

Core Strategy Pre-Submission - Chapter 6 Christchurch New Neighbourhoods

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
654579	Mr Nigel Clarke		CSPS724	6	No	No	No	No	No	No	<p>1. is of a highly disproportionate nature, when considered with the harmony of noise, wildlife, increase of traffic noise, light</p> <p>2. do not address the acceptability of the various aspects when assessed against the relevant planning policy below: The development Plan is the Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Structure Plan and the Borough of Christchurch Local Plan (March 2001). The relevant policy is policy H12 which some consider permits residential development throughout the urban area without due consideration and respect for “appropriate character, scale, design, and materials and.. harm to the residential amenities of existing and future residents or environmental features.”</p> <p>3. HM Government guidance, PPS3, would appear to be relevant in a situation where development is appropriate in character and amenity terms (not one or the other neither in part) therefore this development falls outside the HM Government guidelines. It has been shown that some “harm” can be wilfully caused to the environment and nearby properties and also shows disregard for HM Government guidance.</p> <p>4. Planning Considerations, shown in Policy H12, across an urban area is subject to matters of detail. The character of the area is provided by appropriately built and managed properties with appropriately sized residential gardens, as appropriate to the environment and its mix of diverse, assorted flora and fauna and now mature trees both protected and those not protected close to areas of special interest in nature as in a flood plain. Therefore there are grounds for objecting to this residential development in this geographic area proposed.</p> <p>“..South East Dorset including parts of Christchurch and East Dorset contain heathlands and flood plains which are internationally protected Special Protection Areas. (SPAs) In accordance with advice from Natural England, no residential development is permitted within 400m of protected heathland and any residential development within 400m and 5km of these areas will be required to provide mitigation. Mitigation will take the form of the provision of Suitable Alternative...”</p> <p>5. There are harmful consequences in character terms and the proposals do not accord with the relevant elements of policy H12.</p> <p>6. The document is NOT Positively prepared , Justified , Effective and Consistent with National Policy in line with the policies already mentioned .</p> <p>. 7. Conclusion: The proposals do not represent an</p>	to comply with Government policies as listed in answers to Question 4. i.e. H12, PPS3. The development Plan is the Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Structure Plan and the Borough of Christchurch Local Plan (March 2001).	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		247	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											acceptable suggestion to provide a buildings on land which is, claimed to be appropriate and in an appropriate residential and beautiful area of Dorset, that is also close to and on areas of a fragile eco-structure					
654026	Ms Bev Miller		CSPS617	6.1		No		Yes	Yes		I OBJECT STRONGLY TO ANY EROSION OF GREEN BELT LAND. I object to any sort of 'urban extension', this will just complete the urbanisation of Christchurch, fewer green fields etc more concrete, MORE TRAFFIC.		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		248	
654544	Miss Taylor		CSPS720	6.1	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	The area needs to be maintained as green belt. The continual erosion of green belt areas will result in too much conurbation and not enough green spaces. These are necessary for our general health. As a compromise there are unsold/empty homes in the local vicinity or brown field areas that could perhaps be redeveloped without the need to destroy the necessary green belt. Christchurch and its suburbs are already far too built up. Before you know it there will be no green areas left and one great big mass of conurbation. Who wants that?		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		248	
654551	Mr Richard Wells		CSPS692	6.2	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	No	The building of 500 plus properties (depending on which option is considered) is inappropriate for this area of green belt land. The existing infrastructure will not support that amount of housing concentrated in such a small area. At present I have to wait 2 days for a doctors appointment, 6 weeks for dental treatment and the traffic a peak times in and around Christchurch is bad enough now, particularly in the Bournemouth direction. I live next to the A35 on the Hoburne estate and the traffic noise is only just acceptable and I can hear the trains on the elevated rail line which are about 1 kilometer away. The new housing will be trapped between the two and the noise will be unbearable at weekends and particularly in the holiday season. The smells from the sewage works to the east of Salisbury Road can be smelt where I live and so properties adjacent to the Salisbury Road will be inundated on at warm day when the prevailing west/southwest wind blows. There is new housing becoming available on the Hoburne Farm estate with a very large area still to be developed and there are plenty of properties on this side of Christchurch that have vacant possession just waiting for buyers.	I consider option 5 as the only option which advocates no destruction of the green belt land (particularly the allotment land), no increase in the traffic and smaller scale affordable housing on the existing brownfield sites around Christchurch to spread the load on the creaking infrastructure..	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		249	
654303	Mr Stephen Godley		CSPS762	6.7	No	No	No	No	No	No	1.How can the document be sound etc. if it refers in UE3 to "Relocate allotments and powerlines in current location"! Any consultation process is jeopardised by	1.Clarity, with appropriate publicity, exactly what the Option entails! - and in future	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		254	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											such ambiguous statements.	invest in proper proof reading of such documents!				
654303	Mr Stephen Godley		CSPS763	6.8	No	No	No	No	No		This section is not sound as it does not equate allotments with 'community use'. A "pinch point" is a subjective term. The Mude river crossing is not considered a 'pinch point' even though the land is shown as community use. Are not allotments community use? The option of retaining the allotments and burying the power lines would obviate any 'pinch point'.	Take into consideration the views of the allotment tenants association regarding retaining the allotments but burying the powerlines.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		255	
359461	Mrs Nicola Brunt	Dorset Wildlife Trust	CSPS1311	6.9		No				No	Dorset Wildlife Trust welcomes the requirement to conserve natural habitats and protected species and creation of a buffer zone along the River Mude (para 6.29, CN1 on site ecology). We also welcome the vision to make the River Mude a key green spine through the site that will create an area of biodiversity and recreational value. However, we consider that on a development of this scale biodiversity gains should be expected, especially given its links to the Mude Valley Nature Reserve SNCI (SZ19/39), which comprises semi-natural wet and dry broad-leaved woodland, scrub, semi-improved neutral grassland, ponds and river to the south of the site and also plans for the SANG to link to Burton Common SSSI. This would be in line with NPPF (9, 109, 114, 117, 118). We also consider the policy needs strengthening to ensure there is no harm to the River Mude and the SNCI downstream.	We recommend amendment to para 6.29 and policy CN1 to seek positive gains for biodiversity, in line with NPPF, and ensure no harm to the River Mude and Mude Valley Nature Reserve SNCI derive from the development. Biodiversity gains should include enhancements to natural habitats and protected species on site, incorporation of biodiversity within and around the development and enhancement/development of local ecological networks. We consider environmental designations should be shown on map 6.1. Please note that the Mude Valley Nature Reserve SNCI is referred to as the Somerford SNCI in the Key Facts in para 6.9 and this requires amendment.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		256	
359437	Ms Gill Smith	Dorset County Council	CSPS2020	6.13	Yes						As the Lead Local Flood Authority, Dorset County Council has responsibility to develop a strategy to tackle local flood risks and to ensure that other plans and policies accord with it. A number of references in the Core Strategy need updating and new ones included to ensure that it reflects the County Council's responsibilities in respect of flood risk management.	Para 6.13 Amend to read "Development will be located in areas of low flood risk according to the Council's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (Level 2 2009) and Dorset Surface Water Management Plan (July 2011). Open space will be provided in the centre of the site where there are areas affected by flood zone 2 and 3a should be provided in flood zones 2,3 and areas	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		261	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
												of local flood risk (Dorset Surface Water Management Plan 2011)".				
654026	Ms Bev Miller		CSPS615	6.14	No	No		Yes	Yes		No building on green belt. I OBJECT STRONGLY TO ANY EROSION OF GREEN BELT LAND. There is no mention seen in this entire document about the development of brownfield sites. There are a number of brownfield sites in the borough. These should be looked at before even considering green belt. It is called green belt because that is what it is meant to be. A green belt.		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		262	
653852	Mrs Susan Newman-Crane		CSPS590	6.15								There is no mention seen in this entire document about the development of brownfield sites.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		263	
654026	Ms Bev Miller		CSPS616	6.15	No	No		Yes	Yes		I OBJECT STRONGLY TO ANY EROSION OF GREEN BELT LAND.		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		263	
654046	Mr David Pardy		CSPS634	6.19	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	The brief statement at para 6.19 about the need for a health centre consistent with the localised delivery of health care services is inadequate in view of the planned increase in population.	A proper analysis of the population increase & its probable demography must be undertaken to provide a proper estimate of need for extra health services	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination		267	
654295	Mrs Jean Pardy	Labour Party Christchurch Branch	CSPS657	6.19	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	The passing mention at para 6.19 about the need for a health centre consistent with the localised delivery of health care services is insufficient	There should be a detailed plan for such services equivalent to the detail included for roads, industry & retail development.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		267	
359571	Mr Renny Henderson	Royal Society for the Protection of Birds	CSPS3709	6.22							We note the discussion on the Christchurch Urban Extension within this chapter and the selection of option UE1 as the "most appropriate option to take forward" comprising: "Option UE1: Relocate allotments and SANG north of railway line and move powerlines underground (950 – 1,250 dwellings)." Delivery of the urban extension requires consideration of the possible effects on the European sites. This is acknowledged in the Core Strategy and the HRA, and a mitigation strategy including the delivery of a SANG is proposed (Core Strategy paragraphs 6.22 – 6.27). The SANG is to be provided north of the railway line (paragraph 6.24) but no detailed information is presented in the Core Strategy, nor is the SANG strategy referred to in paragraph 6.25 currently available for scrutiny. This will be the key mitigation		Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	we would like to confirm that we wish to reserve the right to appear at the Examination into the Core Strategy, on the grounds the Core Strategy raises significant issues relating to the protection of internationally important wildlife sites (as highlighted in the HRA) and that there remains uncertainty over the delivery of appropriate and effective mitigation measures.	270	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											measure for this allocation and we will be pleased to receive further details of the bespoke SANG strategy for this important allocation. We support the comments made in paragraph 6.26 that the SANG must operate in perpetuity and that management and monitoring will be required to ensure that the SANG “remains functional”.					
359571	Mr Renny Henderson	Royal Society for the Protection of Birds	CSPS3710	6.23							We note the discussion on the Christchurch Urban Extension within this chapter and the selection of option UE1 as the “most appropriate option to take forward” comprising: “Option UE1: Relocate allotments and SANG north of railway line and move powerlines underground (950 – 1,250 dwellings).” Delivery of the urban extension requires consideration of the possible effects on the European sites. This is acknowledged in the Core Strategy and the HRA, and a mitigation strategy including the delivery of a SANG is proposed (Core Strategy paragraphs 6.22 – 6.27). The SANG is to be provided north of the railway line (paragraph 6.24) but no detailed information is presented in the Core Strategy, nor is the SANG strategy referred to in paragraph 6.25 currently available for scrutiny. This will be the key mitigation measure for this allocation and we will be pleased to receive further details of the bespoke SANG strategy for this important allocation. We support the comments made in paragraph 6.26 that the SANG must operate in perpetuity and that management and monitoring will be required to ensure that the SANG “remains functional”.		Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	we would like to confirm that we wish to reserve the right to appear at the Examination into the Core Strategy, on the grounds the Core Strategy raises significant issues relating to the protection of internationally important wildlife sites (as highlighted in the HRA) and that there remains uncertainty over the delivery of appropriate and effective mitigation measures.	271	
359571	Mr Renny Henderson	Royal Society for the Protection of Birds	CSPS3711	6.24							We note the discussion on the Christchurch Urban Extension within this chapter and the selection of option UE1 as the “most appropriate option to take forward” comprising: “Option UE1: Relocate allotments and SANG north of railway line and move powerlines underground (950 – 1,250 dwellings).” Delivery of the urban extension requires consideration of the possible effects on the European sites. This is acknowledged in the Core Strategy and the HRA, and a mitigation strategy including the delivery of a SANG is proposed (Core Strategy paragraphs 6.22 – 6.27). The SANG is to be provided north of the railway line (paragraph 6.24) but no detailed information is presented in the Core Strategy, nor is the SANG strategy referred to in paragraph 6.25 currently available for scrutiny. This will be the key mitigation measure for this allocation and we will be pleased to receive further details of the bespoke SANG strategy for this important allocation.		Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	we would like to confirm that we wish to reserve the right to appear at the Examination into the Core Strategy, on the grounds the Core Strategy raises significant issues relating to the protection of internationally important wildlife sites (as highlighted in the HRA) and that there remains uncertainty over the delivery of appropriate and effective mitigation measures.	272	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											We support the comments made in paragraph 6.26 that the SANG must operate in perpetuity and that management and monitoring will be required to ensure that the SANG “remains functional”.					
359571	Mr Renny Henderson	Royal Society for the Protection of Birds	CSPS3712	6.25							We note the discussion on the Christchurch Urban Extension within this chapter and the selection of option UE1 as the “most appropriate option to take forward” comprising: “Option UE1: Relocate allotments and SANG north of railway line and move powerlines underground (950 – 1,250 dwellings).” Delivery of the urban extension requires consideration of the possible effects on the European sites. This is acknowledged in the Core Strategy and the HRA, and a mitigation strategy including the delivery of a SANG is proposed (Core Strategy paragraphs 6.22 – 6.27). The SANG is to be provided north of the railway line (paragraph 6.24) but no detailed information is presented in the Core Strategy, nor is the SANG strategy referred to in paragraph 6.25 currently available for scrutiny. This will be the key mitigation measure for this allocation and we will be pleased to receive further details of the bespoke SANG strategy for this important allocation. We support the comments made in paragraph 6.26 that the SANG must operate in perpetuity and that management and monitoring will be required to ensure that the SANG “remains functional”.		Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	we would like to confirm that we wish to reserve the right to appear at the Examination into the Core Strategy, on the grounds the Core Strategy raises significant issues relating to the protection of internationally important wildlife sites (as highlighted in the HRA) and that there remains uncertainty over the delivery of appropriate and effective mitigation measures.	273	
654660	Ms Anne Mason	Transition Town Christchurch	CSPS943	6.26		No					SANGS are recent concepts and may not effectively prevent habitat damage to sensitive sites. Monitoring may reveal damage to late to mitigate it.				274	2259130_0_1.pdf
359571	Mr Renny Henderson	Royal Society for the Protection of Birds	CSPS3713	6.26							We note the discussion on the Christchurch Urban Extension within this chapter and the selection of option UE1 as the “most appropriate option to take forward” comprising: “Option UE1: Relocate allotments and SANG north of railway line and move powerlines underground (950 – 1,250 dwellings).” Delivery of the urban extension requires consideration of the possible effects on the European sites. This is acknowledged in the Core Strategy and the HRA, and a mitigation strategy including the delivery of a SANG is proposed (Core Strategy paragraphs 6.22 – 6.27). The SANG is to be provided north of the railway line (paragraph 6.24) but no detailed information is presented in the Core Strategy, nor is the SANG strategy referred to in paragraph 6.25 currently available for scrutiny. This will be the key mitigation measure for this allocation and we will be pleased to receive further details of the bespoke SANG strategy		Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	we would like to confirm that we wish to reserve the right to appear at the Examination into the Core Strategy, on the grounds the Core Strategy raises significant issues relating to the protection of internationally important wildlife sites (as highlighted in the HRA) and that there remains uncertainty over the delivery of appropriate and effective mitigation measures.	274	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											for this important allocation. We support the comments made in paragraph 6.26 that the SANG must operate in perpetuity and that management and monitoring will be required to ensure that the SANG “remains functional”.					
