, safety regarding proximity to railway lines, viaducts and electrical substation, inadequate living conditions with contamination on site, reduction in green space and biodiversity, development cost (unviable), traffic access and additional congestion, impact on local services, other sites being discounted, site is too big, heritage of the railway, impact on local character, and restrictive covenants present on the site and on properties on Gordon Road South.	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0197	Suzi Thomas	TBW.3	Object to allocation as Gypsy and Traveller site due to transport accessibility, traffic safety and impact on services. Would exacerbate existing congestion on Bourne Valley Road, impede access for emergency services. There should be a detailed transport assessment. Narrow road network and poor public transport will make it difficult for residents to access services and the site would put undue burden on existing community resources.	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0198	Chris Dear	TBW.3	Objection to allocation as a Gypsy and Traveller site. Surrounding roads already used as a 'rat run' creating a safety risk. More vehicles and families with young children living on site will worsen this. Increased pollution also dangerous for children and young people. We must fulfil statutory duties but also ensure we do so in a safe, considered and democratic way. This proposal fails these tests.	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0199	Maurice Huddleston	TBW.3	Objection to allocation as a Gypsy and Traveller site. High security fences needed for protection would create hazards, sense of imprisonment and segregates from settled community. Contrary to PPTS(2023) para 26 which promotes openness and of sites and avoidance of fences, walls and deliberate isolation. Also contrary to Designing Gypsy and Traveller Sites Good Practice (2008) (now withdrawn) para 3.4, 4.12 and 4.25 which promotes open boundaries to foster integration and inclusion and avoiding sense of enclosure, and facilitating easy access for emergency vehicles. Objection due to impact on biodiversity and SNCI. Site is rare and valuable and supports a number of species and linked to disused railway lines which provide biodiversity corridors.	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0201	Dave Folan	TBW.3	Objects to allocation of Branksome Triangle as Gypsy and Travellers site due to concerns of health and safety risks on site, the strain on local services and roads, additional noise to local community, and lack of connection to the community.	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0202	Naomi Sheppard	TBW.3	Objects to proposed gypsy and travellers site at Branksome Triangle due to concerns of safety for residents of the site, impact on travel infrastructure and congestion, site designation as SNCI and protected species on site, and failure to consult with key stakeholders. Interested in what other sites have been considered and discounted.	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0203	Denzil Sheppard	TBW.3	Objects to proposed gypsy and travellers site at Branksome Triangle due to concerns of safety for residents of the site, impact on travel infrastructure and congestion, site designation as SNCI and protected species on site, and failure to consult with key stakeholders. Interested in what other sites have been considered and discounted.	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0204	Elizabeth Sheppard	TBW.3	Objects to the allocation of Branksome Triangle for a gypsy and travellers site due to concerns of safety, additional traffic on to Bourne Valley Road and use of the site access, wildlife and biodiversity status of the site, lack of consultation, other sites not being considered, existing congestion in vicinity, existing road infrastructure, on-site contamination, health and safety hazards, impact on biodiversity and the environment, alternative uses for the site possible, and more suitable alternative sites available.	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0205	Elliot Sheppard	TBW.3	Objects to the allocation of Branksome Triangle as a Gypsy and Travellers site due to safety concerns, impact on traffic congestion, nature conservation designation and species on site, and concerns that other locations were not considered.	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0206	Sharon and Hannah Mallard	TBW.3	Concerns for allocation of Branksome Triangle as gypsy and travellers site, which include the access road to the site and its current condition, encouragement for use of the remainder of the site for anti-social behaviour, speeding along road, noise, required security for site, impact on wildlife, lighting on access road, on-site existing contamination, ability for Bourne Valley Road and rail bridges to accommodate large vehicles associated with the site, road safety, and clusters of health issues in the area, and therefore not safe to live on site.	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0207	Mark Williams	TBW.3	Objects to allocation of Branksome Triangle as gypsy and travellers site due to concerns of only finding one suitable site for this use, lack of consultation with key stakeholders, health and safety, lack of integration of the new community to integrate due to site constraints, on-site existing contamination, site designation as SNCI, lack of viability information, existing congestion, access difficulties for larger vehicles due to bridges, site is too large for intended use and may result in illegal expansion, cost of developing site for use, impact on local services, and site should be made available for locals and converted to a park.	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0208	Vikki Knowles	TBW.3	Objects to allocation of gypsy and travellers site at Branksome Triangle due to concerns of existing on-site contamination and viability to remediate this, health and safety hazards for residents of site, lack of appropriate housing standards for residents of site with likely introduction of high fencing, additional traffic generated and impact on surrounding area (further congestion to that existing), access to site restricted for larger vehicles, reduction in green space and biodiversity on site form construction and occupation of site, size of site being too large for requirement, failure to consult key stakeholders, impact on local services, and other more suitable available sites. It's use would be better as an ecological park with nature trails.	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0209	Felicity Peachey	TBW.3	Objects to proposed gypsy and travellers site at Branksome Triangle due to the inappropriate location with existing traffic congestion and restricted access. The SNCI and associated wildlife will be destroyed, and impact on local services, and site is not safe being next to a train track, with safer alternative at Creekmoor.	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0212	Lisa Hawkins	TBW.3	Objects to Branksome Triangle site allocation due to concerns regarding increase in traffic in an area with severe congestions and high air pollution, impact on local services, impact on the character of the local area, site being larger than required, existing on-site contamination, proximity to hazardous infrastructure, poor living conditions for occupiers, loss of viaduct as heritage asset and railway heritage, site is unsuitable and unviable, lack of consultation, and more suitable sites for use.	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0213	Gerry Frizzelle	TBW.3	Concerns that the site is unsuitable for housing, and could be better utilised as a wild space for recreation, wildlife study, biodiversity and a contribution to the area's industrial heritage with the viaduct.	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0214	Trish and Kevin Lait	TBW.3	Objects to plan for traveller site at Branksome Triangle due to concerns of increased traffic congestion, on-site facilities/infrastructure, and increase in crime.	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0215	Rowan, James and Wendy Little	TBW.3	Objects to allocation of Branksome Triangle as a gypsy and travellers site due to concerns of reduction in green space and biodiversity, site would be better used for a wildlife reserve or recreation area, failure to consult key stakeholders, other sites considered not disclosed and discounted for unknown reasons, impact on the local character (adjacent to a Conservation Area), other more suitable sites, and conflict of interest in BCP deciding any future planning application decision.	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0282	Historic England	TBW.3	Locally Listed within the site should be retained and conserved.	Objection		Modification	Agree	Add criteria to retain and conserve the Locally listed WWII pill box
0216	Laurence Ainley	TBW.3	Objects to plan for traveller site at Branksome Triangle due to concerns of impact upon the environment and biodiversity which is subject to designations and impact upon local architectural character and visual amenity. Also considers there has been a failure to consult with key stakeholders regarding allocation of site, with Council not being sufficiently open or transparent with it unknown why other alternative sites such as Creekmoor have been dismissed.	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0218	John White	TBW.3	Objects to the proposed Gypsy and Travellers site due to political issues, lack of communication with local residents, contamination, lack of transparency on other sites considered, increased congestion from access road to site, positioning between two railway lines (safety concerns), impact on infrastructure, and concerns that a fair approach has not been taken by placing another gypsy and travellers site within Poole rather than Bournemouth or Christchurch.	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0287	Network Rail	TBW.3	Need to be involved with discussions. Asset protection measures needed. Network Rail have rights of access over allocated land. Suitability of site questioned. Noise attenuation, improved fencing and other boundary treatment is required. Allocation fails to take into account proximity of railway.	Objection	Yes	Modification	Met Network Rail on 20 May 2024. Agree that policy wording should be clear on asset protection measures, boundary treatment, noise attenuation and access rights.	Amend to reference the engagement needed with network rail
0219	Charlotte Blatchford	TBW.3	Objects to the proposed gypsy and travellers site at Branksome Triangle due to lack of consultation with key stakeholders, health and safety issues of the existing site, and lack of consideration of alternative sites.	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0221	Ben Lake	TBW.3	Objects to gypsy and travellers site proposed at Branksome Triangle due to loss of biodiversity, in particular protected lizards, and no mitigation could compensate for this loss.	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA



ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0224	Stephanie Marriott	TBW.3	Objects to allocation of Branksome Triangle as a gypsy and travellers site due to concerns of contamination, cost of decontamination, health and safety (site hazards), traffic congestion, restricted access to the site for large vehicles due to narrow bridges, existing on-road parking restrictions on Bourne Valley Road, loss of biodiversity and protected species, detrimental impact on local architectural character and visual amenity of the area, and other more suitable sites within BCP.	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0228	Charlie Lake	TBW.3	Objects to allocation of Branksome Triangle as a gypsy and travellers site due to on-site contamination, loss of biodiversity and threat to protected lizards, no mitigation could compensate for loss of biodiversity, and lack of information on other sites considered.	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0229	Zoe Fudge	TBW.3	Objects to gypsy and travellers site proposed at Branksome Triangle due to concerns of congestion on surrounding roads, congestion at entry point to site, impact of additional vehicles on pedestrians, potential increase in illegal parking, and existing road network not capable of dealing with increase in traffic from site.	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0230	Victoria Howard	TBW.3	Objects to Branksome Triangle being allocated as a gypsy and travellers site due to concerns of contamination on-site, congestion on roads, proximity to railway lines, anti-social behaviour, impact upon Brunstead Road Conservation Area, negative impact on property values, and oversubscribed infrastructure.	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0234	David Richardson	TBW.3	Object to Branksome Triangle, issues with anti-social behaviour, contamination of the area through daily activities, ignoring legislation, health and safety concerns, traffic and access impacts, impacts on environment and biodiversity, development costs, failure to consult, impact on railway heritage, does not integrate with local character, impact on local services, better alternative uses.	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0240	Nicki Warboys	TBW.3	Concerns for gypsy and traveller site allocation including lack of consultation with stakeholders, lack of transparency of the site selection process, and requests for further information (particularly on other sites considered) denied.	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0241	Marianne White	TBW.3	Objects to the proposed allocation of Branksome Triangle as a gypsy and travellers site due to concerns of lack of communication with local residents, lack of information on other sites considered, on-site contamination, increase in congestion, proximity to railway lines, health and safety concerns, site is larger than need and could lead to illegal expansions, viability, out of character with local area, impact on biodiversity, pressure on local schools, and consideration of sites outside of Poole due to a site already being present in Poole.	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0242	Mat Howard	TBW.3	Objects to the allocation of Branksome triangle as a gypsy and travellers site due to concerns of reduction in biodiversity, health and safety (existing site hazards), size of site is too large for need and will lead to future expansion, quality of life for residents living on site, increased congestion in an already congested area, location of access, viability of the scheme, loss of railway heritage, impact of proposal on the character of the area, other more suitable alternative sites, decrease in property value, and better and more appropriate uses for the site, such as an ecological park.	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0243	Katherine Jeanes	TBW.3	Objects to the proposed allocation at Branksome Triangle due to concerns that the site is unsafe due to railway lines and HV electrical installations, and there is on-site contamination which has led to a high number of cancer patients in the area.	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0244	Jimmy Howie	TBW.3	Objects to the use of Branksome Triangle as a gypsy and travellers site due to concerns of on-site contamination, existing traffic problems around the site entrance, impact on wildlife, other sites not being an option, and lack of consultation with residents.	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0249	Martin West	TBW.3	Objects to the allocation of Branksome Triangle for a gypsy and travellers site due to unsuitable infrastructure with regards to roads, congestion from using the site access, on-site contamination, provision of waste water on site which could result in contamination and health risks to local community, and the safety of future occupiers of the site.	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0253	Jessie Lacy	TBW.3	Objects to the proposed allocation of Branksome Triangle due to concerns of not enough consultation and time for local people to consider plans, lack of space for new community to integrate with existing community, higher crime rates, reduced property values, not enough infrastructure, safety of the site, and a rural site being more suitable.	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0255	Corbin Spicer	TBW.3	Objects to the allocation of Branksome Triangle as a gypsy and travellers site due to the location being inappropriate, existing traffic pressure and restrictions in the area, loss of wildlife, amenities in the area are already oversubscribed, and Creekmoor site would be more appropriate and safer.	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0256	Gemma Rose	TBW.3	Objects to allocation of Branksome Triangle for a gypsy and travellers site due to lack of consultation with residents and local community, reduction in property values, impact on local infrastructure and services, existing traffic problems in surrounding area, on-site contamination issues, a rural area would be more suitable for travelling community, and potential crime and conflict.	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0261	James Mathieson	TBW.3	Objects to the proposed allocation at Branksome Triangle due to concerns of pitches proposed in the 400m zone, area is already densely populated, existing congestion and parking problems, noise from future occupiers to existing residents, existing on-site contamination, danger from railway lines, unsuitable access in to the site for large vehicles and mobile homes, and loss of wildlife.	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0262	Richard Nye	TBW.3	Objects to the allocation of Branksome Triangle as a gypsy and travellers site due to concerns of lack of consultation, and existing traffic congestion and parking problems in the area, which would be exacerbated by the development.	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0264	Sir Conor Burns MP	TBW.3	Overwhelming opposition to policy. Unsatisfactory consultation in plan-making and site selection process. No information on why TBW.3 is the only suitable/viable site, or how other sites were considered and reasons for rejection. No opportunities to gain details/background information prior to consultation. Indicates rushed and incomplete site selection process. Does not indicate other possible numbers/uses of specialist homes (concerned higher number would be delivered). Query whether Gypsy and Traveller community have been consulted regarding suitability. Unlikely will be delivered within 5 years (contrary to government policy), due to contamination (cannot be occupied until decontaminated), noise from railway and electromagnetic field radiation (no evidence of risk assessments or consultation with Network Rail/SWR undertaken regarding feasibility/cost of measures required), land stability issues and access to viaducts (no evidence of risk assessments), restricted access (and cost/complexity of new access for emergency vehicles), poor relationship with local area/facilities, and resultant financial issues (including for taxpayers). Potential issues with proximity to heathland. Unclear how compliant with NE2 given difficulty securing enhancements or net gain in biodiversity. Numerous issues with traffic congestion and local infrastructure impacts (parking, healthcare, public transport and school availability/capacity). Inferior site does not represent fair treatment of traveller population. [ Includes results of survey of constituents' views regarding TBW.3.]	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0265	Gillian Taylor	TBW.3	Objects to the Branksome Triangle allocation for gypsy and travellers due to concerns of inappropriate location that will not meet the needs of the whole community, existing congestion, impact on infrastructure and services, and loss of wildlife and green space.	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0266	Karim Moudi	TBW.3	Objects to the allocation of Branksome Triangle for a gypsy and travellers site due to lack of consultation, lack of space for cohabiting of new and existing community, concerns of crime, devaluation of properties, concerns of sufficient infrastructure, safety, impact on existing residents and services they access, and why a more rural location wasn't considered.	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0276	Jenny Eales	TBW.3	Objects to Branksome Triangle being allocated for gypsy and travellers due to concerns of loss of wildlife and biodiversity, and the site would be better delivered as part of a nature trail.	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0277	Richard Page	TBW.3	Objects to the allocation due to failure to consult stakeholders/inadequate consultation, on-site contamination, flooding, health and safety hazards, inappropriate access to site, lack of on-site infrastructure, loss of railway heritage, loss of biodiversity and impact on the environment, inadequate housing and living standards for future occupiers, impact on local character, cost of the development, not financially viable, and lack of consideration of alternative sites.	Objection	Yes	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0278	Serge Garavini	TBW.3	Objects to Branksome Triangle being allocated as a gypsy and travellers site due to concerns of inappropriate location, access, local amenities, suitability of site and viability.	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0279	Natasha O'Neil	TBW.3	Objects to allocation of Branksome Triangle as gypsy and travellers site due to concerns of lack of transparency, the potential to undertake a Community Asset Transfer/purchase of the land, failure to consult, failure to provide information on other sites considered, existing on-site contamination and costs for de-contamination, whether the site is deliverable in 5 years, health and safety, site hazards, existing congestion and future congestion from site allocation, access, unsuitable evacuation procedures, housing standards and required fencing for the site, high levels of air pollution in the area, railway heritage and the loss of viaduct from public access.	Objection	Yes	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0281	Emma Harris	TBW.3	Objects to gypsy and travellers site at Branksome Triangle due to concerns of health and safety (access to the railway lines and contamination), impact on local traffic, strain on local services, and lack of consultation with residents.	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0283	Lyn Haslam	TBW.3	Object to Branksome Triangle concerns with antisocial behaviour and impact on wildlife.	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0285	Kim Parker	TBW.3	Objects to Branksome Triangle allocation as gypsy and travellers site due to concerns of location (semi-rural location would be more suitable), existing congestion in the area and site access, loss of wildlife, increased pressure on local amenities, increased cost to tax payers to subsidise the new community, and the negative impact on property values.	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0294	Caroline Caunter	TBW.3	Objects to Branksome Triangle - inappropriate location, issues within traffic congestions, restricted access, SNCl, impacts on wildlife, pressure on local amenities (school, GPs), safety next to the train track, better site at Creekmoor	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0296	Chloe Howie	TBW.3	Objects to allocation of site for travellers. Considers site is not suitable for human habitation due to contamination and raises issues regarding existing traffic in the area and impact upon wildlife. Finds it difficult to believe there are no other available sites for this use and considers it to be politically motivated.	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0300	Chris Harris	TBW.3	Objects to the use of Branksome Triangle as a permanent traveller site due to concerns of alternative sites ignored and not fully considered, site is not necessarily suitable despite being 'most suitable', lack of consultation with residents, site has been neglected by BCP Council, security of the site, health and safety hazards on site, required fencing for security and impact on residents of site, drainage and water run-off issues on site, contamination, designation of part of the site as an SNCl, and cost of developing site due to single access.	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0303	Mike Skander	TBW.3	Objects to Branksome Triangle - inappropriate location, issues within traffic congestions, restricted access, SNCl, impacts on wildlife, pressure on local amenities (school, GPs), safety next to the train track, better site at Creekmoor	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0305	Martine Kunzi	TBW.3	Comments on the allocation of Branksome Triangle as gypsy and travellers site with concerns of negative impacts on biodiversity and wildlife, health and safety of occupiers of the site, and sufficient engagement with the community and stakeholders. These factors must be considered to create a safe and sustainable living environment for the gypsy and traveller community.	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0308	Joanne Keeling	TBW.4	Objection to inclusion of land at Talbot Village in Draft Local Plan. Land holds significant ecological value, is adjacent to SSSI, and should be safeguarded from further development. No benefits that outweigh harm to Talbot Heath. No statutory requirement to deliver new homes, but there is to protect habitats and species. Actions to destroy habitats can be challenged and found unsound. Multiple refusals of planning applications on the site in past, showing desire to protect area. Further development would add to strain on infrastructure, particularly Wallisdown Road. Increase in vehicles will result in safety issues, increased air and noise pollution. Sustainable transport methods should not be relied upon to alleviate situation. Traffic management is lacking in proposed development.	Objection	No	No action	The issues have been considered by an inspector and the proposal approved.	NA
0313	Adam Luxton	TBW.3	Objects to allocation of site for Gypsy and Traveller homes. Does not consider it deliverable, suitable or viable option and raises issues/concerns relating to contamination, safety, housing standards and inadequate pitch size, traffic and inadequate access, impact upon the environment and biodiversity, impact upon local character, impact upon railway heritage, impact upon local services, and site too overly large for allocated number. Considers that there are more suitable alternative sites which haven't been fully considered. Also considers Council has failed to adequately consult key stakeholders/community.	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0314	Agata Ingleson	TBW.3	Objects to allocation of site for Gypsy and Traveller homes as does not consider it suitable or viable and raises concerns relating to impact on ecology, contamination, safety, traffic and inadequate access, local services and infrastructure. Also raises concerns with lack of consultation with local community.	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0315	Ailsa Mackenzie	TBW.3	Raises concerns with lack of consultation with local community and Council not explored alternative sites.	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0316	Ainara Deininger	TBW.3	Objects to allocation of site for Gypsy and Traveller homes and raises issues/concerns relating to health and safety, environmental impact, traffic congestion and inadequate access, and community cohesion. impact upon local character, impact upon railway heritage, impact upon local services, and site too overly large for allocated number. Considers site to overly large and not economically viable. Also considers Council has failed to adequately consult with local community.	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0317	Alan Clark	TBW.3	Objects to the allocation due to on-site contamination, health and safety hazards, increase in traffic congestion, site of size is too large, impact on local services, impact on wildlife, lack of consultation, and lack of information on alternative sites.	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0320	Alex Fraser	TBW.3	Objects to site allocation due to on-site contamination, health and safety hazards, traffic access and impact, loss of biodiversity and impact in the environment, failure to consult, other sites not considered, and there are alternative uses more suitable for the site.	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0321	Alexia Parkin	TBW.3	Objects to allocation due to on-site contamination, increase in congestion, impact on biodiversity, not consistent with local or national policy, and presence of alternative sites and lack of justification for these.	Objection	Yes	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0322	Alicja Nowicka	TBW.3	Object to Branksome Triangle for gypsy and traveller site concerns with access and traffic impact, high congested area, junctions over capacity, low railway bridges, poor access for emergency vehicles, no traffic impact assessment, traffic issues in conflict with government guidance, more suitable location required.	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0324	Amelia Burgan	TBW.3	Objects to allocation due to impact on local services, impact on the environment and loss of biodiversity, traffic access and impact, and on-site contamination.	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0326	Andrew Borrill	TBW.3	Objects to allocation of site due to lack of consultation, policy should provide a more detailed site location and description, conflict of cultures, electric vehicle charging not mentioned, impact on biodiversity, pollution from redevelopment, anti-social behaviour, and no costing information for development of site or maintenance costs.	Objection	Yes	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0328	Andrew Pidgley	TBW.3	Objects to allocation due to lack of consultation, inappropriate site access, existing traffic issues in the vicinity, and increase in congestion.	Objection	Yes	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0330	Andrew Richards	TBW.3	Objects to Branksome Triangle site, out of character with conservation area, dangerous close to the railway, give thought to local residents and holiday makers.	Objection	Yes	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0331	Andrew Smith	TBW.3	Objects to the allocation due to health and safety concerns, flooding, noise levels unsuitable for future occupiers, traffic access and impact on congestion and air pollution, impact on biodiversity and the environment, size of site too large, lack of consultation, and impact on local services.	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0333	Andy Leggett	TBW.3	Objects to allocation due to on-site contamination, health and safety hazards, flooding, inadequate housing and living standards for future occupiers, traffic access and impact on road infrastructure, loss of biodiversity and impact on the environment, size of site too large, cost of development and viability of scheme, lack of consultation, loss of railway heritage, impact on local character, impact on local services, and alternative uses of site not explored.	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0337	Anne German	TBW.3	Objects to allocation due to on-site contamination, health and safety hazards, flooding, and cost of developing site is not viable.	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0338	Anne Vartan	TBW.3	Objects to allocation due to health and safety hazards, on-site contamination, impact on road traffic and existing congestion and air pollution, and need for Council to review alternative sites.	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0340	Anthony Cauchi	TBW.3	Objects to allocation due to health and safety hazards, access and egress for site, noise levels on site, reduction in green space and biodiversity, failure to consult, and traffic access and impact on existing congestion and air pollution.	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0344	Kerrie Ainley	TBW.3	Object to gypsy and traveller provision at Branksome Triangle. Issues raised with im-pacts on traffic, unfit for human occupation, habitats/ecology, lack of consultation, balance of the area as a whole/the settled community. Better alternative sites have not been considered. Could be better used as a nature area.	