359571	Mr Renny Henderson	Royal Society for the Protection of Birds	CSPS3714	6.27							We note the discussion on the Christchurch Urban Extension within this chapter and the selection of option UE1 as the “most appropriate option to take forward” comprising: “Option UE1: Relocate allotments and SANG north of railway line and move powerlines underground (950 – 1,250 dwellings).” Delivery of the urban extension requires consideration of the possible effects on the European sites. This is acknowledged in the Core Strategy and the HRA, and a mitigation strategy including the delivery of a SANG is proposed (Core Strategy paragraphs 6.22 – 6.27). The SANG is to be provided north of the railway line (paragraph 6.24) but no detailed information is presented in the Core Strategy, nor is the SANG strategy referred to in paragraph 6.25 currently available for scrutiny. This will be the key mitigation measure for this allocation and we will be pleased to receive further details of the bespoke SANG strategy for this important allocation. We support the comments made in paragraph 6.26 that the SANG must operate in perpetuity and that management and monitoring will be required to ensure that the SANG “remains functional”.		Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	we would like to confirm that we wish to reserve the right to appear at the Examination into the Core Strategy, on the grounds the Core Strategy raises significant issues relating to the protection of internationally important wildlife sites (as highlighted in the HRA) and that there remains uncertainty over the delivery of appropriate and effective mitigation measures.	275	
521508	Ms Lisa Jackson	Jackson Planning Ltd	CSPS3798	6.27	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	The Core Strategy is not justified or effective in regard to paragraph 6.27. The site north of the railway between Burton and Burton Common is proposed for sand and gravel extraction which will extend beyond the life of the Core Strategy. It is therefore not justified to include this aspiration within the Core Strategy. It is therefore not justified to include this aspiration within the Core Strategy text. Please note a supporting report is submitted in respect of this representation and its links to other policies.	Any reference to a 'Country Park' north of the railway should be removed as this is not available within the Core Strategy time scale.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		275	2267120_0_1.pdf
359461	Mrs Nicola Brunt	Dorset Wildlife Trust	CSPS1312	6.29		No				No	Dorset Wildlife Trust welcomes the requirement to conserve natural habitats and protected species and creation of a buffer zone along the River Mude (para 6.29, CN1 on site ecology). We also welcome the vision to make the River Mude a key green spine through the site that will create an area of biodiversity and recreational value. However, we consider that on a development of this scale biodiversity gains should be expected, especially given its links to the Mude Valley Nature Reserve SNCI (SZ19/39), which comprises semi-natural wet	We recommend amendment to para 6.29 and policy CN1 to seek positive gains for biodiversity, in line with NPPF, and ensure no harm to the River Mude and Mude Valley Nature Reserve SNCI derive from the development. Biodiversity gains should include enhancements to natural habitats and	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		277	2256007_0_1.pdf

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											and dry broad-leaved woodland, scrub, semi-improved neutral grassland, ponds and river to the south of the site and also plans for the SANG to link to Burton Common SSSI. This would be in line with NPPF (9, 109, 114, 117, 118). We also consider the policy needs strengthening to ensure there is no harm to the River Mude and the SNCI downstream.	protected species on site, incorporation of biodiversity within and around the development and enhancement/development of local ecological networks. We consider environmental designations should be shown on map 6.1. Please note that the Mude Valley Nature Reserve SNCI is referred to as the Somerford SNCI in the Key Facts in para 6.9 and this requires amendment.				
653852	Mrs Susan Newman-Crane		CSPS591	6.31								Staple Cross is of immense importance, being a 14th-century cross (ref English Heritage site visit from Duncan Coe) and research undertaken on it by myself and colleague suggests it was the town cross in the market place in front of the George Inn. It is hideously beleaguered by ugly roads and signs and footbridges, and it should be top priority to enhance and respect this monument, and a policy should be prepared to enable this to happen.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		279	
654026	Ms Bev Miller		CSPS618	6.31		No					Staple Cross is of immense importance, being a 14th-century cross (ref English Heritage) It is surrounded by ugly roads and signs and footbridges, it should be top priority to enhance and respect this monument, and a policy should be prepared to enable this to happen.		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		279	
654745	Mr Mark Hughes		CSPS911	6.31	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	It seems very unlikely the monument will be enhanced by substantially increasing the amount of traffic passing by. Also, by adding the 900 extra homes nearby will increase the chance of it being defaced and further eroded due to car pollution. It is very easy to say to see a potential problem and say - "Don't worry, we'll make it better than it is at the moment", without giving any details as to how you are going to do it.	Again, provide clear plans of the proposals to the A35 junctions, rather than suggesting changes maybe made. Then allow a reasonable amount of time for consultation rather than ask people to comment on vague statements.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		279	
654852	Mr Roger Donne	The Christchurch Antiquarians	CSPS876	6.31	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	One of the major issues for Christchurch in the Core Strategy document is the so-called Urban Extension.		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral		279	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											While not expressing a view on the merits of any of the schemes put forward, The Christchurch Antiquarians is concerned with the fate of the English Heritage scheduled monument known as Staple Cross, on the western edge of the area identified for this extension. In paragraph 6.31 of the draft Core Strategy document the statement is made that that the development of the Roeshot Hill urban extension will enhance the setting of the Staple Cross, but no details are given as to how this will be achieved. TCA would welcome any enhancement of Staple Cross which we believe in the past has been neglected. However, it is difficult to see that its future prospects would be enhanced by its proximity to a new housing development and fear that this may only lead to further deterioration. TCA would suggest the Council take this opportunity to restore the Staple Cross and enhance the overall setting of this scheduled ancient monument by incorporating a provision in a section 106 Agreement requiring the developer to make an appropriate financial contribution to allow appropriate works to be carried out.		examination			
653593	Mr Graham Richards		CSPS767	6.32		No		Yes	Yes	Yes	One of the purposes of Salibury Road Conservation Area at the southern end is the preservation of the view. A village of DIY huts and degrading polytunnels will do nothing to enhance that view.	Leave the allotments at Roeshot Hill.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		280	
654660	Ms Anne Mason	Transition Town Christchurch	CSPS945	6.37							To suitable renewable technologies for the Urban Extension ADD water harvesters and greywater recycling. We are concerned about the apparent suggestion that surrounding the site 'large swathes of forest' would be felled for fuel.				285	2259130_0_1.pdf
654303	Mr Stephen Godley		CSPS764	6.40	No	No	No	No	No	No	As statutory allotments there is an appropriate process for relocating such allotments which presumably involve some consultation with stakeholders. Why then has there been no direct contact with the Roeshot Hill Allotment Association on this matter when CBC already has a working relationship regarding the management of the site?	Review the specific issue of retaining the allotments on the current site and if appropriate justify the relocation with regard to the recent CBC document on allotment provision. Is an isolated "super-site" north of both the bypass and the railway suitable for all residents to access easily from their homes?	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		288	
654046	Mr David Pardy		CSPS718	6.40	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	There has been insufficient consultation with allotment holders & their Associations & there has been no proper survey of the demand for allotment plots. The proposed move of the Roeshott Hill allotments to land north of the railway line makes acces difficult & with the site being outside the urban area will significantly	The Strategy should reconsider the allocation of land for housing at Roeshott Hill to preserve the current allotment area. Allotments do not add significantly to the	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination		288	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											increase site security problems. Surely the best place for garden allotments is with in the community & presrvation of current sites will maximise the horticultural investment of many decades.	local traffic congestion & must be a better option, environmentally, for the town than more housing. If the Christchurch Urban extension is approved then the rerouting of the national grid underground should be given a piriory to release more land north of the allotments for housing & so leaving the current allotments in situ.				
654026	Ms Bev Miller		CSPS619	6.45		No	Yes	Yes			To sweep away the area around Staple Cross is unacceptable: that and Ambury Lane and the southern end of Hawthorn Road, should be protected. I object to Ambury Lane becoming yet another busy access road. At the moment it is a pleasant walk and cycle towards Burton Common please don't loose another country lane to tarmac and 'god the car'.	Provide full details of exactly what is proposed for the roundabout improvements at Staple Cross Junction.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		293	
654046	Mr David Parady		CSPS635	6.45	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	The proposed road changes, whilst they might alleviate the congestion at current traffic flow levels, are unlikely to cope with the increases resulting from the planned increase in population	Radical solutions are needed, the question of an outer relief road for Christchurch should be re-examined & the provision of a park & ride scheme based on the rail link from Hinton Admiral Station should be studied	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	The traffic congestion is likely to become a major problem if the Strategy is implemented & I would like to participate in a discussion to open out this issue	293	
654303	Mr Stephen Godley		CSPS765	6.45		No	No		No		There is no description of how residents of the Urban Extension would access the A35 if they wish to travel west. The only junction offering an easy right turn onto the A35, the "Sainsbury's" access point, is designated "Buses only". The Stoney Cross access offers only eastbound access and the two access points on Lyndhurst Road suffer from the same problems that Westfield Gardens suffered before it was closed off. Allotment tenants report considerable difficulty turning right out of the site. Development residents will soon establish a 'rat run' through Burton.	Clarify where residents will be able to safely turn west onto the A35.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		293	
653852	Mrs Susan Newman-Crane		CSPS594	6.46		No	Yes				It is impossible to comment on proposals which give so little information.	Provide at least general details for the proposal for the roundabouts, roads and junctions specified. It sounds most alarming and gross urbanisation.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		294	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
654026	Ms Bev Miller		CSPS620	6.46		No		Yes	Yes		Too vague....what exactly are 'necessary contributions to Fountains Roundabout, Stony Lane, Staple Cross Junction and Somerford Roundabout.' Traffic will increase leading to more misery for all !		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		294	
654026	Ms Bev Miller		CSPS624	6.48		No		Yes	Yes		Combined with the Urban Extension, this destruction of the natural and historic environment will wipe out Guss Common and destroy the rural nature of Hawthorn Lane. Together with many other large-scale housing and employment provision and loss of Green Belt contained in the Strategy, the impact on Christchurch will be dreadful.		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		296	
653852	Mrs Susan Newman-Crane		CSPS601	6.49	Yes	No	Yes	Yes			Combined with the Urban Extension, this is a gross assault on the natural and historic environment, wiping out as it will Guss Common and destroying the rural nature of Hawthorn Lane. Together with many other large-scale housing and employment provision and loss of Green Belt contained in the Strategy, the impact on Christchurch will be profound, and we will all have to say goodbye to whatever charm and tranquility which remains, but especially a farewell to much of the historic hinterland and environmental beauties. Heaven help all the species which must thrive on this land.	Resist this gravel working plan.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		297	
654026	Ms Bev Miller		CSPS621	6.49		No		Yes	Yes		Gravel extraction AND urban extensions ? Christchurch where time will no longer be pleasant !		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		297	
359437	Ms Gill Smith	Dorset County Council	CSPS1961	6.49	Yes	Yes					Para 6.49 of the Core Strategy identifies land north of the railway line at Roeshot Hill that is intended as a Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG). This is land which has been identified in the emerging Dorset Minerals Site Allocations DPD (Discussion Paper) as a potential site for the extraction of sharp sand and gravel. The reserve extends into Hampshire. Dorset County Council supports the statement that "The Council will continue to work closely with Dorset and Hampshire County Councils and the land owner regarding potential minerals extraction and to ensure appropriate contributions are made by the minerals developer for improvements required on the road network in Dorset."	No proposed change	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	Dorset County Council wishes to partake in any oral hearing on this matter in order to fulfill its role under the duty to cooperate and ensure that its interests are considered in the emerging Core Strategy	297	
359614	Mr & Mrs McCammon		CSPS145	Policy CN 1							The medical centre and schools do not have sufficient places to accept the occupants of 850 dwellings. Why is there no improved infrastructure to accommodate these? Far too many houses, most of which will end up as affordable housing / buy to let houses and will not attract owner / occupier buyers.				298	
359615	Mr		CSPS95	Policy							Land north of the railway is designated for gravel				298	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
	Burridge			CN 1							extraction and moving the allotments will waste years of work. The cost of pylon removal is inordinately expensive. The usual vague statement about transport. This will overload the by pass which an official Christchurch report of some years ago said was at full capacity. Why is there no traveller site here. If established at the beginning of development, new housing could not complain.					
359687	Mrs E Towler		CSPS144	Policy CN 1							Are the affordable houses for local people born in this area? What about schools? As I understand it there aren't enough places for infants now. What about doctors? Its hard enough getting an appointment as it is! What about access to the A35? This road is very busy already without more traffic joining it. I imagine anyone from the estate turning right onto the A35 will be taking their lives into their hands.				298	
360149	Mr John Urganhart		CSPS88	Policy CN 1							No, as said before, this will cause more congestion on the A35 so a great deal more road improvements are needed - more tinkering with junctions will be totally inadequate.				298	
360166	Mr TC Nicholson		CSPS100	Policy CN 1							This is the best location for residential development left in Christchurch but will only succeed if the A35 is moved north of the railway and accessed from a roundabout adjacent to the tunnel on the Hants border then linked to the A338 off Hurn Road. Failure to include this option will only add to the present congestion off the A35 bypass terminating in the centre of Christchurch.				298	
589997	Mrs Clarke		CSPS77	Policy CN 1							No. This is Green Belt land. You have not justified the infrastructure. 850 dwellings means up to 2,000 children. Where are the schools? Not mentioned. Up to 3,000 people, where are the doctors? Up to 3,000 people, where are the hospital spaces? Up to 3,000 more people. Can social services cope? Not thought out just Meyrick Estates and Christchurch Council greedy for money! Objections to the core strategy for moving the allotments at Roeshot Hill. Our objections to moving the allotments to Burton are as follows. 1. Roeshot soil has been worked for over 30 years with alot of hours to make the soil very fertile. At Burton where you wish to put the new allotments is not as good soil as Roeshot, and Burton floods badly in the winter, so what good is that for allotments? 2. A lot of time and money has been put into Roeshot by the allotmenters to no avail, because we will never be compensated enough and will have to start again from scratch. 3. More use of cars to get to the new site, bad for the				298	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	
											environment and climate change, CO2 more traffic on the by-pass. 4. Some allotmenters will have to give up their plots due to starting all over again, and unable to get to the new site. 5. What is the move all about? MONEY £30 million for Christchurch Council. The houses on our site are going to be executive for the rich. We could understand more if it were for starter homes and people on the housing waiting list. 6. In all the core strategy nothing is mentioned about infrastructure i.e. roads, hospitals, doctors, schools. Sewage in Christchurch that was for 20,000 people and now copes with 40,000 people. And you want to build for another potential 4,000 people. 7. Please dont forget we are a statutory site and come under the law of the land! Please dont move Roeshot Hill Allotments.						
647876	Mr Christopher Whitcher		CSPS105	Policy CN 1							As with the decision made about the future of Druitt Hall this complete leaflet is irrelevant as it appears to me the final decision has been made. I also begrudge even more money wasted on this leaflet as with the rise in Councillors expenses "austerity"?				298		
647898	Mr Derek Beasley		CSPS114	Policy CN 1							Yes but 850 dwellings seems excessive.				298		
648240	Mr Roger Haxby		CSPS149	Policy CN 1							Objection 1: PPG2 Green Belts states there are five purposes of including land in Green Belts: 1. To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas; 2. To prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another; 3. To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment; 4. To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and 5. To assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. The development encroaching on Green Belt land does not meet the first reason – since it leads to an unrestricted sprawl, the third reason, since the proposal encroaches on the countryside, and the fourth reason, since the historical riverside / countryside setting characteristic of Christchurch and surrounding villages is not being preserved. The policy does not meet the test of soundness because it is not consistent with national policy. Objection 2: Para 1.7 of PPG2 says “The purposes of including land in Green Belts are of paramount importance to their continued protection, and should take precedence over the land use objectives.” The						

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											policy does not meet the test of soundness because the Green Belt purposes are not given precedence over land use objectives, and so it is not consistent with national policy.					
648788	Mr R Hewetson		CSPS158	Policy CN 1							What is meant by 'affordable'? Where will the money come from!!!? What does this ambiguous statement mean? Have figures for increase in traffic been worked out?				298	
648805	Mr John Cuming		CSPS162	Policy CN 1							One presumes that proper test have been carried out that land is suitable for this proposed development? Is it not a floodplain? Dwellings for 850 will generate a need for extra school places. Are they available? There will be a considerable increase in road traffic. Exits onto the A35 in the Roeshot Hill area will be dangerous and slow fast moving traffic. Exitst onto the dual carriageway bypass would be impossible.				298	
648835	Mr Christopher Balchin		CSPS166	Policy CN 1							Whilst regretable for the allotment holders, the strategy can be justified and effective (within the limited definitions given) but only if a new road is provided from the proposed estate to the re-sited allotments. Otherwise it will fail this test as ploholders will need to drive nearly to Christchurch and then return - this impacting badly on the environment, proving more costly and time consuming. (Most ploholders live in Highcliffe / Mudeford).				298	
648848	Mr Denis Osgood		CSPS170	Policy CN 1							Basically no. Item 3 community facilities - not sure what you mean. Where will the school, doctors surgery and dentist be within the development. How will the traffic exit and enter the development on the A35 and bypass. Is the ground along the bypass not subject to a high water table. Will there be sufficient work available for the residents?				298	
359820	Mr & Mrs A Priddis		CSPS199	Policy CN 1							Yes in favour of CN1, 2 and 3. Also KS10. Please plan for pedestrians and cyclists, i.e. no up and down pavements - a motor car only needs a drop kerb. To encourage more cycling separate ways are required.				298	
360085	Mrs J Houson		CSPS311	Policy CN 1							Anything is better than the gravel extraction and rubbish tip you proposed before! As I suggested previously why not include a reservoir which could be an asset to the area for water sports, nature walks and provide water for all these extra homes you propose to build if adjoining the A35 and landscaped would be a better welcome to the area for visitors than a "housing estate"?				298	
648918	Mrs M		CSPS195	Policy CN 1							No, Green Belt should remain Hinton side of railway.				298	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
	Ramsden-Fisher										Can not be flexible so close to railway. Unsuitable for families.					
648964	Mrs Sue Bruce-Burgess		CSPS204	Policy CN 1							This allocation connects Burton to Christchurch. Burton is a village!!! Stones from the railway will hit houses and people!! Public bridleway!!! Its Grren Belt for a reason!! Leave it like that. 35% affordable is not even half the houses for local people!!! Hate it so much I can hardly write!!				298	
649906	Kim Brackley		CSPS273	Policy CN 1							1000 new homes on green belt land is quite frankly disturbing. 1. Can Royal Bournemouth / Christchurch Hospitals cope with an influx of new people which would at a guesstimate be at least a couple of thousand if based on just a minimum of two occupants per dwelling. Waiting times are already stretched as are bed availability. 2. Can the local schools take any more pupils and what would the catchment area be for more junior and secondary schools? 3. Can the local dentists (NHS) take any more patients? 4. Can the local doctors take any more patients? 5. Is there suitable employment. 6. More traffic and carbon emissions. The roads around Christchurch are already struggling with traffic in the rush hours and there is only one bypass. 7. Is there no brown belt land to use i.e. disused retail spaces.				298	
649982	Mr and Mrs Edward and Marion Slade		CSPS275	Policy CN 1							We do not feel this development is justified or founded on a robust and credible evidence base. The density of housing will be too great, it will present huge traffic problems on the A35, there will be insufficient amenities and infrastructure to support the increase in population. Apparently also, 65% of the housing planned will not be affordable for most people. Is a new school (s) planned to take the extra children?				298	
649998	Mr John Grainger		CSPS279	Policy CN 1							No - the proposed development for 850 dwellings is far too many and will put impossible demands on local medical and educational resources. A snapshot count of empty dwellings and properties for sale in the diagram above clearly proves there is no demand for such a high number of new dwellings.				298	
650390	Mr and Ms T and E J Lodge and Cox		CSPS313	Policy CN 1							No objection but hope affordable housing could be increased to 50% and avoid landlords buying to let. % of housing should be lifelong homes i.e. wheelchair access. All housing should have good environmental infrastructure as possible - i.e. renewable energy. re allotments - new allotments should be increased in				298	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											number, accessible for all and assistance given to those moving to new plots.					
650428	Mrs R Davies		CSPS322	Policy CN 1							Presumably this will become another small town but basically will eventually extend to Burton. Is urban extension of this size required as there are many properties available now and probably always will be. Eventually Christchurch and all surrounding villages and areas are likely to become one large faceless and unmanageable town.				298	
650644	Mrs C M Williams		CSPS337	Policy CN 1							No. In its current layout road exit off the new development will be on Roeshot Hill and this will cause additional traffic and a stop / start obstacle that will restrict flow. Exits should be via South Burton onto Stony Lane.				298	
651353	Mrs Janice Targett		CSPS418	Policy CN 1							Yes justified.				298	
651766	Mr Mark Farrant		CSPS429	Policy CN 1							No! It cannot be 'sound' to glibly 'relocate' the peoples green recreational areas. We all need to breathe and it makes no sense to ask for views on plans that have already been decided. I would like to express my opposition to the proposed development south of the railway and north of the A35 on the following grounds. 1) It is wrong and cannot be justified, to build on green belt land when so many brown field options are available 2) The excuse of 'affordable housing' only lasts as long as the market allows, they will be sold for profit at the first opportunity. 3) There is already a pool of unsold, unoccupied, houses in Christchurch, many of them second or holiday homes. There really is no need to wreck Christchurch just to satisfy a government diktat. We need to think very clearly about this. 4) Christchurch residents have worked very hard to bring the Roeshott allotments to a high level of productivity. This was not achieved overnight. To ride rough-shod over the wishes of these people will produce a negative backlash from your existing residents in favour of those who do not live in, or contribute to, the present infra-structure. Think again, and again. If you seriously believe that you represent the people of Christchurch, be bold enough to ask for their views on this subject. I don't imagine you will do that as you know the answer would not suit the political scene.				298	
518223	Mr Gary Lammers		CSPS717	Policy CN 1		No	Yes	No	Yes	No	There is no reason why 850 new dwellings should go	The need for this high	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral	I have no confidence that	298	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>here. This is Green Belt. It will ruin the entry to Christchurch along Lyndhurst Road. It will destroy the reason why people want to live in Christchurch. You seem to be planning to destroy the very character of Christchurch - the character that makes it a desirable place to live. You seem to want to create an urban sprawl that will be just like every other town in the country. Your plan is UNSOUND and UNJUSTIFIED.</p> <p>It is UNSOUND as it uses GREEN BELT - the approach to Christchurch from Lyndhurst is very pleasant due to the current view as you go down Roeshott Hill. The traffic in the area is already beyond saturation during the daytime - there have been no new road developments since I moved here 30 years ago. It is irresponsible to allow a new development of 650 houses. There are no new facilities plan to support extra people (schools, doctors, hospitals, etc) It is UNJUSTIFIED as there are alternative ways to provide more housing. It would be very easy to use brown field sites. As it is affordable housing that is alledgely needed, there could be flats on these brownfield sites - ie build upwards and use less land.</p>	<p>number of new dwellings should be revisited. There should be NO use of GREEN BELT. There are enough brownfield sites in the area that could be used to build a high proportion of flats - these are more affordable and use less ground space. There needs to be more innovation shown in tackling the problems you outline.</p>	<p>examination</p>	<p>the current "consultation" is being undertaken fairly - I am sure that you have already decided to go ahead with developing Roeshott Hill anyway.</p>		
534508	Mr & Mrs Hugh and Jane Merrett		CSPS669	Policy CN 1							<p>No - As CN1 includes:- 1. about 850 dwellings and 6. the overhead pylons will be moved underground. Therefore the land presently owned by Sir George Meyrick (or on his behalf) included in the CN1 map and your framework masterplan is sufficient for providing 1. above and it is not justified to relocate Roeshot Hill Allotmanets. The policy is not effective as it has been based on virtually no information about the allotments so how can the policy makers arrive at an unbiased decision in this respect. Before reading our letter, please read the final paragraph of 'Core Strategy Vision' available on www.dorsetforyou.com. Is Dorset for us at Roeshot Hill Allotments : The recent policy CN1 is questionable as with the 850 objective for new dwellings and burying the pylons, a further mix and match option is available on behalf of the residents of Christchurch - an option is not explained, not cross referenced correctly and totally overlooked in the core strategy document. Please consider carefully the implications of the following:-</p> <p>1) As a democratic consultation and if all four options were viable at the outset, why was it prejudged that only option UE1 could deliver at the October 2010 stage and why if the Christchurch option KS7 (October 2010) excludes use of garden land, why are you by 2012 prepared to destruct gardening land at</p>				298	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>community allotments.</p> <p>2) Decisions should be made with full knowledgeable information and the Core Strategy gives no information to base a fair decision about Roeshot Hill Allotments. Probably as to date, neither Planners, your Policy Team, Broadway Malyan or our Councillors have met us (the allotment holders) on site to discuss why we are ASKED TOLD to relocate and we can only assume that you all no longer consider your Roeshot Hill Allotments to be a VALUED PART OF THE COMMUNITY OF CHRISTCHURCH. It is easy on paper to say 'JUST GET RID OF 35 YEAR OLD ALLOTMENTS, THEY DO NOT MATTER – THE YOUNG AND OLD CAN START AGAIN' – it is not as easy as that ! You should all know. Since the formation of the Allotment Association many freely given hours of assistance, much money invested, a huge amount of handed-down or shared knowledge for the good of all has been given by many. In 14 years of the Association (taking much of the day to day management from the Council) and working for the community, our Allotment site has ?r...ed? from a rabbit infested site into an Allotment site to be proud and Christchurch should be proud of us for our contribution locally. The recent Christchurch Allotment Strategy praises us for lots of reasons, particularly those relating to healthy communities and the environment. Why is Christchurch prepared to destroy its 'Best Growing Community Owned Land' ? Currently in the UK, vegetable seed sales have now outnumbered flower seed sales and Allotments are being promoted ! The Queen has an Allotment, also CBEEBIES together with the newly opened ECO homes at Southampton (an expected requirement for future developments shortly).</p> <p>3) As the locals know, the land at Burton (Summers Lane/Hawthorn Road) has a drainage problem - crops will ROT !</p> <p>4) Thank you to Christchurch residents for your support to our petition (ignored at the two main Public Council meetings – WHY ? – Your residents' views are important) and thanks to Mr Alan Ottaway and the Allotment Strategy team – a far more democratic process than the Core Strategy.</p> <p>5) Our present government champions communities and recognises their usefulness in society bonding people together. Our local Councillors confirm that they are 'working for our community all year round' – thank you – we can assure you that we have an excellent community of likeminded people at Roeshot Hill Allotments and we're very worthwhile in our present location. May we remind you that allotment</p>					

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>holders get a huge amount of pleasure from what they grow and this is particularly noticeable from words expressed by Somerford residents.</p> <p>6) Christchurch supported 'Britain in Bloom' (we were asked to take part and over the years had several successes) and the Christchurch Food Festival champions local food – WHAT IS MORE LOCAL THAN ALLOTMENT FOOD.</p> <p>7) A large hub site would be unmanageable – as we know from 14 years' of experience with our Association.</p> <p>8) Sir George Meyrick has released sufficient land to build the 850 dwelling objective (Policy CN1) including your affordable homes quote (see page 300 – section 14.18 (first line) – October 2010) without moving Roeshot Hill Allotments.</p> <p>9) Are all LONDON Allotments moved to the outskirts (say lining M25) – NO</p> <p>10) Are the Council property developers or anyone too close to them – that is not your role</p> <p>11) If you are going to destroy our SHEDS, are you going to destroy the SHEDS/HUTS on Mudeford sandspit – NO</p> <p>If the Core Strategy/Policy has to be justified and to be effective and therefore SOUND in relation to all parts of the Options UE1, UE2, UE3 and UE4, why has UE3 changed between the Draft COPY of October 2010 and the document presented prior to the major public meeting on 25th January 2012 and not corrected in the Document committed to final consultation at the Extraordinary Public Council meeting on 5th March 2012. As you know UE3 does not relocate the Allotments. If all or any persons who sanctioned Policy CN1 based their final decisions on the incorrect Option UE3 information from either of these final documents then their decisions need to be revisited or they should instruct a re vote otherwise the Policy decision is unsound.</p> <p>Can we point out, however, that:-</p> <p>OPTION UE3 (as originally presented to the residents of Christchurch and in the Options for consideration October 2010 PLUS burying the pylons WILL</p> <p>a) Reduce the pinch point (currently used as a lame excuse)</p> <p>b) Increase UE3 numbers by 300-400 from 500-650 (originally) to 800-1050 (a sufficient margin to Policy CN1 and affordable housing quota of 850 x 35% = 297 or 850 x 40% = 340 is covered)</p> <p>c) Retain Roeshot Hill Allotments for the community in its present location on Grade 2 community Green Belt land for which the Council are only safe keepers for our residents and community</p>					

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>d) Lessen any extra development traffic to the already often congested Sainsburys/Stewarts end of A35 – when the Hoburne Estate was built, Westfield Gardens (north west end) was closed permanently – too dangerous</p> <p>e) Also include the original forethought of the provision for additional allotments (needed for the Borough – figures not yet confirmed) by increasing Roeshot Hill Allotments present land of 4.682 hectares to 6 hectares by adding the adjacent disused/derelict council nursery (also best Christchurch growing land). The Plan in the original booklet (we have a copy) and the Core Strategy (October 2010) identifies the land and confirms acreage – again a point not explained in the Core Strategy or that by burying the pylons, your decisions are not cut and dried.</p> <p>Please Christchurch, your officers and councillors treat us Allotment holders with a little more respect as an intelligent worthwhile community (of all ages – to 90+) at Roeshot Hill Allotments and SAVE US FROM DESTRUCTION. We are, at present, in the centre of need (see Christchurch Allotment Strategy 2012 – 2028 Location of Allotment holders map). Please not bin our community and consider that future generations may be glad of our present good Agricultural/Horticultural land and our knowledge (as the need for more local food increases) if the current policy of devaluing the pound under quantitative easing continues – thus increasing the cost of imported food.</p>					
653013	Mr Andrew Chambers		CSPS766	Policy CN 1	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Provision of the new allotments will require considerable new parking spaces due to their new location requiring a large number of the allotments' owners to travel by car. This will have to be accommodated by creating a car park as roadside parking next to the railway bridge is inherently unsafe. This will be yet more concrete poured over what is supposed to be 'protected' green belt land.		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		298	
653593	Mr Graham Richards		CSPS652	Policy CN 1		No	No	Yes	Yes		<p>Point 4. Future of Christchurch Document . North Christchurch Urban Extension Strategic Allocation. To relocate the Roeshot Hill allotments to Land east of Salisbury Rd Burton, bounded by Hawthorn Rd & Summers lane is nonsensical. Summers Lane & Hawthorn Rd. are little more than cart tracks. Salisbury rd at the junction with Martins Hill Lane is busy and can be dangerous. All approach roads are narrow. The additional traffic is undesirable. Salisbury Rd is a conservation area, the allotments conflict with the reasons for the conservation areas existence .</p>	Leave the Allotments at the Roeshot Hill site.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination	If necessary	298	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											There are also archaeological reasons why myriad diggers should not be allowed to scratch around here.					