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0346	Benjamin Piercy	TBW.3	Objects to the allocation due to health vand safety concerns, flooding, on-site contamination, failure to consult, failure to consider alternative sites, traffic access and impact on existing congestion and air pollution, site access and egress, loss of biodiversity and impact on the environment, impact on local services, and cost of development and viability of scheme.	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0347	Bethany Bowen	TBW.3	Objects to the allocation due to impact on local services, impact on wildlife on site, and lack of consultation with councillors.	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0348	Beverley Mitchell	TBW.3	Objects to the allocation due to decrease in property values, safety, and anti-social behaviour.	Objection	Yes	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0349	Bhavini Chauhan	TBW.3	Objects to the allocation due to risk of anti-social behaviour.	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0352	Bradley Instance	TBW.3	Objects to the allocation due to on-site contamination, health and safety hazards, flooding, traffic access and impact on existing congestion and infrastructure, impact on biodiversity and the environment, failure to consult, and availability of alternative and more suitable sites.	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0354	Brian Langridge	TBW.3	Objects to the allocation due to on-site contamination, unviable to decontaminate site, health and safety hazards, unsuitable living standards for future occupiers, traffic impacts from congestion and unsuitable infrastructure, additional air pollution, unsuitable site access, reduction in green space and biodiversity, size of site too large, economically unviable to develop site, failure to consult, loss of railway heritage asset, detrimental impact on local architecture and character, impact on local services, and other more suitable sites available.	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0356	Brian Stocks	TBW.3	Object to Branksome Triangle for gypsy and traveller site concerns with low railway bridges on access points and noise levels.	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0361	Carole Gay	TBW.3	Objects to the allocation due to health and safety hazards, impact on local services, existing congestion, and on-site contamination.	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0364	Catherine Ingle	TBW.3	Objects to the allocation due to on-site contamination, health and safety hazards, loss of biodiversity and habitats, site is too large, loss of railway heritage asset, site access is unsuitable, and increase in existing congestion.	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0365	Catherine Latre	TBW.3	Objects to the allocation due to on-site contamination, unviable to decontaminate site, health and safety hazards, unsuitable housing and living standards for future occupiers, traffic access and impact on existing congestion and infrastructure, loss of biodiversity and habitats, and site is too large.	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0366	Charlotte Hammond	TBW.3	Objects to the allocation due to unsuitable housing and living standards for future occupiers, traffic access and impact on existing congestion and air pollution, impact on local character of the area, and on-site contamination.	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0370	Christopher Tansey	TBW.3	Object to Branksome Triangle for gypsy and traveller site concerns that site isolates from the local community, lack of integration, failure to consult, site is unsafe (adjacent railway line, railway viaduct), contamination, not suitable family environment.	Objection	Yes	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0373	Lord Clark	TBW.3	Object to gypsy and traveller site at Branksome Triangle. Object to process followed and breaches of the "Probity in Planning" document issued by the Planning Advisory Service in December 2019. Does not accord with Nolan principles. Allocation is not in the public interest, not made objectively, openly or honestly, or in accordance with leadership principle. Site is unsuitable, other potential sites (Creekmoor Park and Ride), decisions not made transparently, details of other sites not provided.	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0375	Corrine Pickering	TBW.3	Objects to the allocation due to unsuitable site access, impact on existing congestion, on-site contamination, impact on wildlife, health and safety hazards, other more suitable and available sites, alternative uses possible for the site, and amount of consultation limited.	Objection	Yes	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0376	Daniel Paine	TBW.3	Objects to the allocation due to on-site contamination, health and safety hazards, unsuitable site access, existing congestion, detrimental impact on biodiversity and the environment, and lack of consultation.	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0377	Daniel Parkin	TBW.3	Objects to the allocation due to Lack of community engagement, on-site contamination, health and safety hazards, unsuitable living standards for future occupiers, impact on biodiversity and the environment, , and alternative uses possible for the site.	Objection	Yes	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0379	Daniel Willsher	TBW.3	Objects to the allocation due to health and safety hazards, on-site contamination, and unsuitable housing and living standards for future occupiers.	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0380	Daniele Genovese	TBW.3	Objects to the allocation due to detrimental impact on biodiversity and the environment, size of site is too large, unsuitable housing and living standards for future occupiers, and no risk assessment undertaken.	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0381	Darren Roach	TBW.3	Objects to the allocation due to on-site contamination, health and safety hazards, and other more suitable and available sites.	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0383	David Acott	TBW.3	Object to Branksome Triangle Gypsy and Traveller site issues include health and safety risk (proximity of high voltage railway line, access to power supply, access to viaduct), limited road access, land contamination, pressure on health services.	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0387	David Lloyd	TBW.3	Objects to the allocation due to on-site contamination and no risk assessment of this, location if site and impact on existing and future residents, lack of supporting evidence, and impact on health and safety.	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0388	David Sheridan	TBW.3	Objects to the allocation due to on-site contamination, health and safety hazards, unsuitable housing and living standards of future occupiers, increased congestion and air pollution, site access, existing road layout and infrastructure, loss of green space and biodiversity, size of site is too large, and failure to consult.	Objection	Yes	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0389	David Terry	TBW.3	Objects to the site allocation due to not considering alternative site options publicly, the availability of alternative and suitable sites, and the decrease in market value of nearby properties.	Objection	Yes	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0391	Dawn Milton	TBW.3	Objects to the allocation due to on-site contamination, cost of decontamination, health and safety hazards, lack of risk assessment, impact on local services, existing traffic congestion, unsuitable site access, unsuitable housing and living standards for future occupiers, need for additional public transport has not been addressed in plan, impact on (and loss of) biodiversity and the environment, size of site too large, cost of developing site, failure to consult, loss of railway heritage asset, impact on local character and visual amenity, and availability of more suitable sites.	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0392	Dawn Rasbridge	TBW.3	Objects to the allocation due to lack of transparency, other more suitable sites available, on-site contamination, costs of decontamination, health and safety hazards, unsuitable site access, unsuitable road infrastructure, lack of integration with local community, lack of infrastructure and utilities on site, impact on biodiversity and the environment, size of site too large, cost of development, alternative uses for the site, lack of consultation, risk of attracting transient travellers to site, and risk of anti-social behaviour.	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0393	Deborah Parsons	TBW.3	Objects to the allocation due to on-site contamination, health and safety hazards, unsuitable housing and living standards for future occupiers, existing congestion and access issues in area, loss of habitats and species, size of site too large, not economically viable to develop site, loss of railway heritage, impact on local character, and availability of alternative and suitable sites.	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0394	Denise Hurst	TBW.3	Objects to the allocation due to existing congestion in the area, on-site contamination, cost of decontamination, other sites not properly considered, and health and safety hazards.	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0396	Deniz Grant	TBW.3	Objects to the allocation due to on-site contamination, health and safety hazards, existing traffic congestion in area, increase in air pollution, lack of transparency from Council, alternative uses for the site, impact on local services, and other more suitable sites in the conurbation.	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0397	Dianne Parfitt	TBW.3	Objects to the allocation due to on-site contamination, health and safety hazards, impact on local services, unsuitable housing and living standards for future occupiers, unsuitable site access, inadequate highway infrastructure, existing congestion, impact on biodiversity and the environment, size of site too large, failure to consult, availability of alternative and more suitable sites, and not financially viable.	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0398	Dominic Biles	TBW.3	Objects to the allocation due to lack of consultation with key stakeholders, existing congestion around the site, increase in air pollution, on-site contamination, health and safety hazards, flooding, and the isolation of the site.	Objection	Yes	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0400	Edward Mitton	TBW.3	Objects to the allocation due to existing traffic congestion in the area, impact on local services, covenants on site and neighbouring properties restricting development, size of site too large, loss of biodiversity and habitats, development costs, impact on local character of the area, not in compliance with national policy and guidance, and more suitable alternative sites available.	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0404	Michelle Ottewill	TBW.3	Object to gypsy and traveller site at Branksome Triangle. Lack of consultation. Better alternative sites, Branksome Chine car park.	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0406	Elliot Fraser	TBW.3	Objects to allocation of site for traveller homes because of concerns regarding health and safety from the railway tracks and site contamination; increased traffic congestion and inadequate access; impact upon the environment and biodiversity. Considers more suitable alternative sites and develop this site for walking trail.	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0407	Emma Parsons	TBW.3	Objects to allocation of site for traveller homes because site is unsuitable due to contamination and cost of decontamination; impact upon health and safety from electrical substations; not meeting basic housing standards; increased traffic congestion and inadequate access; site overly large and concerns of unauthorised expansion; cost to development and whether it is viable; impact upon local services; impact upon character and railway heritage. Also considers there are more suitable alternative sites and Council failed to properly consult community.	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0408	Emma Smith	TBW.3	Objects to the allocation due to negative impacts on local house prices and the ability to sell properties, worries about the potential increase in crime and reduced safety in the neighbourhood, the impact on local wildlife, including protected species such as sand lizards, deer, birds, and foxes as well as the site being registered for nature conservation and the impact on community in terms of stress for local residents.	Objection	Yes	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0409	Erik Fraser	TBW.3	Objects to allocation of site for traveller homes because concerns of health and safety from site contamination and the adjacent railway lines; impact upon the environment and biodiversity; increased traffic congestion. Also considers Council failed to properly consult.	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0410	Evelyn Clark	TBW.3	Objects to allocation of site for traveller homes because of concerns of health and safety from site contamination and the adjacent railway lines.	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0411	Farid Asghari	TBW.3	Objects to allocation of site for traveller homes because of concerns of impact upon traffic congestion and local services.	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0413	Mike Fudge	TBW.3	Object to gypsy/travellers site on Branksome triangle. Impacts on traffic/congestion/junctions, road safety, on street parking and pavement parking.	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0414	Francisca Rodriguez	TBW.3	Objects to Branksome Triangle for gypsy and traveller site adverse impact on local heritage (East Viaduct), proposal will sever connection to the viaduct, viaduct isolation and decay, threatens community objects to restore viaduct into community space/ecological park, security measures need to protect residents for accessing viaduct.	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0418	Gemma Riggs	TBW.3	Objects due to the site being bordered by live railway lines, posing significant danger, especially to children. Also believes the site to be contaminated with arsenic in the soil, making it hazardous for residential use.	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0421	Georgia Smith	TBW.3	Object to Branksome Triangle as Gypsy and Traveller site concerned with access and congestion, impacts on air quality, access for emergency vehicles, health risks, proximity of the railway, safety issues, potential damage to biodiversity and heritage access, pressure on local services, more suitable alternative sites.	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0422	Gerald Patrick Ryan	TBW.3	Objects to designation of Branksome Triangle due to heavy contamination with toxic materials from its industrial past, a live railway line, and high-voltage electrical substations making the site dangerous. Also objects on the basis that the increased population will strain already stretched local services and infrastructure.	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0423	Gill Coleman	TBW.3	Objects to the Branksome triangle site due to the sites contamination from its history as a coal yard and industrial site, including landfill use and the presence of Japanese Knotweed. Also objects due to environmental impacts with the site being located in an SNCI and falling within the Heathland exclusion zone as well as being a significant ecological and heritage asset, part of a biodiversity corridor, and home to protected species like slow worms, common lizards, and bats.	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0425	Graham Boyce	TBW.3	Objects to the Branksome triangle site due to the following reasons, environmental concerns specifically the impact on the SNCI and the sites status as an ecological extension to Talbot Heath, believing the SA to be inaccurate; also believes that the requirement to erect high fences for safety would lead to compliance issues with local planning laws and national policies for traveller sites; believes that proximity to the railway would cause safety concerns; believes that there will be negative impact on the community as a result of the lack of infrastructure and impact of reduced footfall on local businesses; the development is an inefficient use of valuable land.	