653852	Mrs Susan Newman-Crane		CSPS592	Policy CN 1		No	Yes				<p>To sweep away the area around Staple Cross is unacceptable: that part at least, including the charming Ambury Lane and the southern end of Hawthorn Road, should be protected.</p> <p>A level of 35% affordable housing is far too low for a borough which this Strategy acknowledges has one of the country's lowest ratio of earnings to house prices, and therefore affordability.</p> <p>An affordability criteria must have a legally binding restriction for occupancy by local people only.</p>	<p>Reduce the area of building so as to preserve and enhance the setting of the 14th-century Scheduled Ancient Monument, Staple Cross. Although the policy states it will do this, provision for no housing around it is not stated. Furthermore, the 'access point' to the 850-housing estate is said to be at Staple Cross, and this must not be permitted, as it negates the pledge in the Strategy to enhance its setting.</p> <p>Increase the proportion of affordable housing and restrict its use to locals. Provide full details of exactly what is proposed for the roundabout improvements, especially that of Staple Cross Junction.</p> <p>Provide details also of what is intended for the junctions listed at the end of the policy for the A35. I foresee a serious visual and sound degradation following on any amendments made to roundabouts and roads as specified.</p>	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		298	
654026	Ms Bev Miller		CSPS622	Policy CN 1		No		Yes	Yes		<p>Nothing in this is sound or justified. Just another erosion of green belt land. More houses, more people to overload an already overloaded town. Very little here that residents of Christchurch can look forward to.</p>		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		298	
507546	Mr Nigel Pugsley	BNP Paribas Real Estate	CSPS713	Policy CN 1	Yes	Yes					<p>My client is supportive of policy which would require the delivery of essential infrastructure it would be essential that the infrastructure needed to support the planned growth is provided for in a timely way.</p>		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		298	
654341	Ms Chris Keats		CSPS665	Policy CN 1							<p>No, the proposed policy to build approx. 850 dwellings on this piece of land is not 'sound'. Christchurch should not be swamped by homes, it should be a beacon of sustainable living, a place 'Where time is pleasant', not</p>				298	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											a town that's been spoilt by over development, resulting in constant traffic jams. Traffic in the Christchurch area is already heavy, and add to that burden by illegally building up to 850 dwellings (illegal if built on Green belt land) is not an option the Council should consider. If you were talking about 100 decently designed, spacious homes, perhaps for families , then that might be a different matter, but small, cramped homes built for profit, not for people, should not be contemplated. And NO building should enroach on Green Belt land. Leave the allotments where they are and tell the Government that the people of Christchurch say 'No' to green belt development.					
654400	Mrs J Williams		CSPS670	Policy CN 1							If this housing development goes ahead, where are all the children from these family homes going to go to school. We haven't enough places now. Houses are no good without local infrastructure. This will mean even more cars on the roads to ferry children into the town.				298	
654686	Mrs J E Francis		CSPS769	Policy CN 1								No. The Green Belt is there to protect out countryside and environment. It was not meant to be built on. Brown field sites should be used as there are enough for needs. Roads, hospitals etc already overstretched.			298	
654745	Mr Mark Hughes		CSPS795	Policy CN 1	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	Not enough detail is given regarding the plans for the Staples Cross/A35 junction. Currently, this junction allows traffic to/from Salisbury road onto A35 Eastbound only. Though not detailed in this document, it seems the expectation is that this junction will also service A35 Westbound. By doing so, Burton village will be opened up to traffic from the new development/ Somerford/ Highcliffe and anyone in the area who is looking to bypass Stony Lane whilst travelling north to Burton, Ringwood, Winkton, New Forest and beyond. This will have a significant on life in Burton. If the remainder of the plans are implemented, we will already see a rise in traffic, but I suspect this change will cause the greater issue. Salisbury road is currently reasonably quiet. So much so, it can be closed if required, for example to support the veterans day parade, scouts etc. It also has a Primary School situated on it where parents park and wait to pick up their children. There is also a Nursery which is situated on either side of Salisbury Road, and the children need to cross to get to one part of the building to the other.	I suggest a detailed plan of the proposed change with supporting analysis as to the expected changes in traffic behaviour it would cause. This should then be communicated to the affected communities for their review and consultation.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		298	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											It does not appear that any analysis has been done to reasonably understand the impact of such changes, and no information as to whether there are any further points in the planning process which will allow residents to realistically object to this point, so I cannot see until steps are put in place to fully understand the disruption to the community that this proposal can be accepted.					
653576	Mrs Sue Ellis		CSPS1119	Policy CN 1							A35 is already too busy at this point. Unnecessary surely another 850 homes. Pressure on hospitals, Doctors, schools.				298	
653586	Mr Robert Stephen Homer		CSPS1124	Policy CN 1							Policy CN1 does not meet the tests of soundness. the destruction of working farmland and rich flora and fauna enjoyed by the local population of an already overcrowded and congested Borough will seriously diminish our quality of life. The relocation of Roeshot Hill allotments will eat up yet more precious Green Belt. As this should not go ahead the removal of overhead pylons and the transport contributions from the development are unnecessary.				298	
654745	Mr Mark Hughes		CSPS912	Policy CN 1	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	It does not seem to me that any the impact to the existing communities has been assessed. I think that this proposal will have a massive affect on areas such as Burton, Somerford , and whilst plans have been made available, people are guessing as to how it will impact them. As far as I can see, residents in these areas can look forward to a reduction in quality of life caused by - An increase in traffic, specifically along the A35, Burton Village centre and Christchurch town centre, - An increase strain on Schools, health services etc - A reduction in open areas - Consequently a reduction in property values for those not lucky enough to Acres upon acres of land.	A review of the impact changes to the local communities (inc projected traffic volumes and behaviour), advising what the actual need is, why the areas proposed are being considered above brown field sites.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		298	
654780	Ms Sharon Davis		CSPS850	Policy CN 1	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	There will be a serious loss of Green Belt land when alternative sites not placed in the Green Belt are available. The proposed site is in the Burton Conservation Area which will be severely damaged by such a large development and relocation of allotments. Burton Farm, mentioned in the Conservation Area Appraisal as making a valuable contribution to Conservation Area will be lost with the consequential loss of jobs. The proposal for a pedestrian/cycle track at the top of Roeshot Hill (Verno Hill) is incredibly dangerous, crossing the road or joining the flow of traffic is highly life-threatening as any person who uses this track is aware.	Brown field sites should surely be more suitable for any extra housing/development (please see the sites proposed for the multiple new supermarkets proposed for Christchurch)	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		298	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	
											There does not appear to be any new schools or medical facilities for the 850 proposed dwellings. The proposed local retail shops seem to be placed directly behind the very large open all hours large Supermarket.						
654787	Mr Darren Player		CSPS849	Policy CN 1		No		No	No		<p>Firstly this proposal is to build on land designated as Green Belt, building on Green Belt should never be allowed. The whole point of green belt is for it to remain as beautiful unspoilt undeveloped, wild, or agricultural land , not desecrated by buildings and development. There are more than enough Brown Field land in the area which should be used for development.</p> <p>Also all the amenities in the area are already stretched such as, Schools, Doctors Surgery's and Hospitals adding another 850 homes with 1000+ people will only add to the problem and lead to further delays and strain to these essential services.</p> <p>Lastly the A35 is already an extremely busy stretch of road adding this amount of homes to the area and with it a large volume of cars that will need to get on and off this busy stretch of road is an accident \ traffic jam nightmare in the making.</p> <p>I strongly object to this whole proposal on the points listed above I do not believe that this should be allowed to go ahead at all.</p>		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination			298	
654842	Miss Denise White		CSPS869	Policy CN 1	No	No			No		As a Burton resident I consider any development detrimental to the economy of Christchurch as I currently find it easier to shop in areas such as Ringwood or Southampton due to the traffic congestion at the Stony Cross roundabout which is only going to get worse. The area being considered for development is a conservation area and is also greenbelt and I feel that the working farm should be left as this is an essential part of village life, there are various brown belt options which need to be considered before the village is turned into an extension of Christchurch.		Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination			298	
654962	Mr Christopher Choape		CSPS917	Policy CN 1	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Policy CN1 involves 'releasing' land from the Green Belt. This is not justified under the National Planning Policy Framework. It further involves removal of allotment land.	To confine strategic housing allocation to land which is not currently designated as Green Belt.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	Because of the large number of representations which I have received from constituents who are outraged at the proposal to remove this valuable Green Belt land.		298	
359461	Mrs Nicola Brunt	Dorset Wildlife Trust	CSPS1313	Policy CN 1		No				No	Dorset Wildlife Trust welcomes the requirement to conserve natural habitats and protected species and creation of a buffer zone along the River Mude (para 6.29, CN1 on site ecology). We also welcome the	We recommend amendment to para 6.29 and policy CN1 to seek positive gains for biodiversity, in line with	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination			298	2256007_0_1.pdf

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>vision to make the River Mude a key green spine through the site that will create an area of biodiversity and recreational value. However, we consider that on a development of this scale biodiversity gains should be expected, especially given its links to the Mude Valley Nature Reserve SNCI (SZ19/39), which comprises semi-natural wet and dry broad-leaved woodland, scrub, semi-improved neutral grassland, ponds and river to the south of the site and also plans for the SANG to link to Burton Common SSSI. This would be in line with NPPF (9, 109, 114, 117, 118). We also consider the policy needs strengthening to ensure there is no harm to the River Mude and the SNCI downstream.</p>	<p>NPPF, and ensure no harm to the River Mude and Mude Valley Nature Reserve SNCI derive from the development. Biodiversity gains should include enhancements to natural habitats and protected species on site, incorporation of biodiversity within and around the development and enhancement/development of local ecological networks. We consider environmental designations should be shown on map 6.1. Please note that the Mude Valley Nature Reserve SNCI is referred to as the Somerford SNCI in the Key Facts in para 6.9 and this requires amendment.</p>				
654660	Ms Anne Mason	Transition Town Christchurch	CSPS946	Policy CN 1		No	No	No	No	No	<p>We are opposed to the loss of farming land and these long-established allotments which provide local food. and could be utilised more fully for that purpose. The new site will take many years if it is even possible, to achieve the productivity of this site.</p>				298	2259130_0_1.pdf
654700	Mr & Mrs F L Crabb		CSPS1115	Policy CN 1							<p>Tinkering with the Christchurch Bypass in no way alleviates Farimile Road and Barrack Road which have to absorb this traffic and that from other development in the pipeline. Also traffic from the gravel extraction and the HGV's which are not allowed through the New Forest.</p>				298	
654704	Mrs J E John		CSPS1053	Policy CN 1							<p>No. No. No! The number of houses on the printed sheets would turn into nearly 1,000 new homes in practice! Planners have done this for decades - it brings in more money for those behind the sale of land, land owners and building firms, so apart from nearby infrastructure, what about that relief road on the drawing board for over 40 years now? We need it now! If these plans go through for such a density of building new homes. At present main roads are so congested already. Sort out the relief road and maybe that number of houses should be considered.</p>				298	
654775	Mr David Monks		CSPS1011	Policy CN 1	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	<p>This is my letter which covers the need for a "Real Christchurch Bye Pass" before many of the proposed plans are implemented. The Planning Policy Team Christchurch Borough Council</p>	<p>See the letter in Q4 above</p>	<p>Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination</p>	<p>There could be information available from previous attempts at providing a viable and effective REAL bye pass for Christchurch</p>	298	2255781_0_1.pdf

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>Civic Offices Bridge Street Christchurch BH23 1BR Dear Sir Transport – in Particular - Roads for Emergency Vehicles, Buses & Private Vehicles. A Gridlocked Town Centre for want of a Real Bye Pass Core Strategy Pre-Submission Document Urban Extension - Additional Housing Core Strategy It is noted that any comments to this pre-submission document must be in by midnight 25th June 2012 and I am endeavouring to comply at this late stage but still find it hard to unveil all the current and archived facts of the case. There are many aspects I have an interest in but I shall restrict my comments to those of most importance to all residents of (and future viability of) Christchurch and the nearby towns that are also affected. Urban Extension - Additional Housing KS3 Says - 3020 new homes will be provided in Christchurch by 2028, including the 90+45 in Burton and 850 at Roeshot Hill. Assume that just for the latter 850 homes, each will have on average 2 cars, that's a further 1700 cars trying to get onto our already very crowded roads plus the extra buses that will be needed. CN1 In mentioning Roeshot Hill, the plan to move the allotments to north of the Railway against the plot holder's wishes is well out of order and Statutory Requirements. KS10 & CH1 Christchurch Town Centre, often Gridlocked for want of a Real Bye Pass Local maps show A35 as a "Christchurch Bye Pass"!! It should be renamed "Somerford Bye Pass" as that is what it is. It must be the only Bye Pass in the world that ends in the middle of an ancient town at the infamous Fountains Roundabout. Let us be honest for once; no amount of money spent on this roundabout can overcome the congestion. Summer warm weather, the air show, other special events, locals from further east are trying in-vain to get to Bournemouth or the airport. Not only from towns as far as Lymington and beyond but even all of London and towns between. Knowing that the spur Road A338 is always busy at these times, people think wrongly that they can miss all that by using the A35 through Christchurch. It is a known fact that there are insufficient and inadequate crossings of the River Avon South of Salisbury. More than 40 years ago plans were made</p>			and I am willing to assist in achiveing an effective plan if mine needs amendment.		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>for a Christchurch Relief Road. It is either cancelled or still pending!!! The only good crossings are the dual carriageways A31 at Ringwood and A35 at Christchurch and yet they cannot cope. The only other (single carriageways) are Avon Causeway and Bridge Street in the town and whereas these are useful, they can only be considered as a joke for moving volume traffic.</p> <p>At times of mass congestion on these roads, for those who live East of the River Avon, Heaven Help anyone who has a heart attack or a house fire, as emergency vehicles cannot get to you in time.</p> <p>BA2 A Real Christchurch Bye Pass</p> <p>Thankfully there is a solution and one that must be put in place ahead of any more housing and certainly long before 2028!! A new road must be built linking A35 (North of the railway and Roeshot Hill) and in an almost straight line to the Hurn village roundabout and on to Bournemouth International Airport. It should start with a two lane large roundabout on A35 in way of the entrance to the existing Pick-Your-Own farm. It should have no further access until the A338 Spur Road and have flyovers for the 3 road crossings including B3347 where it also crosses the River Avon. See the attached map. At Hurn and the adjacent Moors River there should likewise be a flyover and maybe access to the new road. Even without the new road, the Hurn roundabout and Moors River bridge are long overdue for a major widening and upgrade.</p> <p>Note: - Most town Bye Passes have to be of a circuitous nature with many curves. As this road is virtually straight, it is thankfully a very cost effective solution at 5.5 miles long.</p> <p>This scheme is of major importance to the whole of Dorset and Hampshire and that is why I have addressed it not just to Christchurch but also I have copied it to East Dorset & New Forest District Councils and the Dorset County office. I am also copying it to our MP and to the Bournemouth Echo so the local people can know of my suggestion and have their say. I see that in March 2011, they ran an article "Battling for Christchurch bypass plan".</p> <p>Whereas it has great benefit potential for many, I can foresee objections for some, such as the people of Burton/Winkton and Hurn and also the land owners, especially Meyrick Estates.</p> <p>Of further interest, I see that in March 2009 the Echo also did an article "Christchurch residents urged to fight gravel extraction". I am not sure but I guess if this was to go ahead, I expect this would be north of the Railway Line on Meyrick Estate land. I also believe Meyrick own and wish to sell the land of the large field</p>					

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											and the allotment at Roeshot Hill where the urban extension for 850 houses are to be built. Question: - If the gravel extraction scheme where to go ahead, would it be bang in the middle of the new road I am now proposing??? I look forward to your acknowledgment and subsequent reply Yours sincerely Note: - The attached map showing the route of the new bye pass would not copy here but it has been delivered by hand and email					
654814	Mrs Carole Hughes		CSPS974	Policy CN 1	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	I do not want this development because of the following: 1 The infrastructure can not support such a development (A35 already congested, no provision for schools, NHS services etc). 2 The impact on existing communities has not been fully investigated 3 Why build on green belt land - what about brown field sites? There will be no green belt land dividing one village from another - just another unsightly urban sprawl 4 Current proposals to change the road infrastructure are vague eg Staple's Cross (roundabout, right hand turn). If any of these were to happen it would result in more traffic travelling through the village centre. What do you propose to do to manage increased road traffic?	Please respond to the above and be very clear about changes to road systems when they will have an impact on the communities that live in these areas.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		298	
655418	Mrs Katrina Davies		CSPS1016	Policy CN 1							No to this site. There are plenty of brown sites available. This site would stretch the resources of local schools, hospitals etc. Local allotments should not be moved. The increase in traffic would be overwhelming. In fact this site would 'overwhelm' the whole of the local area.				298	
655432	Mr Andy Davies		CSPS1021	Policy CN 1							No to this scheme. No to extra traffic. Ust the brownfield site and reduce the quantity of houses. They are not required. How much just to remove pylons? This would result in increased traffic to the area, increase on schools, hospitals and general resources. Leave this Green Belt. This will not contribute anything. Quite the reverse.				298	
655526	Mr Paul Morrison		CSPS1036	Policy CN 1							No. The problem being that the urge most people have to reproduce themselves will create the need for a further 3000+ homes within 20-25 years. Why bother to move the new allotment site? Just build a new estate now north of the railway. 65% of all housing will not be affordable?				298	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
656746	Mr Barry Olorenshaw	New Forest Business Partnership	CSPS1457	Policy CN 1		No					<p>First of all we should advise you that the New Forest Business Partnership represents a large number of businesses situated within the New Forest District and its primary aim is to support their activities and promulgate the growth of the rural economy. In this context we also work closely with the joint Authorities, the New Forest National Park Authority and the New Forest District Council, whose views on the Joint Core Strategy have been advised to us and with which we are in overall agreement.</p> <p>In specific terms our observations relate to just two of the policies contained in the document viz;</p> <p>1. Policy CN1 – Christchurch Urban Expansion Acknowledging the contents of the A35 Route Management Study allied to the mitigation factors expressed in the Core Strategy itself, it is clear that too little thought has been given to the “rolling impact” of these proposals insofar as they relate to the eastern approaches to Christchurch and the Lyndhurst Road in particular.</p> <p>Frequently – and especially during the summer months – the A35 is operating at full capacity and Lyndhurst itself is regularly gridlocked, all to the detriment of New Forest based businesses (including those in the hotel and leisure sectors).</p> <p>The absence of any defined action plan and detailed, wide-reaching Traffic Impact Assessment which takes into account the effect these proposals will have on traffic movements throughout the New Forest renders this Policy UNSOUND.</p>		Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination		298	
657121	Mr Ash Griffiths		CSPS1451	Policy CN 1		No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Loss of working dairy farm, local jobs. Road infrastructure is inadequate.	Leave at previous site.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		298	
657126	Mr Ryan Hirst		CSPS1420	Policy CN 1		No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	<p>By relocating the allotments to south of the railway line, and increasing the amount to become the 'hub' of Christchurch, will make a working farm unsustainable as this is prime grazing land. It will also interfere with the cattle crossing.</p> <p>The roads and lane surrounding this area cannot cope with increased traffic and even if you do something about the junction at the end of Salisbury Road, Hawthorn Lane / Summers Lane will become dangerous. You cannot expect allotment holders to arrive by bus or bike, it would be more likely vans and trailers!</p> <p>By creating the SANG, this would link Burton to the new houses in Roeshot, which goes against the purpose of Greenbelt to leave a corridor between settlements!</p> <p>This area was also included in the Burton Conservation Area in 2007, where it clearly says that</p>	Leave the allotments where they are and find an alternative space south of the railway line for the SANG.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		298	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											the farm is an important part to keep Burton rural / agricultural.					
657136	Mrs Valerie Fowler		CSPS1398	Policy CN 1	No		No	No	No	No	Increase of traffic Greenbelt land		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		298	
657169	Mrs Jacqueline Bramall		CSPS1370	Policy CN 1		No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	As a resident of Christchurch it is the impact on the traffic that would be the most noticeable. Travelling through Christchurch can at times take over 30 mins, so to add to this would be disastrous.		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		298	
656952	Mrs Tina Esterling		CSPS1690	Policy CN 1		No		Yes			According to page 21 the "development should be located in most accessible locations". The proposed plans for CN1 and CN2 housing and proposed allotments seem not to take into account the surrounding transport access: Salisbury Road, Martins Hill Lane, Hawthorn Road, Summers Lane, as well as access onto Stony Lane. This appears not to be deliverable with no effective, robust and credible evidence base.				298	
507477	Mrs Sally Owen		CSPS1833	Policy CN 1	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	The council also needs to work closely with Hampshire County Council in this regard.	As above.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		298	
523627	David Lowin	WYG Planning & Design	CSPS1581	Policy CN 1							We write concerning your recently published Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy Pre-Submission document. As you are aware, Sainsbury's Supermarkets Ltd are taking an active interest in the formulation of the LDF and accompanying documents. On behalf of our client, we have considered in detail the policies set out in the Core Strategy and wish to make the following representations. Policy CN1 – Christchurch Urban Extension Joint Representations on the Urban Extension and associated policy CN1 have been made separately with developers Taylor Wimpey and Meyrick Estates (landowners) for the area. Sainsbury's Supermarkets Ltd are supportive of the proposed amendment to the Green Belt boundary which would remove land from the Green Belt at Roeshot Hill, enabling the new urban extension to be brought forward. They are also supportive of those elements of the policy which seek to properly integrate the Sainsbury's store into the new centre.				298	
656832	Mr Paul Ramsey		CSPS1866	Policy CN 1	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	This proposal would render the farm unviable. It is in contravention to the Burton Conservation Area Management Plan. The closure of the farm would create additional unemployment! The surrounding roads are unable to accommodate the additional traffic that would be generated.	The document needs to adhere to the Burton Conservation Area Management Plan. This plan was adopted by council and at no point has it been	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	It is an unsound proposal. I wish to ensure that our observations are heard.	298	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
												agreed to ignore this plan.				
656835	Mr Adrian Flower		CSPS1853	Policy CN 1	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Point 4 - allotments. It is quite clear that Summers Lane will not be able to withstand extra traffic. It is a narrow country lane, which will not under any circumstances be made suitable for the increased volume.		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		298	
656838	Ms Jeanette Trudgeon		CSPS1831	Policy CN 1	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	I object to the relocation of the allotments from Roeshot Hill to the land bounded by Summers Lane and Hawthorn Road. This is Green Belt land that is part of the Burton Conservation Area and should remain as farm land to be used by Burton Farm. The roads around the new proposed allotments cannot support the additional traffic that would occur if the allotments were moved. These quiet country lanes that are frequently used by pedestrians and cyclists would become unsafe and the additional traffic would cause congestion around the village of Burton.	The Roeshot Hill allotments should stay where they are and be incorporated within the new urban development. The area lost to build new houses should be added to from Brownfield sites that are currently left redundant within the Christchurch area. If extra allotments are required, spare land should be found nearer to urban communities so people don't have to use their cars to visit them.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		298	
656840	Mr Steven Aries		CSPS1822	Policy CN 1	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	1) Building on Green Belt land is an infringement of National Policy if it is deemed not required which this is. Unoccupied land is available in the area without the need for building a new urbanization. 2) Extra housing if required in the Christchurch area should be built on existing vacant brownfield sites in Christchurch and especially around the Somerford Road area that have no prospect of use for the foreseeable future. This would help regenerate and enhance these areas that are becoming run down and an eye sore. 3) The Roeshot Hill Allotments should not be moved to land north of the railway line. This Green Belt farm land partly falls within the Burton Conservation Area and should remain as agricultural grazing land that is essential for Burton Farm to exist. This totally goes against the Burton Conservation Area policy of 2007 that states the survival of farms should be kept as a reminder of the strong agricultural origins of the area. It would also lead to more people using their cars to visit the allotments, meaning more pollution. The existing roads close to the proposed new allotments are narrow lanes and form part of the National Cycle Network Route 2. These lanes would be unable to support the increase in traffic that would occur and would add safety concerns to families who often use the cycle network route. Extra traffic would increase through Burton village and its surrounding narrow roads, leading to congestion and would move away from the safety setting associated with a village.	1) To remove the proposal of building on Green Belt land and to incorporate any further housing requirements on existing unoccupied Brownfield sites situated in urban areas throughout Christchurch. 2) To remove the proposal of building on Green Belt land and to incorporate any further housing requirements on existing unoccupied Brownfield sites situated in urban areas throughout Christchurch. 3) The allotments should remain at Roeshot Hill where they are close to the urban areas that use them. Any further land required for allotments should be made available from unused land close to urban environments. 4) To integrate new housing into existing urban areas would reduce the extra traffic from the proposed new site onto the A35 and any extra public transport required could easily be added to the existing network. Traffic improvements along the A35 need to be carried out now to remove the bottlenecks and congestion that already exists. We should not be	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		298	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	
											4) The increase of up to 2000 cars from the new urban extension would cause more congestion to existing traffic problems that already occur along the A35. These include the traffic congestion at the Sainsbury's Junction / Somerford Roundabout which is the hub of the new development. Traffic at the Stony Lane Roundabout that is already a bottleneck would increase as the majority of the new residents would commute this way for work during the week and travel to shopping outlets within the Christchurch / Bournemouth area at weekends. This also has a knock on effect to the Fountain Roundabout where congestion can be found here at the same times.	adding to this.					