Objection	Yes	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0427	Harry Parsons	TBW.3	Objects to the Branksome triangle site due to issues with contamination of the site, proximity of the railway causing a health and safety risk, the sites designation as a SNCI, lack of engagement with key stakeholders, impact of increased population on local services, impact on the character of the conservation area, concerns about future unplanned expansions, concerns about traffic congestion and emergency vehicle access, impact on important Victorian railway heritage.	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0429	Hayley Ryan	TBW.3	Objects to Branksome Triangle site due to concerns about contamination from previous industrial uses and landfill, Health and Safety Concerns regarding proximity to electrical substations and surrounding railway lines, concerns about traffic access and impact, concerns about impacts on the SNCI and biodiversity corridors, concerns about lack of consultation, lack of consideration of other sites, Increased strain on schools, healthcare, and public transport, Development cost concerns, concerns about impact on local character, Very late change in the submission policy during the consultation window.	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0430	Hayley Thomas	TBW.3	Objects to the allocation due to health and safety hazards, excessive noise levels for future occupiers, impact on traffic in area and increase in existing congestion, constrained site access, failure to consult key stakeholders, impact on local services, and impact on biodiversity and the environment.	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0431	Helen Bradley	TBW.3	Object to Branksome Triangle Gypsy and Traveller site issues include cost to develop, lack of community engagement	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0432	Helen Goodwin	TBW.3	Objects to the allocation due to on-site contamination, health and safety hazards, housing and living standards for future occupiers, increase in traffic in already congested area, impact on biodiversity and the environment, size of site is too large, cost to develop site, failure to consult, loss of railway heritage, impact on local character, impact on local services, and other alternative sites not properly considered.	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0434	Henry Hearn	TBW.3	Objects to the allocation due to on-site contamination, health and safety hazards, flooding and need for a flood risk assessment, unacceptable living standards for future occupiers, existing traffic congestion in the area, existing infrastructure and road layout unsuitable, development not viable, and lack of consultation.	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0484	Anonymous	TBW.B	Although 4 and a half storeys (15m) may be appropriate for flats, it is not appropriate height on surrounding residential roads such as Benellen Avenue and Leven Close which are dominated by single dwelling, many of them period on landscaped plots, backing onto single period dwellings on Leven Avenue. The interactive Local Plan map indicates surrounding roads have a context height of 7.635m to 11.790m. Not compliant/sound/reasonable to introduce a plan allowing 15m height in these roads. Would not be in keeping and would have negative noise, light and sound impact. Flats would increase traffic congestion and pollution. 4 and a half storey development would negatively impact Talbot Woods Conservation Area and does not comply with requirement to preserve or enhance its character and appearance. Policy suggestion of 'plot assembly' would lead to large, overbearing development in side roads. The Surrey Road and surrounds (TBW.B) and Branksome Woods Road and surrounds (TBW.C) local opportunity areas should be modified Branksome Wood Rad and properties south of this road, excluding side roads with single dwelling homes immediately adjacent to the conservation area. Alternatively the policy could be reworded to change height on roads adjacent to conservation area to no more than 3 storey.	Objection	No	Follow up	Review extent of the area and if text needs to be amended	



ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0437	Ian Burgan	TBW.3	Objection to allocation of this site due to concerns about impact on local services, the natural environment, traffic access and contamination.	Objection	Yes	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0438	Ian Houlston	TBW.3	Object to Branksome Triangle as Gypsy and Traveller site. Concerned about impact on wildlife/biodiversity, loss of urban green space, impact on wellbeing, reduced positive affect on mitigating climate change, purifying air and urban heat island affect.	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0439	Ian Scott	TBW.3	Objects to allocation and considers failure to consult and community not properly consulted or engaged prior to draft plan; and site not suitable due to concerns of contamination, risks to health and safety, increased traffic congestion and inadequate access, development costs and not being feasible, impact upon local services. Suggests alternative and more suitable site at Creekmoor park and ride.	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0440	Ivana Fraser	TBW.3	Objects to allocation raising concerns of contamination; poor health and safety; increased traffic congestion and inadequate access; impact upon biodiversity; failure to properly consult with community; more appropriate sites elsewhere and alternative use for this site as walking trail and nature reserve.	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0441	Iwona Johnson	TBW.3	Objects to allocation as considers there has been insufficient consultation with community or gypsy and travellers. Site unsuitable due to railway line, viaducts, high voltage equipment, and contamination. Also overly large for use and pitches, poor living environment through segregation, noise, air quality and disintegration with existing community. Also not economically viable or feasible. Concerns of inadequate access, increased traffic congestion, impact upon biodiversity.	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0442	Rimple Poonia	TBW.3	Object to gypsy and traveller site at Branksome Triangle. Issues with lack of transparency, unsuitability of the site (land contamination, wildlife, traffic and road safety), not a fair consultation period and the availability of email as a way of submitting responses.	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0443	Jacky Streeter	TBW.3	Objects to allocation due to there being inadequate access; land contamination and health issues posed; landscaping and poor living environment; unstable land; noise from railway; lack of consultation with community; not suitable for travellers needs; impact from flooding; and impact upon conservation and wildlife.	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0448	James Dean	TBW.3	Objection to allocation of this site due to concerns about impact on local services and infrastructure, failure to consult, costs, health and safety, impact on local character. Would be good to use as green space for community. A new site selection process should be undertaken with assessments of contamination and costs for decontamination, environmental impact assessment and a transparent consultation process.	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0452	Jason Derry	TBW.3	Objection to allocation due to concerns about lack of consultation, traffic impact and access, impact on local infrastructure and services, need for transport assessment, impact on air pollution, and the health and well being of both future residents and the existing community.	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0455	Jenni Willsher	TBW.3	Objection to allocation due to concerns about contamination, impact on aesthetic appeal, air quality and natural environment, traffic access and impact. Site should be preserved as green space addressing existing infrastructure and traffic challenges. Need to consider long term challenges and implications.	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0459	Joanna Paine	TBW.3	Objection to allocation due to concerns about contamination, health and safety, access and impact on natural environment. Residents of Gordon Road South should have been consulted as their properties back onto the site. Would be better to use as local park.	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0461	John Ingleson	TBW.3	Objection to this allocation due to concerns about contamination, costs, impact on natural environment, lack of consultation, health and safety ad impact on local services. Local residents would like something that supports wildlife and the heritage railway architecture.	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0462	John Parfitt	TBW.3	Objection to allocation due to concerns about contamination, traffic access, nature, health and safety, and impact on local services. Recent census says gypsy and traveller population is stable and only one pitch needed, Concerned site would be used as transit site. G&T representatives want smaller site. There are alternative sites, e.g. Creekmoor park and ride. Consultation inadequate.	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0465	Jonathan Rawsthorn	TBW.3	Objection to allocation due to concerns about contamination, traffic impact and access, housing standards, impact on natural environment, lack of supporting evidence, failure to consult, lack of information about alternative sites. Roeshot Hill Christchurch would be better site which is preferred by the gypsy and traveller community.	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0466	Jonathan Scott	TBW.3	Objection to this allocation as consider local plan to be not legally compliant or sound and failing to comply with duty to cooperate. Concern about contamination, health and safety, housing standards, traffic access and impact, environment and biodiversity, site too big, costs, lack of supporting evidence, failure to consult, impact on railway heritage, impact on local services. Other sites appear more suitable.	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0467	Jonathan Swan	TBW.3	Objection to this allocation due to concern about health and safety, impact on natural environment, social cohesion, impact on local services, lack of consultation. Already a site in Poole so additional site should be within Bournemouth or Christchurch. Further review of site choice required.	Objection	Yes	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0468	Joshua Instance	TBW.3	Objection to this allocation due to concerns about contamination, flooding, noise, traffic access and impact, impact on natural environment and lack of consultation. There appear to be better sites such as Creekmoor Park and Ride. This site should be used as part of a walking trail as not suitable for habitation.	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0470	Judith Parkin	TBW.3	Objection to this allocation due to concerns about viability, lack of consultation, access and traffic issues, contamination, health and safety, impact on protected species and impact on local services.	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0471	Judith Ryan	TBW.3	Objection to this allocation due to concerns about contamination, health and safety and well being.	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0472	Judith Tollerfield	TBW.3	Object to allocation of this site due to health and safety risks, impact on local character and local services, costs, and concerns about further expansion. Alternative sites should be explored.	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0475	Julie Miles	TBW.3	Objects to allocation of site for Gypsy and Traveller Homes because not in line with government guidelines and concerns of contamination and impact upon wildlife. Would be better suited as car park and consider there could be more suitable sites elsewhere. Also a traffic survey is needed.	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0476	Juliet Mitchell	TBW.3	Objects to allocation of site for Gypsy and Traveller Homes because of concerns on habitats and wildlife; road safety and increased congestion; and also considers site too big.	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0477	Juliette Oviedo	TBW.3	Objects to allocation of site for gypsy and traveller homes because of concerns of contamination and impact upon health and safety and financial feasibility of decontamination; impact upon road safety, increased congestion and inadequate access.	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0479	Kapil Chauhan	TBW.3	Objects to allocation of site. Considers plan ridiculous and concerns for vulnerable/elderly. Considers proposal would increase crime, antisocial behaviour etc.	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0480	Karen Clark	TBW.3	Objection to allocation of this site due to concerns about contamination, health and safety, impact on natural environment, lack of consultation and transparency and size of site. Alternative sites should be explored.	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0481	Karen Willsher	TBW.3	Objection to allocation due to concerns about contamination, costs of decontamination, health and safety, flooding, noise, housing standards, traffic impact and access, air pollution, impact on natural environment, economic viability, size of site, impact on railway heritage and local character, failure to consult and lack of transparency. An independent review of the true costs and further assessments are needed. The site forms part of biodiversity corridor connecting Talbot Heath, Upper Gardens, Puggs Hole and Meyrick Park and much needed green space for the local community.	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0482	Katie Dean	TBW.3	Objection to allocation of this site due to concern about health and safety, contamination, lack of transparency, flooding, impact on natural environment, lack of evidence to support choice of this site, impact on local services. Need to carry out further assessments.	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0483	Keith Grant	TBW.3	Objection to allocation of this site due to concerns about contamination, health and safety, traffic access and impact, impact on natural environment and local services. To develop (trash) the habitat for limited development seems wasteful. Concern about lack of consultation and transparency. Site should be retained as a nature reserve.	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0486	Kieren Johnson	TBW.3	Objection to this allocation due to concerns about lack of consultation, lack of assessment, size of site, health and safety, noise and air quality, impact on natural environment, access and contamination. Need for proper consultation and assessments. If deemed suitable for residential, SNCI status should dictate type suitable (not children or pets).	Objection	Yes	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0487	Kim Instance	TBW.3	Objection to allocation due to concerns about contamination, health and safety, traffic access and impact, impact on natural environment and failure to consult. Appear to be better sites. This site should be used as a walking trail linking other routes.	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0488	Kirstie McCulloch	TBW.3	Objection to allocation of this site due to concerns about contamination, health and safety, flooding, access and lack of public transport, impact on local services, impact on natural environment, lack of consultation and transparency and lack of information about alternative sites. Need for impartial and evidence based review of alternative sites.	Objection	Yes	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0489	Kristopher O'Neill	TBW.3	Objection to allocation of this site due to concerns about the consultation process, and concerns about contamination, health and safety, traffic access and impact, impact on local services, housing standards, costs, need to properly consider alternative sites, impact on natural environment. Site should be used as a nature and heritage trail, solar or wind farm or allotments.	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0491	Laura Campbell	TBW.3	Objection to the allocation of this site due to concerns about contamination, health and safety, traffic impact, access, size, management concerns, costs and impact on nature. Site should become a heritage and ecological park.	