656847	Mr M,P MacAuley		CSPS1821	Policy CN 1	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Will cause the loss of a working dairy farm and jobs of farm workers. Wil increase traffic in Salisbury Road and Hawthorn Road with more traffic entering and exiting onto by pass at a dangerous junction.	Other sites available that more suitable.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		298		
656848	Mrs Paula Hancock		CSPS1820	Policy CN 1		No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	This is key grazing land for the farm which will be lost. Road can't cope with more traffic.	Leave them at Roeshot.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		298		
656852	Mr Kevin Jones		CSPS1817	Policy CN 1		No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Will loose the working dairy farm. Burton cannot cope with more traffic.	Leave at previous site.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		298		
656853	Mrs Lucy Jackson		CSPS1802	Policy CN 1		No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Loss of farm land and the working of the farm. Additional traffic. Intrusion into conservation area.				298		
656855	Mr Steve Barwood		CSPS1794	Policy CN 1		No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	It is not justified to move the allotments because again: Loss of working farm as prime grazing land, causing unemployment and ruin the character of the village. Traffic congestion - the roads / lanes in and around the village cannot take the increase in traffic, the roads are not suitable and will become dangerous.	Leave them where they are!	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		298		
656867	Mrs Alison Ramsey		CSPS1741	Policy CN 1	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	The relocation of the allotments (and potentially a larger number of allotments) is unjustified because: 1. The core strategy background paper states that the allotments provision should be in a suitable accessible location which can be accessed by a range of transport. This would clearly not be the case as by the nature of allotment holders, they would require cars / trailers etc and could not be expected to arrive on a bus, bike or on foot! This would then contradict your 'objective 3 to adapt to the challenges of climate change'. On the allotments website, they consider that during the growing year a great deal more than 10% of tenants are present at one time and that your proposal ignores the logistics of modern allotment gardening. The increase in traffic therefore on Salisbury Road /	Leave allotments where they are!	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	This proposal is both unsound and unjustified and I would therefore wish to participate in the oral part of the examination to ensure all objections are considered satisfactorily.	298		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											Hawthorn and Summers Lane is neither practical or safe and lanes cannot be improved to accommodate this. 2. This would cause the working farm to become unsustainable - this is prime grazing land and would cause the farm to close. In the Burton Conservation Area Management Plan, which is used for planning purposes states 'Burton Farm - a number of unlisted buildings making an important contribution to the character of the conservation area. Is a working farm with a cow herd crossing the Salisbury Road for milking. Adds a genuine sense of rural community on the edge of an urban sprawl. Views of a very open agricultural landscape.' I do not think this requires further explanation as clearly goes against your own Management Plan! The closure of the farm would also cause unemployment and re-homing of farm workers!					
656947	Mrs Gillian Macauley		CSPS1712	Policy CN 1	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	There would be additional traffic in surrounding area i.e. Summers Lane, Salisbury Road, Hawthorn Road, all entering and leaving at the already dangerous A35 by pass. May cause the Burton Farm to fail causing a loss of local business and job losses.	Find and use more accessible sites away from main roads and local housing.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		298	
657057	Mrs C Moss		CSPS1901	Policy CN 1							Without a proper relief road and all services improved this will only congest Christchurch totally.				298	
657059	Mr and Mrs T R Beaumont		CSPS1888	Policy CN 1							Does not meet the tests of soundness. No credible evidence justifying 850 houses (2,000 plus people) in a single development extending beyond the Green Belt boundary. 298 (35%) affordable homes on a single site is not appropriate, these dwellings need to be built on multiple brown field sites across the Borough for the inhabitants to be integrated into the community. Supporting infrastructure and transport requirements are not deliverable. Negative affects on both the centre of Christchurch and across the Borough require specific local population approval to be consistent with national policy, including this major Urban Extension as a "fait accompli" in the Core Strategy incorrectly presumes that approval has been obtained.				298	
359492	Mr Stuart Jarvis	Hampshire County Council	CSPS2034	Policy CN 1	Yes	No		Yes	Yes		Hampshire County Council (HCC) welcomes the commitment by CBC & EDDC to work with the Mineral Authorities regarding the delivery of minerals development. As a neighbouring Minerals Authority, HCC notes that the emerging Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan (HMWP) includes an allocation for the extraction of 3.0 mt of sharp sand and gravel at Roeshot. It is therefore important that the emerging HMWP	The following text should be added to Policy CN1: Mineral Resources The potential for prior extraction of sand and gravel at this site before development, and compatible workings of minerals sites across the county boundary	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		298	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											allocation is taken into account when considering the timing and delivery of the SANG and Christchurch Urban Extension. This is particularly important as the identified SANG lies on land identified in the emerging Dorset County Council Minerals Sites Allocations DPD for potential extraction of sharp sand and gravel. It has previously discussed that if the cross boundary allocations were to gain planning permission that working would take place, in a phased manner across the county boundary.	in Hampshire, will be considered.				
359824	Mrs Carol Hellicar		CSPS2087	Policy CN 1							1. Anti loss of Green Belt. Too many dwellings (rabbit hutches)! 4. These should be left where they are! What about additional travelling here? 2. Make sure they are for Christchurch families not outsiders second homes. 5. Wont be able to get to it! Unwanted urban sprawl. Make better use of brown sites. Bring dwellings back to empty shops in High Street.				298	
612430	Mr Nick Squirrell	Natural England, Dorset and Somerset Team	CSPS1913	Policy CN 1	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	Policies; CN 1, CN 2, CN 3, WMC 3, WMC 4, WMC 5, WMC 6, FWP 3, FWP 4, FWP 6, FWP 7, FWP 8, VTSW 2, VTSW3, VTSW 4, VTSW 8 etc are all proposing development and or mitigation in the form of SANGs on greenfield locations. In order to avoid a conflict with policy ME1 at a later stage in the planning process Natural England advise the authorities to bring to the attention of those with an interest in these locations the need to carry out a basic biodiversity survey eg Phase 1 habitat survey including assessment of the likely presence or evidence of other features likely to restrict or delay development eg badger setts, priority species such as reptiles, water voles etc in time for consideration at the EIP. In many cases this will simply be a statement as the proposer has already engaged an ecological advisor. These policies appear to have been brought forward in an absence of adequate information and assessment on the biodiversity features held by the policy land. There is reason to suspect that on some there may be a significant biodiversity interest owing to close proximity with designated sites and or other biodiversity sites. The NPPF requires that planning policies should be based on up-to date information on the natural environment (paragraph 165). These policies are not shown to be compliant with this requirement. Thus, irrespective of the above matters concerning other nearby designated sites, it is not possible to identify whether the policies are compliant with policy considerations in the NPPF on sustainable development for the sites alone, especially the aspect	The policies may need to include specific paragraphs about features of biodiversity importance which are to be secured or enhanced. Natural England have raised a number of considerations, however we consider that the incorporation of modifications may best be achieved through discussion with the LPA.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	Natural England may wish to provide specific advice to the Inspector regarding the effects of the wording on European and internationally designated sites.	298	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>on sustainable development set out in paragraph 9 of moving from a net loss of biodiversity to achieving net gains (for example on priority habitats and species). Policy CN1 deals with a proposed urban extension. However this substantial extension requires appropriate mitigation to avoid harm to both designated European heathlands in Dorset and Hampshire.</p> <p>Natural England have been extensively involved in negotiating a package of measures including a SANGs site. This is alluded to in the policy and supporting text. However the key details of this proposal are not available for consideration or assessment even at a high level as is the case elsewhere in the Core Strategy. Natural England objects to the policy. The SANGs site lies within the same land holding but outwith the Boroughs boundary in Hampshire. At this time there is no firm or outline proposal for consideration nor a clear mechanism whereby the measures can be secured with the certainty required by the Habitats Regulations.</p> <p>Planning Authorities have a duty to co-operate with adjoining authorities and are required to demonstrate that they are working together. No evidence is available that the New Forest DC or New Forest National Park Authority are in agreement with this provision. The SANGs location is also substantially zoned as a Minerals site in the Hampshire Minerals Plan which would prevent the development from being brought forward. Paragraph 6.49 indicates some discussion but little evidence of a joint formal commitment about delivery. These factors create considerable uncertainty that this key element of the Core Strategy may be considered sound or legally compliant.</p> <p>Natural England advice that the policy should be reworded to reflect the SANG criteria (ref ME3) put forward in the Dorset Heathlands SPD recently and approved by several authorities.</p> <p>The policy should reflect government policy to secure biodiversity gains (NPPF para 9) with specific enhancement requirement for any applicant. Natural England support the Dorset Wildlife Trust proposals on this matter in relation to text and map modifications.</p>					
657039	Mrs Pat Brookes		CSPS2104	Policy CN 1							Are there any schools forecast for the 850 proposed dwellings.				298	
657048	Mr Ian David Kirchin		CSPS2068	Policy CN 1							Around 550 homes for sale on the open market, no doubt the majority of which will be bought by people from outside of the area. Where are the jobs for these people? Where are the school places for their children? What about the additional strain on public				298	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											services and road infrastructure? The last thing Christchurch needs is another significant increase in population. What possible justification is there for these proposals? Leave our greenbelt alone!					
657052	Mrs Carol Cofhay		CSPS1951	Policy CN 1							I object to Policy CN1 because it will reduce green belt land and housing need should not be more important than space between settlements. Development at Roeshot Hill would increase the amount of traffic coming onto an already congested A35.				298	
657055	Mr and Mrs Gavin and Daf Kewley		CSPS1917	Policy CN 1							Appears an appropriate strategy, although its loss of open space will alter the aspect north of the by-pass. The potential to re-inforce the Highcliffe / Grange schools social divide must be monitored / planned against. Affordable housing should be spread throughout the development not concentrated at the western end. It is essential to maintain provision for bicycle and horse riders who use Ambury Lane to access Burton Common.				298	
657124	Mrs Isabell Quibell		CSPS2171	Policy CN 1							No, No, No, a thousand times no to building on Burtons Green Belt land. Reasons to be uncheerful. 1) Roads not suitable:- Stony Lane roundabout a joke, mornings chaotic from 7am onwards, school run disasterous, A31 accident diversions all come along Stony Lane. 2) Schools:- Burton Primary not up to Offstead standard, Grange Acadamy will not be able to cope. 3) No decent walking pavements: no street lighting 4) Not enough doctors and practice nurses 5) Hourly bus service ???? There are many more reasons why Burton is not suitable, for additional housing, councillors come and stay awhile.				298	
655852	Mr Mark Ambler	Yellow Buses	CSPS2268	Policy CN 1	Yes	No			Yes		Insufficient emphasis and detail on developing and supporting public bus transport network improvements and infrastructure within the core strategy itself.	Due consideration and detail on supporting and improving passenger transport needs to be demonstrated in regards to Policy CN 1 which sets out the strategy for the Christchurch Urban Extension. Bus priority measures should be considered at both the site accesses and nearby junctions and where appropriate segregated bus lanes along the main link roads in the vicinity of the sites. It is imperative that the	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination	298		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
												<p>internal link roads can safely accommodate bus traffic, bus stops and passenger waiting facilities whist offering safe pedestrian integration. The core strategy should give due consideration to financially supporting bus services to the urban extension development site, to positively encourage use of public transport and reducing reliance on private transport. Improvements will also need to be made to bus stop and passenger waiting facilities nearby and inside the development site along with suitable and safe areas for buses to enter and exit and where necessary lay-over. More emphasis should be given within the core strategy to the Local Authorities and Developers working in partnership with local passenger transport providers to achieve a sustainable and accessible bus network and bus passenger facilities for the development.</p>				
656857	Mr Stephen Perry		CSPS2215	Policy CN 1			Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	<p>The allotment provision identified in CN1 east of Salisbury Road is entirely out of scale with the area. It jeopardises the future of the farm and therefore is at odds with the Conservation Area. The additional traffic generated by a borough-wide "hub-site" could not be accommodated on village roads. It is not justified because it is not the most appropriate strategy when considered against reasonable alternatives. It is neither effective nor is it consistent with government policy due to its impact on a Conservation Area with increasing traffic and the loss of farm land.</p>	<p>The allotments should be preserved in their present location.</p>	<p>Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination</p>	<p>Beacuse I wish to further substantiate my response and to seek transparency in this process.</p>	298	
656228	Mr Adrian Dwyer		CSPS2477	Policy CN 1							<p>No. 1. With an unprecedented number of houses remaining unsold, there is ample evidence of lack of demand. 2. This is unsound because it has not considered brownfield development. 3. This is unsound because it has not considered the</p>				298	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											impact of reduced GDV as a result of 1:1 social housing planning policy.					