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0492	Laura Marriott	TBW.3	Object to allocation of this site due to concerns about antisocial behaviour and health and safety issues for occupiers including from noise pollution, air pollution, safety hazards, vibrations and mental health issues. Site too close to residential area.	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0493	Lauren Houlston	TBW.3	Object to Branksome Triangle as Gypsy and Traveller site. Concerned about impact on wildlife/biodiversity, loss of urban green space, impact on wellbeing, reduced positive affect on mitigating climate change, purifying air and urban heat island affect.	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0494	Laurence Bush	TBW.3	Objection to the allocation of this site due to concern about the impact on local services, impact on protected species, contamination issues, health and safety and costs.	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0495	Vicci Pickering	TBW.3	Object to traveller/gypsy site at Branksome Triangle. Highlights safety concerns traffic congestion, lack of consultation, issues with community cohesion. Explore alternative sites.	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0496	Lewis Hawkins	TBW.3	Objection to the allocation of this site due to size of the site, future management, contamination, health and safety, traffic impact and access, impact on the natural environment, contamination issues, concerns about costs of decontamination, lack of due process in allocating the site, impact on heritage and local character, size of site, health and safety, traffic issues, need to consider alternative sites properly and impact on local services.	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0498	Linda Savage	TBW.3	Objection to the allocation of this site due to lack of consultation, concerns about access, contamination, impact on local services, impact on wildlife, health and safety concerns and need for further assessments.	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0499	Lisa Parsons	TBW.3	Objection to this allocation due to concerns about the size of the site, contamination, costs and impact on local services.	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0500	Lorraine Trevett	TBW.3	Objection to the allocation of this site due to concerns about contamination, health and safety, traffic access and impact, impact on natural environment, size, costs, failure to consult and lack of transparency, impact on railway heritage and local character, impact on local services, need for assessment and consideration of alternative sites.	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0501	Louise Luxton	TBW.3	Objection to the allocation of this site due to concerns about contamination, housing standards, traffic impact and access, impact on natural environment, size, costs, failure to consult, impact on heritage and local character, impact on local services, need for consideration of other sites. Site could be used for allotments or a nature trail with walkers car park offering parking for the railway station.	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0504	Luke Gane	TBW.3	Objection to allocation of this site due to concerns about contamination, health and safety, traffic impact, access, housing standards, community cohesion, pollution, impact on the natural environment, size, need for assessments, costs, need for consultation and transparency in decision making, impact on heritage and local character and impact on local services.	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0505	Luke Mankee	TBW.3	Objection to the allocation of this site due to concerns about health and safety, noise from trains and traffic, congestion, need for consultation and site visits with relevant communities and stakeholders.	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0507	M Green	TBW.3	Objection to the allocation of this site as it is too large and concerns about access and traffic impact.	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0509	Maisie Dean	TBW.3	Objection to allocation of this site due to concerns about the impact on the natural environment, contamination, costs, size and impact on protected species.	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0512	Marilyn Parsons	TBW.3	Objection to allocation due to need for comprehensive, transparent and impartial assessment of all potential gypsy and traveller sites.	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0513	Mark Coles	TBW.3	Objection to allocation due to concerns about the impact on the SNCI and wildlife. Should use site as an ecological park accessible for whole community	Objection	Yes	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0515	Mark Mould	TBW.3	Objection to the allocation of this site due to concerns about health and safety, traffic access and impact, contamination, lack of meaningful consultation, site too large, and query protection of SNCI.	Objection	Yes	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0516	Mark Redler	TBW.3	Objection to the allocation of this site due to concerns about housing standards, community cohesion, health and safety, contamination, flooding, accessibility, economic viability, lack of information and consultation, congestion, impact on the natural environment, lack of transparency, impact on local character and the need for further assessments.	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0519	Marlene Page	TBW.3	Objection to allocation of this site due to concerns about contamination, health and safety, lack of infrastructure, costs, size of site and lack of consultation.	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0520	Martin Goodwin	TBW.3	Object to allocation of this site due to concerns about lack of consultation, contamination, housing standards, safety, lack of amenities, incompatible surrounding uses, traffic, natural environment, pitch sizes, impact on railway heritage, impact on local character, impact on local services and failure to adequately consider alternative sites.	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0522	Martin Pope	TBW.3	Objects to allocation of site for gypsy and traveller homes because of concerns of contamination and impact upon health and safety and prohibitively high decontamination costs. Also concerns of poor living environment and dangers to health and safety as a result of the electrical substations; unstable ground conditions; flooding; roads and railway lines. Also design and layout would fail to meet basic housing standards and good site design. Also concerns of impact upon traffic and inadequate access and also future expansion of the site.	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0523	Matt Smith	TBW.3	Objects to allocation of site for gypsy and traveller homes because of impact upon local services; contamination; congestion; environment and wildlife; and cost to Council.	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0524	Matthew Parsons	TBW.3	Objects to allocation of site for gypsy and traveller homes because of contamination issues and impact upon health and wellbeing and does not consider it feasible to decontaminate; failure to meet basic housing standards; severe impact upon traffic and inadequate access and traffic impact assessment needed; impact upon the environment and biodiversity; impact upon railway heritage; concerns site is overly large and concerns of unauthorised expansion; concerns of cost to develop.	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0525	Max Forward	TBW.3	Objection to allocation of this site due to concerns about the impact on the natural environment, size and future management of the site. Site should be used for a solar or wind farm.	Objection	Yes	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0526	Melanie Page	TBW.3	Objection to the allocation of this site due to concerns about contamination, health and safety, access, impact on natural environment, lack of infrastructure, size and impact on local services.	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0530	Michael Green	TBW.3	Objection to allocation of this site due to concerns about contamination, traffic impact and lack of consultation.	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0533	Michael Streeter	TBW.3	Objection to allocation due to concerns about lack of consultation and consideration of alternative sites, contamination, health and safety, impact on the natural environment, access and traffic impact.	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0535	Miranda Tracey	TBW.3	Objection to allocation of this site due to concerns about congestion, impact on infrastructure, contamination, costs and impact on local services, noise and pollution.	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0536	Mirja Ahti	TBW.3	Object to Branksome Triangle Gypsy and Traveller site issues include land contamination, unsuitable access, unsafe (railway lines, viaduct), traffic congestion, parking, environmental considerations, sand lizards and proposal has been rushed through.	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0537	Nancy Mayne	TBW.3	Objection to allocation due to concerns about contamination, health and safety, access, impact on the natural environment, costs, lack of consultation, impact on character of the local area, impact on local services, traffic impact, need to reconsider alternative sites, flooding and size of site. The site should be transformed into a space that would meet 4 objectives of the local plan – combat and adapt to climate and ecological emergency, conserve natural environment, improve health and well-being and grow the economy and offer for visitors, and objective 8 – preserve and enhance heritage. Site could be used for specialist housing – homes for the elderly or care home, a vertical farm, nature and heritage trail with community maintained ecological park, solar or wind farm or allotments (may need raised beds).	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0538	Naomi Ryan	TBW.3	Objects to Branksome Triangle site concerns regarding contamination, potential health impacts, cost effectiveness and viability of proposal, unstable ground conditions, high voltage substations, lacks adequate surface water drainage, flood risk assessment required, noise exposure of future residential, unsuitable and dangerous residential environment, impact on local services (schools, medical, public transport), adverse impact on congestion,, restricted access, increased air pollution, lack of proposed mitigation to various issues, inadequate emergency access, does not confirm with government guidance, adverse impact on environment and biodiversity (SNCI present, species rich, borders Talbot Heath, within 400m of Heath, critical biodiversity corridor), site is too large (illegal expansion) alternative sites not fully considered, lack of impact assessments on alternative sites, lack of transparency, alternative sites needed, failure to consult, flawed decision making process, development costs and viability, poor value for money, not deliverable within 5 years, detrimental impact on local character, consultation process too difficult.	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0542	Neil Drissell	TBW.3	Objection to allocation due to concerns about contamination, health and safety, housing standards, community cohesion, access, impact on natural environment, costs, impact on heritage assets, impact on local services, need for further assessments and consideration of alternative sites.	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0546	Nicola Lewis	TBW.3	Objection to allocation of this site due to concerns about contamination, health and safety, access, impact on natural environment, impact on heritage assets, size of the site, impact on local services and infrastructure, need to consider alternative sites. Should use the site as heritage and nature park.	Objection	Yes	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0547	Nicole Davidson	TBW.3	Objects to Branksome Triangle site concerns regarding contamination, potential health impacts, cost effectiveness and viability of proposal, unstable ground conditions, lack mitigation identified, high voltage substations tracks, flood risk issues, flood risk assessment required, noise exposure of future residential, unsuitable and dangerous residential environment, high viaducts, site is isolated, lack of integration, adverse impact on congestion, restricted access, increased air pollution, , inadequate emergency access, impact on local services (medical facilities, schools, public transport, water gas, broadband), does not confirm with government guidance, failure to consult, flawed site selection process, lack of due diligence, site not deliverable, adverse impact on environment and biodiversity (SNCI present, protected species), development costs and viability, poor value for money, not deliverable within 5 years. Site better used for food growing/farmers market.	Objection	Yes	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0548	Nuria Sans-Ruiz	TBW.3	Objection to allocation of this site due to concerns about security and location in middle of residential area and close to protected spaces.	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0549	Oliver Atkins	TBW.3	Objection to allocation of this site due to concern about increased crime	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0550	Oliver Latre	TBW.3	Objection to allocation due to concerns about contamination, health and safety, housing standards, traffic impacts and access, impact on natural environment and size of site.	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0551	Paul Adams	TBW.3	Object to Branksome Triangle Gypsy and Traveller site issues include land contamination, high levels of cancer locally, cost of remediation, adverse impacts on SNCI and biodiversity, adverse impact on historical viaduct, site is too large, consider alternative locations	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0553	Paul Evans	TBW.3	Objection to allocation of this site due to concerns about impact on local services, impact on the natural environment, traffic and access issues, contamination and the lack of consultation.	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0554	Paul Grayson-Mather	TBW.3	Objection to the allocation of this site due to concerns about contamination, health and safety, flooding, noise pollution, traffic and access, community cohesion and the need for further assessments and better consultation.	Objection	Yes	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0555	Paul Greenfield	TBW.3	Objection to site allocation due to concerns about health, safety and wellbeing of future residents, contamination issues, consultation process and local of transparency in decision making.	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0557	Paul Stockting	TBW.3	Objection to site allocation due to concerns about lack of consultation, impact on natural environment and additional pressures for police.	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0558	Peter Leary	TBW.3	Objection to site allocation due to concerns about impact on traffic, access, health and safety and need to consider alternative sites properly. Should retain for nature and create a circular nature and heritage trail.	Objection	Yes	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0561	Peter Phillips	TBW.3	Objection to the allocation of this site due to concerns about contamination, health and safety, housing standards, need for assessments, traffic impacts and access, impact on services, size of site, costs, lack of consultation and transparency in decision process, impact on local character, impact on natural environment, need to consider alternative sites.	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0562	phil miesleszko	TBW.3	Objection to this allocation due to concerns over contamination, lack of consultation, traffic impact and access, health and safety issues, impact on natural environment, size of site, costs and impact on local services.	Objection	Yes	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0563	Philip Broadhead	TBW.3	Objection to allocation of this site due to concern over lack of consultation and lack of transparency over decision to allocate the site, contamination, flooding, health and safety, impact on natural environment, costs, lack of assessments and consideration of alternative sites such as the Creekmoor Park and Ride.	