656568	Mrs Barbara Wilcox		CSPS2462	Policy CN 1							No because there will be too much traffic on not enough road! The proposed housing development is on Green Belt land when there are ample brownfield sites nearby. The proposed relocation of the allotments will impinge on Green Belt land and Burton Conservation area.				298	
656650	Mrs Patricia Fear		CSPS2442	Policy CN 1							No. Because this will destroy Burton Village. It gets flooded and there is a big traffic problem. Traffic going onto the bypass is dangerous and onto Burton and Roeshot Hill Rd. I grew up in Somerford and used to play on the field at River Mude and pick blackberries along Watery Lane, and took my own children there and hoped to take my grandchildren, but you want to build on this lovely part of Christchurch. Also this is green belt land, so this is a crime. Also Somerford and Highclife and Burton schools are full, so where will the children go to school?				298	
656653	Mrs Anne Archer		CSPS2448	Policy CN 1							No. The site for housing and relocation of the allotmentes is on Green Belt land and adjacent to the Burton Conservation area. The lanes around Burton are nowhere near big enough to cope with the increase in traffic. Alternative brownfield sites (eg Somerford Road) should be filled before even considering Green Belt land for housing. Allotments should not be moved when people have committed so much time and energy on them.				298	
656664	Mr Glen Morrison		CSPS2457	Policy CN 1							The intended development of 850 new homes will no doubt stretch Chrischurch town's infrastructure as already mentioned in KS3. 1. Key concerns building on Green Belt 2 Roeshot Hill allotments relocation to land north of the Railway, the question needs to be asked is this location accessible for those allotment users who are mainly elderly and live close by the current site? 3 Pollution to the River Mude and the ill effects on the surrounding Green Belt all need to be added to this focus as key factors needing addressing.				298	
510796	Mr Rollo Reid		CSPS2717	Policy CN 1							No. It will only add to already really bad traffic problems. There is no crying need for houses in Christchurch. There are hundreds for sale, some for a long time. There is plenty of brownfield and infill available. Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option relating the North				298	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option.					
654854	Mrs Jeannie Seymour		CSPS2872	Policy CN 1							No. The burden of such a large development could not be met by the services and road networks. To lose Green Belt land is sacrilege to the town which is in danger of losing its appeal to tourists and residents alike.				298	
655432	Mr Andy Davies		CSPS2724	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).				298	
656121	Mrs Lynn Harris		CSPS2881	Policy CN 1							I wish to object to the following proposed development for the following reasons. a) The traffic on the by-pass at certain times of the day is nose to tail as it is and during holiday times is even worse. The roundabout at Stoney Lane causes everyone problems. Having navigating these areas Fountains roundabout awaits. Having arrived in Christchurch it becomes even more difficult to leave. The obvious answer don't put more cars on the road. b) Christchurch will become part of a Bournemouth conurbation with even more pressure on hospitals etc. c) I am an allotment holder and would therefore have to leave my plot. The allotments are vital to those who work at them. For those who are retired they give them a purpose. Healthwise there is fresh air and relief of stress. There a quite a few single women who have allotments, they feel quite safe at Roeshall Hall if we are moved to Burton how will these people get to the new site Stoney Lane roundabout no doubt. It will be even more difficult for those who have bicycles. We all need open spaces.				298	
656126	Mr Rodney Burton		CSPS2886	Policy CN 1							I am writing to object to the CN1/CN2 proposed planning development in my village of Burton. It is not justified because using Green belt land – even for affordable housing is totally unacceptable. Burton				298	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	
											already has a number of affordable type houses in the village. How will Burton cope with the extra traffic which will be caused by these developments? Martin's Hill Lane is only a narrow road and merges onto an already over loaded road (Stoney Lane). I do not feel this scheme is justified.						
656167	Mr Mark Browne		CSPS2876	Policy CN 1							I was upset and astonished to discover that there are proposals to build on the allotments. The allotments are amongst the highest places in Christchurch for wildlife and the environment. Plus it supplies healthy fruit and vegetables and relaxation to hundreds of people. It is of great benefit to well being of the community. If the allotments were destroyed it would greatly harm my life. Due to my mental health illnesses my allotment is the only place I can go to relax and be able to sleep as I have chronic fatigue syndrome. My G.P. and counsellor would confirm this. Also the nutritional benefits are vital to me. I would have to be physically evicted. There are many places in the far more satisfactory to build on. Please inform me of the costs or profit to the council and who financially benefits if the allotments were destroyed. I beg you never to build on the Roeshot Hill Allotments. Indeed, more space should be allocated in the area for highly sought after allotments. This would improve the environment, increase wildlife and benefit the health of the community.					298	
656369	Mr Timothy Peter Cook	John Reid and Sons (Strucsteel) Ltd	CSPS2764	Policy CN 1							No, this is not a sound plan at all. Area is already congested. Further development will make problem worse, block up the roads, overflow limited parking, cause even more traffic jams. Completely unacceptable.					298	
656426	Mrs Pauline Pritchard		CSPS2725	Policy CN 1							This extension is vast and would cause complete chaos on the surrounding roads if they are not developed first. This must not become part of the village of Burton - as it would lose its village status. Flooding - would most likely be an issue. Allotments would increase traffic along country lanes. More pollution and carbon footprint.					298	
656527	Ms Nicole Cox		CSPS2809	Policy CN 1							As per previous option. Retain the allotments, Fewer houses. More flats.					298	
656529	T Pratt		CSPS2816	Policy CN 1							Retain allotments. Do not spoil our Green Belt.					298	
656534	Mr		CSPS2820	Policy							This does not make sense. Keep allotmentes. Keep					298	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
	Rob Warn			CN 1							Green Belt.					
656536	Ms Wendy Voller		CSPS2827	Policy CN 1							Stop ruining the Green Belt. No justification. Keep allotments.				298	
656542	Mrs Deidre Harding		CSPS2841	Policy CN 1							No. Erosion of Green Belt is direct erosion of national policy. Transport and roads and services cannot sustain all extra loads put upon them. Allotments to Burton - will create chaos.				298	
656567	Mr Michael D Chappell		CSPS2860	Policy CN 1							No. Green Belt should not be used, especially when brownfield sites are available.				298	
656680	Mr N J Power		CSPS2660	Policy CN 1							<p>I am writing to object to Christchurch and East Dorset Pre-Submission Core Strategy Document Policy CN1. I am not convinced that the part of the Core Strategy dealing with the Roeshot Hill allotment site has a 'robust and credible evidence base'.</p> <p>It seems contradictory that the plan to provide affordable housing goes on to describe 60% as low density, therefore likely to attract wealthy outsider to our already overcrowded infrastructure.</p> <p>I think there is questionable justification for this because local council figures show that the allotments could be kept on the current site, and affordable homes built, as the area of land designated for low density (more expensive) housing is greater than the area of the Roeshot Hill site.</p> <p>At the moment, there is access from the allotment site to the A35. This is frequently difficult to negotiate due to the high and increasing volumes of traffic on the A35. The Strategy Document does not seem to take account of the increased volume of traffic from the many hundreds of houses on the Housing Development, which would significantly impact the pressure of traffic on the A35.</p> <p>Moving the allotments to Burton will not enhance the village and will put increased strain on the already busy local village roads. We already face disruption to village life from gravel extraction plans so this does not look like sustainable development.</p> <p>For these reasons I don't feel the plan is effective, justified or positively prepared.</p>				298	
359478	Mr Rohan Torkildsen	English Heritage	CSPS2736	Policy CN 1							Noted				298	
359593	S Thick		CSPS3042	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points:				298	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).					
360066	Mrs D A Hopkins		CSPS2731	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).				298	
480260	Mr Philip Glover		CSPS3029	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).				298	
660326	Mr P Diment		CSPS2721	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).				298	
660342	A Razzell		CSPS2728	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; 				298	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).					
660347	T J Tippings		CSPS2729	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).				298	
660351	G Cater		CSPS2730	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).				298	
660357	C Hopkins		CSPS2733	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).				298	
660362	Carol Maloney		CSPS2735	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; 				298	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).					
660367	M A Brinkman		CSPS2744	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).				298	
660377	M Chisnall		CSPS2748	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).				298	
660379	Mr W G Cussen		CSPS2750	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).				298	
660408	Mr J Head		CSPS2759	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield 				298	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).					
660415	T Player		CSPS2762	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).				298	
660419	P E Minns		CSPS2765	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).				298	
660428	E Nicklin		CSPS2773	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).				298	
660434	Mr D Reid		CSPS2775	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. 				298	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).					
660439	Mr Morrison		CSPS2778	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).				298	
660441	Ms Pendlebury		CSPS2780	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).				298	
660447	Mr Neil King		CSPS2788	Policy CN 1							I would like to register my objection to any further destruction of the Green Belt in this area. We are constantly being bombarded with need to be green and the expected rise in sea levels flooding large areas of the planet. If this is the case, bearing in mind this country is not self sufficient in food, it begs the question why are we building on arable land when every square foot may be required for food production in the very near future. There are several fairly large brown field sites in the area which could be used, rather than anymore supermarkets. Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).				298	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
660451	Mr and Mrs R Simmonds		CSPS2796	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).				298	
660452	J Bennett		CSPS2800	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).				298	
660456	R Cooke		CSPS2803	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).				298	
660459	D R Munson		CSPS2805	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).				298	
660468	D Westerman		CSPS2808	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by				298	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).					
660474	C M Judge		CSPS2813	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).				298	
660478	P Rogers		CSPS2815	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).				298	
660483	Mr Emerton		CSPS2819	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).				298	
660487	Mr Martineau		CSPS2825	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage				298	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).					
660491	A M Churchill		CSPS2829	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).				298	
660496	D J Sweet		CSPS2832	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).				298	
660506	Mrs Mavis Burton		CSPS2836	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).				298	
660530	Mr D Kerridge		CSPS2870	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant.				298	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).					
660534	Mr G Sharkey		CSPS2875	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).				298	
660539	R Shelton		CSPS2879	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).				298	
660545	S Peck		CSPS2884	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).				298	
661207	C C Crowe		CSPS3022	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the				298	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	
											<p>North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. <p>The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).</p>						
656225	Mrs L.M Collins		CSPS3224	Policy CN 1							<p>The purpose of this letter is to voice my objection to the document referred to as the Christchurch & East Dorset Pre-submission core strategy policy, which proposes development of greenbelt farm land within the boundaries of Burton and surrounding areas. Policies CN1 and CN2 both propose development of a large area of greenbelt which if approved will change Burton from a semi rural village with a working farm into an urban sprawl with a lost identity. The proposed CN2 policy also encroaches on the boundaries of the Salisbury Road conservation area. The following statement is taken from the Salisbury Road Conservation Area Document 5.50.1. it states "Infilling or other further intensification of the housing within Burton would continue to erode the basic village character of the settlement to the general detriment of the existing residential amenity."</p> <p>As a resident of Burton for over thirty years, it concerns me that the proposed development of CN2. Land South of Burton Village if approved will partially be built on land subject to flooding. Moreover it will encourage and justify further planning and development proposals which will in time inevitably swallow up most of the green belt which separates Burton from Christchurch.</p> <p>A combined housing development on such a scale will no doubt cause a significant increase in traffic and amplify the strain on the already severely gridlocked congested infrastructure of the Christchurch area. It will increase greatly the strain on the current sewage works at Stony Lane and depending on the demographics of the population moving into the area, place added pressure on local schools hospitals and may increase unemployment.</p> <p>The proposed CN1 relocation of the Roeshot Hill allotments to the area East of Salisbury Road and South of Summers Lane along with the proposed threat of gravel extraction from Hawthorn Road to Burton Common will also further add to increased traffic throughout Burton, in particular the Staplecross area. At present Ambury Lane provides horse riders, dog walkers, ramblers, and bike riders' etc relatively safe traffic free access to Burton Common. Should</p>					298	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>permission for gravel extraction be granted Ambury Lane will become a busy access road for heavy large lorries. The largest impact of the proposed housing developments, allotments and gravel extraction site will undoubtedly be to the existing farm and its financial viability. Should the farm loose the acreage to the proposed CN1 and CN2 development of green belt, it will result in loss of jobs, in particular the livelihood of the Farwell family who have farmed the land and been a part of the Burton village community for over a 100 years.</p> <p>I therefore strongly object to both CN1 and CN2 proposals for the development of Burton and surrounding area.</p> <p>Please acknowledge receipt of this objection and keep me informed of any further development concerning this matter.</p>					
656498	Mr Matthew Morris	GVA Planning Development	CSPS2911	Policy CN 1	Yes	No				No	<p>Policy CN1 outlines a proposed urban extension in the northern part of Christchurch. Whilst the Co-op does not object to aspiration for limited local retail and service facilities to serve the expanding population in this area, it does object to the Sainsburys store forming part of the planned Local Centre and also the lack of clear guidance on the amount of retail floorspace which should be provided.</p> <p>Allowing the Sainsburys store to form part of a new Local Centre would remove any existing controls over what is a large stand alone out of centre supermarket. It would also lead to the potential for significant adverse impacts should the store wish to grow and expand in the future. Whilst we are sure that there is a good intention to see a new focus for appropriate local facilities in this area, a serious unintended consequence of allowing the Sainsburys store to form part of the centre will compromise the ability of the Council to maintain and enhance the health of Christchurch town centre and other defined centres in the local area.</p>		Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	Given the detailed nature of the Co-op's representations ans the need to interrogate the Council's evidence base.	298	
660551	Mr Thomas Eddicott		CSPS2892	Policy CN 1							<p>Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. <p>The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).</p>				298	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
661210	Mr Philip Ball		CSPS3023	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).				298	
661214	I Randall		CSPS3024	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).				298	
661216	Mrs A Differ		CSPS3025	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).				298	
661221	Mrs D Canning		CSPS3026	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).				298	
661224	Mr & Mrs E		CSPS3027	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by				298	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
	Dinmore										Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).					
661227	Wilkinson		CSPS3028	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).				298	
661231	Mrs F Glover		CSPS3030	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).				298	
661235	Paul Williams		CSPS3031	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).				298	
661238	H Faint		CSPS3033	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage				298	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. <p>The respondent has indicated support for this option (5). "proposed" development of 650 houses from Stony Lane to Sainsbury's Roeshot Hill. Why are you asking for any objections to above proposal, as you have already built a pedestrian bridge across the Christchurch flypast (A35) which can only be for access from the proposed development to the junior and senior schools south of the A35 it seems to me the decision has already been made to proceed with this development! Therefore any pretence at a consultation exercise is a waste of ratepayers money! I will be interested to hear your reasons for the building of this bridge together with cost of same.</p>					
661244	M Wheeler		CSPS3036	Policy CN 1							<p>Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. <p>The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).</p>				298	
661247	M Bateman		CSPS3037	Policy CN 1							<p>Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. <p>The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).</p>				298	
661250	Mr Moffatt		CSPS3038	Policy CN 1							<p>Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant.</p>				298	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).					