Objection	Yes	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0565	Philip Trevett	TBW.3	Objection to the allocation of this site due to concerns about contamination, costs, health, impact on natural environment, need for further assessments, impact on heritage, size of site and impact on services.	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0567	Rachael Forward	TBW.3		Objection	Yes	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0568	Rachael Mould	TBW.3	Objection to the allocation of this site due to concerns about contamination, health and safety issues, traffic impact, heritage impact, impact on the natural environment, costs, impact on local services. Should consider alternative sites such as Creekmoor Park and Ride and restore the East Viaduct to create a nature and heritage trail.	Objection	Yes	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0569	Rachel Bartlett	TBW.3	Object to Branksome Triangle Gypsy and Traveller site issues include land contamination, safety hazards, flood risk, adverse impacts on nature and biodiversity, site is too large, adverse impact on local services, lack of community engagement, better alternative at Creekmoor Park and Ride site	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0570	Rachel Bowden	TBW.3	Objection to allocation due to concerns about health and safety of the site.	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0574	Rebekah Champion	TBW.3	Objects to allocation of site for gypsy and traveller homes. Considers plan is not legally compliant due to a failure to notify and consult neighbourhood forums, local business groups and bodies representing ethnic groups at Reg 18; Environmental Impact Assessment is insufficient to consider impact on SNCI; lacks robust evidence regarding services/utilities; is unsound due to lack of consultation; no identified and annually updated supply for G & T; lack of consideration for social integration. Allocation should be removed and undertake new site selection.	Objection	Yes	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0580	Richard Willsher	TBW.3	Objection to the allocation of this site due to concerns about contamination, health and safety, noise, access, traffic impact, pollution, impact on natural environment, need to consider alternative sites, size of site, costs, consultation process and lack of transparency and impact on heritage and local character The allocation of this site is contrary to the requirements of draft BCP Local Plan policy H10 (b) and (e).	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0584	Robert Barnes	TBW.3	Objection to allocation of this site due to concerns about contamination, health and safety, costs, impact on natural environment, impact on railway heritage, failure to consult and lack of transparency in site selection. Should use the site for ecological park and consider use of alternative sites.	Objection	Yes	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0585	Robert Castle	TBW.3	Objection to allocation of this site due to concerns about health and safety, impact on the natural environment, access and impact on traffic, development being out of character, contamination issues, costs and concerns about management. Site would be better used as a nature reserve.	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0586	Robert Clarke	TBW.3	Objection to allocation of this site due to concerns about contamination, costs of remediation, traffic impact and access, impact on natural environment, size of site, pollution from neighbouring uses, health and safety, lack of consultation, lack of transparency of site selection process.	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0587	Roberta Hearn	TBW.3	Objection to allocation of this site due to concerns about contamination, health and safety, access, housing standards, size of site and impact on natural environment.	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0588	Roberta Howieson	TBW.3	Objection to the allocation of this site due to concerns about traffic impact, rats, contamination, enclosure of site making it difficult to manage, access and impact on the natural environment.	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0589	J Joseph	TBW.3	Objects to allocation on grounds of health and safety, flooding, amenity, contamination, housing standards, community cohesion, need for assessment, access, traffic impact, natural environment, size, cost, consultation process	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0590	Roberto Isasa	TBW.3	Objection to the allocation of this site due to impact on local services, health and safety, flooding and noise concerns, and failure of council to carry out proper consultation.	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0591	Robin Joy	TBW.3	Objection to the allocation of this site as its inclusion is considered to be unsound. By providing housing for travellers you offer an open invitation non residential travellers. Site could be used as a care home which would have low impact on traffic.	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0593	Rosalind McCulloch	TBW.3	Objection to the allocation of this site due to concerns about contamination, costs, health and safety, need for further assessment, housing standards, suitability of shape and size of the site, traffic impact and access, impact on natural environment, well being of existing residents and Gypsy and Traveller community, impact on local character and heritage, impact on local services and infrastructure, lack of community cohesion, the need to consider alternative sites and need for a fair, transparent and well-reasoned process in choosing a site.	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0596	Sally Driver	TBW.3	Objects to allocation of site for traveller homes because consider Council failed to consult or co-operate; considers plan is unsound and site unsuitable and contaminated.	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0599	Samantha Drissell	TBW.3	Objects to allocation of site for traveller homes because of concerns of contamination and cost of decontaminating; impact upon health and safety; from railway lines and electrical substations; lack of integration with community; increased traffic congestion, inadequate access and pollution; impact upon environment and wildlife; site is too big and concerns of expansion; cost and whether viable to deliver; impact upon character and railway heritage; impact upon local services. Also considers Council failed to properly consult.	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0600	Sammie Pope	TBW.3	Objects to allocation of site for traveller homes because of concerns of contamination and cost of decontaminating; impact upon health and safety; from railway lines and electrical substations; poor housing standards and lack of integration with community; increased traffic congestion and inadequate access; cost to Council to develop.	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0601	Sarah Scott	TBW.3	Objects to allocation of site for traveller homes because of concerns of health and safety from the impact of contamination, railway lines and electrical substations; housing standards and noise; flooding; increased traffic congestion and inadequate access; impact upon environment and biodiversity; future expansion; impact upon local services; and development costs. Also considers Council failed to properly consult and consider site more suitable for community use.	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0603	Sasha Pickering	TBW.3	Objection to allocation of this site due to concerns about access, contamination, health and safety, impact on the natural environment, and lack of consultation. The site would be good for use as a nature reserve or care home/elderly services.	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0604	Satsuki Takada	TBW.3	Objection to allocation of this site due to impact on the natural environment, impact on heritage, size of site, costs, proposal being out of character, lack of engagement with local community and transparency in site selection process. Site should be considered for creation of a nature and heritage park with the viaduct becoming a landmark.	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0605	Sebastian Plant	TBW.3		Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0606	Sharon Biles	TBW.3	Objection to the allocation of this site due to unsuitability of the site and the process of allocating the site. In particular, concern is raised about health and safety issues, impact on the natural environment and costs to the council.	Objection	Yes	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0607	Sharon Kay	TBW.3	Objection to this allocation due to concerns about traffic impact, access, pollution, impact on local services and need for additional assessments.	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0608	Shelley Hayes	TBW.3	Objection due to concerns about contamination, health and safety, housing standards, traffic impact and access, impact on natural environment, size, cost, failure to consult, railway heritage, local character, impact on local services and need to consider other sites.	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0611	Simon Gwynn	TBW.3	Objection to the allocation of this site due to concerns about the consultation process, site access, contamination, health and safety, traffic impact, impact on natural environment, heritage assets and local services, costs. Need for proper consideration and consultation on alternative sites and using this site for a nature reserve of sports facility with parking.	Objection	Yes	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0612	Simon Rasbridge	TBW.3	Objection to the allocation of this site due to health and safety issues.	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0613	Sophie Burgan	TBW.3	Objection to allocation of this site due to concerns about impact on local services, the environment, traffic access, contamination, natural environment, access, health and safety, costs, need for further assessments and consultation, consideration of alternative sites and needs assessment.	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0618	Stephen Parham	TBW.3	Objection to the allocation of this site due to concerns about lack of consultation, health and safety, traffic impacts and access, impact on local services, the natural environment, costs and the need for proper consideration of alternative sites such as Creekmoor Park and Ride and Roeshot Nursery.	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0620	Steve Cole	TBW.3	Objection to allocation of this site due to traffic access, congestion and safety impacts.	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0622	Steve Richardson	TBW.3	Objection to the allocation of this site due to concerns about contamination, costs, health and safety, need for further assessment, traffic impact, access, housing standards, natural environment, size, lack of consultation, impact on heritage assets and local character, local services and the need to properly consider alternative sites.	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0623	Steven Delve	TBW.3	Objection to the allocation of this site due to impact on natural environment, costs, lack of community cohesion, contamination, traffic impact, access, lack of consideration of alternative sites, impact on heritage asset. Branksome Triangle should be used to form part of a nature and heritage trail with the Branksome East Viaduct, linking Bournemouth Gardens to Branksome Chine.	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0625	Susan Best	TBW.3	Objection to allocation of this site due to concerns about health and safety, traffic access and impact, lack of consultation and impact on local services.	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0626	Susan Bush	TBW.3	Objection to this site being allocated due to lack of consultation and consideration of alternative sites, impact on local services and facilities, health and safety, impact on natural environment, contamination and flooding.	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0627	Susan Robathan	TBW.3	Objection to the allocation of this site due to lack of consultation, contamination, heritage, natural environment, traffic impact. We should preserve green spaces and find a more suitable site not in the middle of a highly populated area.	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0630	Suzanne Richardson	TBW.3	Objection to the allocation of this site due to concerns about the consultation process, including with the traveller community, and the need to consider other sites, contamination, health and safety and traffic impact.	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0631	Suzanne Scott	TBW.3	Objection to allocation of this site due to amenity and housing standards, contamination, health and safety, access, traffic impact, and concerns about the consultation process. Suggestion site should be used as a solar farm.	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0632	Sven Theophil	TBW.3	Object to the allocation of this site due to impact on the natural environment, traffic impact, pollution, costs, flooding, impact on services such as electricity, gas and sewerage and concerns about the consultation process and the need for further assessments.	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0637	Terry Tibbs	TBW.3	Objects as consider allocation of site for gypsy and traveller homes to be petty politics and vengeance. Does not consider site to be safe, healthy, viable and the people and travellers and ward constituents will suffer.	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0639	Testy McTestface	TBW.3	Objection to allocation of this site due to heritage impact, health and safety, traffic impact, access and the need to consider alternative sites.	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0640	Theo Biles	TBW.3	Object to site allocation due to being unhappy about the consultation process, traffic impact, contamination, need for further assessments, need to consider other sites further.	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA



ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0643	Timothy Parker-Smith	TBW.3	Objection to allocation due to consultation process, contamination, costs, health and safety, community cohesion, traffic impact, access, natura environment, size, impact on local services and facilities and impact on local character and heritage. There are alternative better sites including Creekmore and Roeshot Hill Nursery.	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0644	Tina Boswell	TBW.3	Objection to allocation of this site due to site being unsuitable, undeliverable and not in line with national policy. Concerns about the consultation process, contamination, health and safety, natural environment, access, local services and facilities, ground stability and impact of works on the railway, flooding, housing standards and costs. There is a need to consider and assess other site options properly and provide a site that is deliverable in the plan period.	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0649	Trevor Matthews	TBW.3	Objects to this allocation due to consultation process, need for assessments, size, health and safety, access, heritage, impact on local facilities and services, infrastructure, traffic impact, local facilities and services, costs and natural environment.	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0650	Valerie Balkwill	TBW.3	Objects to the allocation due to access, traffic impact, size and health and safety.	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0654	Voula Greenfield	TBW.3	Object to the allocation of this site due to contamination, health and safety, welfare, risk of legal action to the council and the consultation process.	Objection	Yes	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0657	Wendy Mantle	TBW.3	Objects to the allocation of this site due to the consultation process, contamination, health and safety, natural environment, traffic impact and unsuitability of the site.	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0658	Wilf Biles	TBW.3	Objects to allocation on grounds of traffic impact, housing standards, health and safety, community cohesion, local facilities and services including impact on local schools, costs and viability, consultation process and needs assessment.	Objection	Yes	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0021	George Ponsford	TBW.3	Objects to allocation of site for gypsy and traveller homes. Site is not suitable due to contamination, health and safety concerns, cost, flooring, noise, site is too large (potential for illegal expansion), lack of consultation, railway heritage, poor quality housing standards, isolated location, inappropriate access, adverse traffic impacts, adverse impacts from construction, adverse impact on air quality, sites is an SNCI and would have an adverse impact on ecology and biodiversity, proximity to the heathland buffer zone, lack of risk assessment, not deliverable, upgraded infrastructure required, existing on-site contamination, health and safety hazards, flooding, unacceptable noise levels on site for occupation, poor housing standards and living conditions for future occupiers, impact on traffic through additional congestion and inappropriate infrastructure, reduction in biodiversity and impact on the environment, size of site too big, site is not financially viable, failure to consult, loss of railway heritage, impact on local services, and improper consideration of other sites.	Objection	Yes	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper. Some amendments proposed to ensure a future planning application addresses and mitigates contamination and safety issues.	NA
0022	Julie McFarland	TBW.3	Objects to allocation due to concerns of anti-social behaviour, impact on property values, on-site contamination, health and safety hazards, flooding, unacceptable noise levels on site for future occupiers, poor housing and living standards for future occupiers, impact on existing traffic congestion and inappropriate infrastructure, loss of biodiversity and impact on the environment, size of site is too large, no risk assessment undertaken, development cost and viability, the need for infrastructure on site, failure to consult, loss of railway heritage, impact on local character, and impact on local services. Other more suitable sites being available, not in line with national policy, and would fail to comply with other policies in the plan.	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0022	Scott and Julie Mcfarland	TBW.3	Provides information regarding issues for Network Rail in previous site proposals to ensure no adverse impact on railway interests including impacts on plant, scaffolding and cranes, excavations, noise, drainage, landscaping and site layout. Previously advised that fencing would be required to prevent trespass and vandalism. Party Wall agreements may be required with Network Rail. Supporting information government traveller count tables, email responses from Cllr Slade and government requirements in relation to Local Plan in relation to land supply.	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper. Some amendments proposed to ensure a future planning application addresses and mitigates contamination and safety issues.	NA

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0022	Scott McFarland	TBW.3	Objects to allocation due to concerns of anti-social behaviour, impact on property values, on-site contamination, presence of Japanese Knotweed, health and safety hazards, flooding, unacceptable noise levels on site for future occupiers, poor housing and living standards for future occupiers, impact on existing traffic congestion and inappropriate infrastructure, loss of biodiversity and impact on the environment, size of site is too large, no risk assessment undertaken, development cost and viability, the need for infrastructure on site, failure to consult, loss of railway heritage, impact on local character, and impact on local services. Would fail to comply with other policies in the plan, and not in line with national policy.	Objection	No	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0023	Gavin Parsons	TBW.3	Objects to allocation due to concerns of impact upon heathlands and 400m embargo; restrictive covenants on the site; not being in line with government policy; affect on landscaping; protection of amenity and environment, impact upon wellbeing of occupants from noise and air pollution and danger to life; impact upon local services; not properly considering other more suitable sites; inadequate access and no proper traffic assessment; impact upon wildlife and biodiversity; contamination; failure to properly consult with community and the consultation procedure being difficult/hinderance; impact of flooding and need for sequential/impact assessment; overly large site and concerns of illegal expansion; cost of development to taxpayer's. Considers there to be other more suitable sites for use which need proper evaluation and could better meet needs of travellers. Raised issues regarding submitting representation during consultation on draft plan. FOI response regarding process to allocate Branksome Triangle, the engagement with traveller community and how alternative sites were assessed. Submission of potential risk assessment on Branksome Triangle site. Risk of injury or death due to access to live railway tracks, high viaducts, electrical substation, contaminated land, steep embankments, undergrowth and unstable ground. Information regarding the importance of Branksome Triangle SNCI for nature conservation specifically sand lizard habitat, wildlife corridor to Talbot Heath, part of ecological network. Case officer report setting out that the site is acceptable for use as a temporary car park. Letter from Natural England confirming no objection to continued use as the site for a temporary car park.	Objection	Yes	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper. Some amendments proposed to ensure a future planning application addresses and mitigates contamination and safety issues.	NA
0024	Mark Emmett	TBW.3	Concern regarding access to site and congestion	Objection	Yes	No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper. Some amendments proposed to ensure a future planning application addresses and mitigates contamination and safety issues.	NA
0025	Mark and Lisa Hathaway	TBW.3	Object to site allocation for gypsy and traveller use. Lack of access (low and narrow bridges), traffic levels, flooding, poor drainage, no sewage provision, ground contamination, adverse impact on local wildlife including sand lizards, near rail way lines (safety risk), previous student accommodation proposals not taken forward/declined, WWII bomb shelters pose health and safety risk, not supported by traveller community, better alternative locations exist (Roeshot Hill, Creekmoor Park and Ride)	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper. Some amendments proposed to ensure a future planning application addresses and mitigates contamination and safety issues.	NA
0026	Justin Allison	TBW.3	Objection to Branksome Triangle as Gypsy and Traveller site. Issues with SNCI, historic viaduct, contamination, figures on number of pitches are vague, cost of making site habitable, could be used for permanent/affordable homes, adverse impacts on nature and biodiversity, adverse impact on historical viaduct, inefficient use of land, council has been secretive and lack of community engagement.	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper. Some amendments proposed to ensure a future planning application addresses and mitigates contamination and safety issues.	NA
0030	Marion Burdis	TBW.3	Objects to allocation of site for homes for gypsies and travellers. Not fit for human habitation due to issues with pollution and flooding. Unsuitable as overly populated area and better suited for open space community use.	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper. Some amendments proposed to ensure a future planning application addresses and mitigates contamination and safety issues.	NA
0032	Dawn Grimes	TBW.3	Objection to Branksome Triangle as Gypsy and Traveller site. Issues with impact on local economy (local drop in footfall and tourists choosing elsewhere), adverse impact on character of the area, adverse visual impact, adverse impact on house prices, countryside site more suitable,	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper. Some amendments proposed to ensure a future planning application addresses and mitigates contamination and safety issues.	NA

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0037	Ann van Spall	TBW.3	Objection to Branksome Triangle as Gypsy and Traveller site. The site is not large enough for 15 dwellings. Site is not appropriate in surrounding residential area. Integrate traveller families in existing housing stock. Issues with impact on amenities (doctors, schools etc), impact on local roads.	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0040	Natural England	TBW.3	Do not object on the basis that the SNCI can be avoided and the population of sand lizards secured through appropriate fencing and habitat/predator management.	Support		No action	Noted. No action required.	NA
0042	Maureen Hall	TBW.3	Objects to Branksome Triangle as Gypsy and Traveller site issues with contamination, health and safety risks, flood risk, traffic congestion, not accessible for large vehicles, adverse impacts on biodiversity, site is too large, lack of engagement with community and stakeholders, adverse impact on historical viaduct, impact on local services. Creekmoor Park and ride site is an alternative.	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0043	Paul Vanner	TBW.3	Objects to Branksome Triangle as Gypsy and Traveller site issues with contamination, health and safety risks, traffic and access, failure to consult.	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0002	Julie Reeves	TBW.3	Objects to allocation of site for gypsy and traveller homes. Would result in overprovision in area as there is a traveller site already in Poole so new traveller site should be provided in Bournemouth or Christchurch. Traveller site would be out of character with area, would impact upon wildlife and SNCI and access is unsuitable and dangerous. Would be incompatible/inappropriate to area, has inadequate access and road safety, and concerned with issues of land contamination and impact on nature conservation. Additional site in Poole would be excessive and should be provided in Bournemouth or Christchurch. Also considers that Council failed to properly consult with community regarding allocation of site for gypsy and traveller homes.	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper.	NA
0003	Douglas Gray	TBW.3	Objects to allocation of site for gypsy and traveller homes as it is an unsuitable locations and add to overstretched public services. Other sites rejected which are less congested and more suitable and should be given consideration. Concerns of antisocial behaviour including violence, rubbish and debris. Site should be re-considered for affordable accommodation for young local people.	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper. Some amendments proposed to ensure a future planning application addresses and mitigates contamination and safety issues.	NA
0004	Tim Marden	TBW.3	Objects to allocation of site for gypsy and traveller homes as they are not clean and could have a negative affect on businesses at the retail park.	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper. Some amendments proposed to ensure a future planning application addresses and mitigates contamination and safety issues.	NA
0010	K Walsh	TBW.3	Objects to allocation of site for homes for gypsy and travellers due to land contamination from past industrial use and landfill which may not be able to be remediated; health and safety as site is dangerous for families with young children; housing standards as security fences would be needed to protect residents and disjointed from surrounding community; traffic access and impacts including congestion, restricted access for construction and emergency vehicles; environment and biodiversity and reduction in green space and biodiversity; site is too big for only 15 pitches and could grow larger; not economically viable; lack of consultation; preventing public access to Branksome East Viaduct (heritage asset); impact upon character and visual amenity; pressure on local services; site is not deliverable and other sites should be re-considered (Creekmoor Park and Ride or Roeshot Hill Nursery).	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper. Some amendments proposed to ensure a future planning application addresses and mitigates contamination and safety issues.	NA
0013	Rachel Small	TBW.3	Supports some ideas in Local Plan but objects to allocation of site for homes for gypsy and travellers as it is a dense area with lots of children; concerns regarding access to roads and being used as a ratrun; concerns regarding graffiti, littering and anti social behaviour; gypsy travellers should be located outside main residential areas as it will negatively affect area; Bournemouth town needs more investment.	Objection		No action	Issues raised in relation to the site are considered in the Gypsy and Traveller background paper. Some amendments proposed to ensure a future planning application addresses and mitigates contamination and safety issues.	NA
0648	Tony Barnett	TBW.4	Previous proposal by Nuffield Health rejected by SoS - nothing has changed. Concerns regarding air quality, congestion and infrastructure capacity impacts on surrounding neighbourhood.	Objection	No	No action	The issues have been considered by an inspector and the proposal approved.	NA

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0079	The Society for Poole	P30	Policy P30 is effective and sound, as it seeks to address infrastructure issues.	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0150	Ken Parke on behalf of various clients 3	P30	Unclear how 165 dwellings figure has been derived, or if it reflects the ward's housing need. Unclear whether development is expected to comply with Policy H2. High reliance on windfall sites when focus restricted to local opportunity areas and streets - question achievability. No need for prescriptive approach to building heights - do not take permitted development rights into account. Unclear whether development outside local opportunity areas and streets is permissible.	Objection		No action	All the wards collectively contribute to the delivery of housing. Each ward has its own characteristics and constraints which impact the number of homes which can be delivered. The figure for the number of homes is calculate from a combination of existing commitments, proposed allocations and windfall sites. The windfall figure has been calculated using historical averages for the number of homes typically delivered within the ward. Development would be expected to comply with other plan policies include H2 Affordable Housing. LOA/LOS identify where windfall can be focused and increased heights achieved but this does not prevent windfall in other locations. Approach to heights seeks to provide clarity about the design expectations.	NA
0190	John Dymott	P30	Flood risk concerns - Need to address combined sewers to address flooding issues, including at Fernside Road, White Farm Close and other locations causing flood risk in Winton	Comment	Yes	No action	The Council will continue to work with Wessex Water to address flood risk issues outside of the local plan process. CIL will continue to be collected which can be spent on infrastructure proposals.	NA
0268	Talbot Village Trust	P30	Support	Support		No action	Support noted	NA
0190	John Dymott	WWW.1	Heritage and biodiversity concerns - Development should be no different to existing (buildings existing). Concerned White Farm at risk from planned conversion. Specific work to enhance biodiversity in Albion Woods identified	Objection	Yes	No action	Allocation sets out that development should preserve or enhance the character of the conservation and enhance the conservation area as set out in the management plan.	NA
0282	Historic England	WWW.1	Development at Talbot Village must conserve and enhance heritage assets. Enabling development not suitable terminology and cannot be established through allocation. Clarification required surrounding quantum of development, infilling could result in heritage impacts.	Objection		Modification	Agree	Amend to provide clarification and correct terminology.
0282	Historic England	WWW.2	HIA recommends maximum of 3 storeys, taller elements should be set back from the road frontage and a tree screen retained.	Objection		Modification	Agree	Amend to provide clarification.
0150	Ken Parke on behalf of various clients 3	P31	Unclear how 130 dwellings figure has been derived, or if it reflects the ward's housing need. Unclear whether development is expected to comply with Policy H2. High reliance on windfall sites when focus restricted to local opportunity areas and streets - question achievability. No need for prescriptive approach to building heights - do not take permitted development rights into account. Unclear whether development outside local opportunity areas and streets is permissible.	Objection		No action	All the wards collectively contribute to the delivery of housing. Each ward has its own characteristics and constraints which impact the number of homes which can be delivered. The figure for the number of homes is calculate from a combination of existing commitments, proposed allocations and windfall sites. The windfall figure has been calculated using historical averages for the number of homes typically delivered within the ward. Development would be expected to comply with other plan policies include H2 Affordable Housing. LOA/LOS identify where windfall can be focused and increased heights achieved but this does not prevent windfall in other locations. Approach to heights seeks to provide clarity about the design expectations.	NA
0148	FCERM	P31	Clarification required on coastal change/sea cliff stability risks and approach to addressing these issues (including Policy C5 applicability). Clarification also needed on approach to flood risk in the ward.	Support with changes		No action	Do not consider that it is necessary for this ward policy to contain information regarding coastal erosion and sea cliff stability risk zones or for a cross-reference to Policy C5 to be included. Consider Policy C5 sufficiently addresses this issue, the plan will be read as a whole and it is unnecessary to duplicate policy requirements. Text regarding approach to flood risk is only included in ward policies where this is not adequately covered by generic flood risk policy/flood risk is a significant issue for development near the coast/river/harbour in the ward. It is considered that generic flood risk policy adequately addresses the approach to flood risk in this ward and that text regarding flood risk is therefore not required in this ward policy.	NA
0543	Nicholas Mason	P31	Unclear when referenced improvements to cycling experience will take place – should be swiftly introduced. Need to address signage problems on Watcombe Road.	Support with changes		No action	Comment noted, the implementation of the proposals will depend on the funding and priorities of the Council	NA

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0150	Ken Parke on behalf of various clients 3	P32	Unclear how 900 dwellings figure has been derived, or if it reflects the ward's housing need. Unclear whether development is expected to comply with Policy H2. High reliance on windfall sites when focus restricted to local opportunity areas and streets - question achievability. Unclear why size of local community shops is restricted and they are restricted to some parts of the ward. No need for prescriptive approach to building heights - do not take permitted development rights into account. Unclear whether development outside local opportunity areas and streets is permissible.	Objection		No action	All the wards collectively contribute to the delivery of housing. Each ward has its own characteristics and constraints which impact the number of homes which can be delivered. The figure for the number of homes is calculate from a combination of existing commitments, proposed allocations and windfall sites. The windfall figure has been calculated using historical averages for the number of homes typically delivered within the ward. Development would be expected to comply with other plan policies include H2 Affordable Housing. LOA/LOS identify where windfall can be focused and increased heights achieved but this does not prevent windfall in other locations. Size of shops is restricted to avoid an adverse impact on existing retail areas/centres and the locations highlighted where there is a current lack of facilities. Approach to heights seeks to provide clarity about the design expectations.	NA
0148	FCERM	P32	Clarification required on coastal change/sea cliff stability risks and approach to addressing these issues (including Policy C5 applicability). Clarification also needed on approach to flood risk in the ward.	Support with changes		No action	Do not consider that it is necessary for this ward policy to contain information regarding coastal erosion and sea cliff stability risk zones or for a cross-reference to Policy C5 to be included. Consider Policy C5 sufficiently addresses this issue, the plan will be read as a whole and it is unnecessary to duplicate policy requirements. Text regarding approach to flood risk is only included in ward policies where this is not adequately covered by generic flood risk policy/flood risk is a significant issue for development near the coast/river/harbour in the ward. It is considered that generic flood risk policy adequately addresses the approach to flood risk in this ward and that text regarding flood risk is therefore not required in this ward policy.	NA
0148	FCERM	WWC.1	Proposals on WWC.1 will need to be complete Coastal Vulnerability Assessment and demonstrate will not impact/be impacted by sea cliff stability.	Support with changes		Modification	Agree requirement for Coastal Vulnerability Assessment should be referenced.	Amend to reference requirement for Coastal Vulnerability Assessment
0217	Marriott Hotels	WWC.1	Owners of site and support policy in terms of principle of residential development being proposed and also supported in terms of not being overly detailed and lengthy content. However, considers site can accommodate more than 20 dwellings, and also site can and should be allowed to accommodate development greater in height than 6-9 metres (2-3 stories). Considers proposals will have significant positive impact upon the character and appearance of the CA. Issue regarding the design and layout for the villas. Error raised with ownership boundary and revised plan to follow.	Support with changes	Yes	Follow up	Consider change to site boundary. Heights and the resulting number of units reflect the sensitive nature of the site.	Follow up to ensure site boundary is correct given ownerships
0510	Malcolm Viner	WWC.1	Objects to allocation and considers plan unsound as loss of M & S food hall and car park will impact on the prosperity if Westbourne which is important retailer which draws people to Westbourne.	Objection	No	No action	The local plan can not protect specific retailers/companies but the allocation seeks to retain a retail convenience store of at least 600 sqm on the ground floor.	NA
0153	Weis Group	WWC.2	Lack of consultation about site allocation at M&S. Concerned regarding height restrictions, potential impact on viability, opportunity for 5-6 storey on part of the site.	Objection	No	No action	Heights seek to ensure development is predominantly between 3 and 4 storey to reflect the character of the conservation area but does not preclude some large buildings.	NA
0282	Historic England	WWC.3	HIA sets out building heights should be limited to 3 storeys	Objection		No action	Appropriate building heights would depend on which car park or parts of a car park are released. It is considered there could be potential for buildings taller than three storeys on the northern car park adjacent to the Wessex Way.	NA
0282	Historic England	WWC.5	Number 137 is the positive building, welcome policy to convert both buildings	Objection		Modification	Amend	Amend to provide clarification

ID Ref	Representor	Plan Ref	Summary of Representation	Obj/Supp	App ear	Action	Officer Response	Modification
0016	Brian Sutcliffe	WWC.6	Objects to West Hill Car Park proposal. Plan/Parking SPD breaches NPPF para. 111 and 112, as Bournemouth Town Centre, as supports inappropriate and non-compliant zero max parking standard in West Cliff and Poole Hill Conservation Area. Bus services poor as while frequent, routes circuitous and travel times slow - no incentive to not use car. There is not easy access to the town centre - main retail centre is Castlepoint, and centres of employment are not in town centre - parking typically free so no incentive not to use car. No way of preventing new occupiers owning vehicles. Increased pollution, congestion, adverse impacts on active travel promotion. In West Cliff and Poole Hill Conservation Area on street parking over stressed/serious shortage of parking and significant illegal parking and parking conflict with no enforcement. Durley Car Park closed and no increased capacity at West Hill Car Park. Street Scene wrecked (including due to parked cars and bins), leading to no active travel development. Overcharging in off street car parks worsening situation and in breach of Road Traffic Regulation Act. Central key area in decline, many HMOs, some illegal, and some housing families in unsuitable accommodation.	Objection	Yes	No action	The allocation of West Hill car park is subject to a parking strategy for the Bournemouth Town Centre area. This would consider the closure of Durley and the parking situation on the west side of the town centre. The town centre is a sustainable location with a wide range of facilities. The Council will continue to implement and monitor the SPD to assess the impacts of zero parking, at present not enough consents have been built out to take a view on the policy.	NA
0077	Craig Hendry	P33	Additional stories in Charminster Road will increase the development of flats in this area.	Objection		No action	Some urban intensification is required to support the overall strategy. Increased building heights on key routes in sustainable locations outside of conservation areas is considered a valid approach to supporting urban intensification.	NA
0145	Jennifer Ansell	P33	Include reference to affordable housing on Alma Road Surgery allocation and include reference to cycle parking on Wilko/Cranmer Road allocation. Ensure new hardstanding is porous.	Support with changes		No action	These issues are covered by other policies in the plan and do not need to be set out for every allocation.	NA
0150	Ken Parke on behalf of various clients 3	P33	Unclear how 375 dwellings figure has been derived, or if it reflects the ward's housing need. Unclear whether development is expected to comply with Policy H2. High reliance on windfall sites when focus restricted to local opportunity areas and streets - question achievability. No need for prescriptive approach to building heights - do not take permitted development rights into account. Unclear whether development outside local opportunity areas and streets is permissible.	Objection		No action	All the wards collectively contribute to the delivery of housing. Each ward has its own characteristics and constraints which impact the number of homes which can be delivered. The figure for the number of homes is calculate from a combination of existing commitments, proposed allocations and windfall sites. The windfall figure has been calculated using historical averages for the number of homes typically delivered within the ward. Development would be expected to comply with other plan policies include H2 Affordable Housing. LOA/LOS identify where windfall can be focused and increased heights achieved but this does not prevent windfall in other locations. Approach to heights seeks to provide clarity about the design expectations.	NA
0158	New Forest National Park Authority	Appendix 1	Regular monitoring will be an important part of the review process.	Comment		No action	Comment noted.	NA
0292	WH White	Appendix 1	Supports early review mechanism/ Large strategic sites take time to deliver and reserve sites should be included with triggers. Canford Garden Village omission site would be a suitable reserve site. Objects to target indicators in 2(a) for S2 and H1 as no staged delivery milestones for contingency of reserve sites to address shortfall in delivery.	Objection	Yes	No action	In accordance with the NPPF the Plan does not propose to release Green Belt to meet housing needs. The Plan will be reviewed as required in five years and/or as a result from on going work with neighbouring Council's on their local plans.	NA
0148	FCERM	Appendix 1	C5 - Monitoring indicaC6 (2.) Include target to monitor applications to ensure they are safe for their lifetime.tors need to include that Coastal Vulnerability Assessments. C6 (1.) Include target to monitor applications considered against the sequential test.	Support with changes		Modification	C5 - This is too detailed and onerous to monitor, and this is complicated more so by the suggestion, so we will remove the monitoring indicator. C6 (1 and 2.) are too detailed and onerous to monitor.	Amend to remove monitoring indicator
0282	Historic England	Appendix 1	Application of building heights policy should be included as a monitoring indicator. Historic environment indicators should be included in the monitoring e.g. conservation area appraisals and management plans, reduction in assets at risk.	Objection		Modification	Building heights indicator is too detailed and onerous to monitor. Agree the number of conservation area appraisals and management plans updated are easily measurable and can be included.	Amend to reference conservation area appraisals and management plans
0078	Hurn Parish Council	Appendix 2	Objection to transport schemes including Lane widening (Ashley Heath-Blackwater), Link road from A338 to airport, Wessex Fields safeguard land adjacent to A338 - concerned with impacts on heathland, high traffic volumes, impacts on heritage assets, contrary to encouraging sustainable travel, impacts on Green Belt. Any new Avon Causeway bridge must include access for horse riders.	Objection		No action	These schemes are considered to be strategically important, the detail of the schemes would be developed outside of the Local Plan process.	NA
0148	FCERM	Appendix 3	Definitions for "Coastal Change Management Area" and "Coastal Vulnerability Zone" should be included.	Support with changes		Modification	Add definitions to glossary.	NA