661256	B Wilson		CSPS3039	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).				298	
661263	Mr Harris		CSPS3040	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).				298	
661265	D Mulcock		CSPS3041	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).				298	
661274	S J Keetley		CSPS3043	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the				298	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).					
661279	Mr & Mrs Tasker		CSPS3044	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).				298	
661281	M D Macted		CSPS3060	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).				298	
661288	S J Cabezas		CSPS3046	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5). I would suggest that the Beagle site in Stony Lane would be a good place to build affordable housing. We do not need anohter supermarket.				298	
661291	Mr Hilton		CSPS3047	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage				298	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).					
661296	M Blinman		CSPS3048	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5). We need to preserve all greenbelt land. Stop looking for instant fixes and use the resources we already have available.				298	
661299	D M Barnett		CSPS3049	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).				298	
661300	Mr Collier		CSPS3050	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).				298	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
661302	D J Bobbitt		CSPS3051	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).				298	
661306	M Foden		CSPS3052	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).				298	
661309	M Allen		CSPS3053	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).				298	
661312	Mr Ryder		CSPS3054	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).				298	
661313	R Foden		CSPS3055	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by				298	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5). Roads already head to tail traffic jams all around Christchurch.					
661316	Mrs W H Owen		CSPS3056	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).				298	
661325	Mrs P Foden		CSPS3058	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).				298	
661331	R M Brown		CSPS3059	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).				298	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
661341	C G Prude		CSPS3061	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).				298	
661343	J Sizeland		CSPS3063	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).				298	
661344	A Randall		CSPS3062	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).				298	
661345	J Littlefair		CSPS3064	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).				298	
661353	V J Barrell		CSPS3065	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by				298	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).					
661355	June and Julian Angell		CSPS3066	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).				298	
661362	D Littleam		CSPS3067	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).				298	
661363	B Wilson		CSPS3068	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).				298	
661366	J Patterson		CSPS3069	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage				298	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).					
661368	A Malon		CSPS3070	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).				298	
661392	Mr W M Owen		CSPS3072	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).				298	
661415	Mr Owen		CSPS3075	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).				298	
661421	Richard Allen		CSPS3076	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant.				298	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).					
661429	Mr D Maxfield		CSPS3077	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).				298	
661431	Mrs J Jerrom		CSPS3078	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).				298	
661437	Mr & Mrs J Harris		CSPS3079	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).				298	
661438	Mr & Mrs P F Rumbles		CSPS3080	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the				298	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).					
661440	G Wallis		CSPS3081	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).				298	
661442	D Hayes		CSPS3082	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).				298	
661443	Mr and Mrs Bailey		CSPS3083	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).				298	
661444	E Armstrong		CSPS3084	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the				298	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											following points: • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).					
661445	Ms J Jepson		CSPS3085	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).				298	
661446	M King		CSPS3086	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5). We cannot afford to lose any more Green Belt land. As world population is growing we will need to be efficient in future in food production, and once land is built on its gone forever. There are plenty of sites in the area, left to fall into disrepair and a real eyesore, use these for homes and not our precious Green Belt land. What will my grandchildren inherit??				298	
661447	C J Astin		CSPS3087	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).				298	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
661450	M Field		CSPS3088	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).				298	
661453	S Owers		CSPS3089	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).				298	
661454	Theobald		CSPS3090	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).				298	
661455	S Robinson		CSPS3091	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).				298	
661456	D M Potter		CSPS3092	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by				298	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).					
661459	Mrs D Rose		CSPS3093	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).				298	
661463	J M Pink		CSPS3094	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).				298	
661464	Mr A Soanes		CSPS3095	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).				298	
661467	P MacGregor		CSPS3096	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage				298	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).					
661476	Mr & Mrs C Duncan		CSPS3097	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).				298	
661479	L R Wager		CSPS3098	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).				298	
661480	Mr McDowell		CSPS3099	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).				298	
661482	Ms J Green		CSPS3100	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant.				298	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).					
661485	Mr Jim Maloney		CSPS3101	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).				298	
661490	M Smith		CSPS3102	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).				298	
661492	Mr C Saunders		CSPS3103	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).				298	
661497	R Harrison		CSPS3104	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the				298	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).					
661505	Mrs Ann Hills		CSPS3105	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).				298	
661506	J Sinden		CSPS3106	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).				298	
661507	Dr D Cummins		CSPS3107	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).				298	
661508	M Barrett		CSPS3108	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the				298	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											following points: • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).					
661511	D Bevis		CSPS3109	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).				298	
661519	Ms R A Hazell		CSPS3110	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).				298	
661520	G Richards		CSPS3111	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).				298	
661521	Mrs N Coss		CSPS3112	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points:				298	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).					
661523	A G Caswell		CSPS3113	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).				298	
661526	Mr P McDermott		CSPS3114	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).				298	
661528	J Magnus		CSPS3115	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).				298	
661532	Mr and Mrs A Hann		CSPS3116	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; 				298	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).					
661534	P Sirmway		CSPS3117	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).				298	
661535	Mr & Mrs J A Collins		CSPS3118	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).				298	
661537	Mr J Maxted		CSPS3119	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5). Mr				298	
661546	Mr D Bobbitt		CSPS3120	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; 				298	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).					
661549	RW and JA Scurry		CSPS3121	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).				298	
661550	Mr W Forsyth		CSPS3122	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).				298	
661552	J Brown		CSPS3123	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).				298	
661649	Ms Iris Mansell		CSPS3124	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; 				298	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).					
661659	S A Tippings		CSPS3125	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).				298	
661661	A Gaffney-Dodds		CSPS3126	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).				298	
661664	K A Giddins		CSPS3127	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).				298	
360099	Mr John Foskett		CSPS3344	Policy CN 1							Having just given up my allotment at Roeshot Hill you might say I am biased as the alternative location is completely unacceptable. I doubt whether all the objectives will be realised, namely 35% affordable; open spaces – how will they be financed and managed (Mudeford Wood). Transport improvements will not be satisfied with the plans as shown - there will be chaos around Sainsburys and up Roeshot Hill. Only one access point				298	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											to this 'estate' is ridiculous. Roundabout requested here (see circle on Masterplan map on leaflet - east of Stewarts Garden centre) No access to A35 here (see circle on Masterplan map on leaflet - along Lyndhurst Road east of Stewarts garden centre to edge of site) road or footpath. Far too dangerous.					
661671	S Knight		CSPS3128	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).				298	
661672	Mr Patrick Scanlan		CSPS3130	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).				298	
661674	Mr Alan Jerrom		CSPS3131	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).				298	
661675	Mr P.F Chopin		CSPS3132	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points:				298	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. <p>The respondent has indicated support for this option (5). I am writing to you to lodge my very strong objection to the above-mentioned proposed scheme. Quite frankly, with all the cuts in budgets, lack of jobs, and considering the local infra-structure, we will NEVER be able to cope with the influx of more people. A friend of mine recently tried to get his son in to a local school in Highcliffe, but they were over subscribed and has now had to make do with a school in New Milton. When are these developers ever going to stop wanting to make a fast buck? The medical centres in Mundeford, Christchurch and Highcliffe are always packed with patients waiting to see doctors. How on earth are these going to cope with an additional even just 500/600 proposed dwellings which would equate to a minimum of another 1,500 people not including children???</p> <p>I would like to lodge my very strong objection to the proposed development of our beautiful urban green fields in the strongest possible terms. If a development must take place, then let it be towards Barton-On-Sea – Southampton areas instead.</p>					
661676	T Linnington		CSPS3133	Policy CN 1							<p>Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. <p>The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).</p>				298	
661679	N Webster		CSPS3134	Policy CN 1							<p>Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. <p>The respondent has indicated support for this option</p>				298	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											(5).					
661681	J Thomas		CSPS3135	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).				298	
661683	G Garner		CSPS3136	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).				298	
661684	E Merrick		CSPS3137	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).				298	
661700	J Lee		CSPS3138	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).				298	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
661702	H Skerratt		CSPS3139	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).				298	
661706	G Blackburn		CSPS3140	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).				298	
661707	V Kent		CSPS3141	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).				298	
661718	J Hathaway		CSPS3142	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).				298	
661720	B Hathaway		CSPS3143	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by				298	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).					
661726	T Ward		CSPS3144	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).				298	
661732	Mr Alan Gray		CSPS3146	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).				298	
661737	Ms Beryl Woodley		CSPS3147	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).				298	
661743	Mr H Hammers		CSPS3148	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage				298	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).					
661749	Mr Tim Green		CSPS3149	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).				298	
661751	Miss C Roderick		CSPS3150	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).				298	
661755	Mr John Dendy		CSPS3151	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).				298	
661761	M Hathaway		CSPS3152	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant.				298	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).					
661763	J D Hathaway		CSPS3153	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).				298	
661767	Mrs H Hallett		CSPS3154	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).				298	
661769	L Redgrave		CSPS3155	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).				298	
661772	H G Swann		CSPS3156	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the				298	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5). NO "TRAVELLERS"					
661773	N and P Street and May		CSPS3157	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).				298	
661777	Ms Janet Jordan		CSPS3158	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).				298	
661787	Mr Delves		CSPS3160	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).				298	
661791	Mr J Hale		CSPS3162	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the				298	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).					
661797	Mr Kevin Dapp		CSPS3163	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).				298	
661798	M O'Callaghan		CSPS3164	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).				298	
661800	Mr T M Hills		CSPS3166	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).				298	
661802	R Scott		CSPS3167	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the				298	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											following points: • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).					
662055	H Butcher		CSPS3187	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option.				298	
662060	Mr A M Ashby		CSPS3189	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option.				298	
662063	K J Dixon		CSPS3191	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option.				298	
662067	Mrs J Saunders		CSPS3193	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield				298	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option.					
662075	M Wilkinson		CSPS3194	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option.				298	
662084	Mr John Challener		CSPS3199	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option.				298	
662089	J Prater		CSPS3202	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option.				298	
662295	Mr Luther Collins		CSPS3232	Policy CN 1							I would like to register my complete objection to various items within the Christchurch & East Dorset Pre-Submission Core Strategy Policy. I have lived in the village of Burton since I was born in 1983, in which time it has always been a charming and pleasant place. I have seen many changes to the village in my lifetime but I believe that these latest proposals are a step too far. I feel the village will lose all character and be in danger of becoming lost to aggressive urban development. Policy CN1: North Christchurch Urban Extension Strategic Allocation. This policy is not consistent with national planning policy framework, is not positively prepared and cannot				298	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>be justified or effective for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. The land is greenbelt and must remain so. ii. Such a large loss of farm pastures will most probably make the farm unworkable. This will cause a loss of jobs on the farm which has been worked by the Farwell family for many many years. Growing up the farm always had a vital role to play in the village community and I believe it should continue to do so. iii. The relocation of the Roeshot Hill allotments to the area to the East of Salisbury Road and South of Summers Lane will cause increased traffic congestion in Salisbury Road and Martins Hill Lane and further congestion at the Stony Lane and Fountain roundabouts. iv. Increased traffic for the proposed development will add to the already ludicrous traffic problems entering Christchurch and the Bargates area, further local traffic is completely unworkable. It will also greatly increase the pressure around Staplecross area. v. The development will greatly affect the many horse riders of the village – a key social activity of the community. Currently, Ambury Lane provides safe access for horse riders to Burton Common unhindered by traffic – this will be negatively affected by the development. vi. The provision of suitable alternative natural greenspace (SAGS) to the North of the railway line running East from Salisbury Road to Burton Common SSSI is already in place as natural farmland but this is under threat by the proposed gravel pit from Hawthorn Road to Burton Common. The loss of this greenspace for gravel extraction if allowed will last years and is totally unjustified. vii. There will be increased pressure on local amenities, including; schools, roads, sewage, police and the NHS. Many of which are already struggling with local demand. 					
662299	Mrs Rachael Crosby		CSPS3235	Policy CN 1							<p>I grew up in Burton Village and lived in Burton up until I moved away for University. As a child I always appreciated living in a rural village and now I appreciate it even more when I visit my family from London.</p> <p>I am most horrified to hear of the proposed planning and would like to register my complaint against the above proposals for the reasons set out below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Policy CN1 Location and scale of housing. North Christchurch Urban Extension Strategic Allocation. This is not positively prepared, not justified, cannot be effective and is not consistent with national planning policy framework due to the following reasons:- a) The land is greenbelt and should remain this way. 				298	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>b) To lose such a large amount of the farm land will cause the farm to be unusable and therefore there will be a loss of jobs and livelihood. The farm is a large part of the community, playing an important role in maintaining the rural charm and character of the village and should therefore remain in its entirety.</p> <p>c) The relocation of the Roeshot Hill allotments will cause increased traffic congestion in Salisbury Road and Martins Hill Lane and further congestion at the Stony Lane and Fountain roundabouts that are already very busy.</p> <p>d) The proposed gravel pit will put the natural farmland that is already in place (North of the railway line running East from Salisbury Road to Burton Common SSSI) under threat. The loss of this green space for gravel extraction if allowed will last years and is completely unnecessary.</p> <p>e) The proposed development will cause a significant increase in traffic causing further problems entering Christchurch and around the Bargates area.</p> <p>f) Currently horseriders and cyclists are able to access Burton Common via Ambery Lane safely and unhindered by traffic, this will be threatened by this proposed development.</p> <p>g) As well as the increased pressure on roads there will be an increased pressure on other local services such as schools.</p>					
359514	Mr Edward Gerry	New Forest District Council	CSPS3470	Policy CN 1	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	<p>Policy CN1, titled Christchurch Urban Extension, outlines the proposal to provide a SANG to attract people away from the South East Dorset Heathlands, the New Forest and the Burton Common SSSI. The proposal to create a SANG is broadly supported by New Forest District Council (NFDC) as it is hoped that the proposal will reduce pressure on sensitive areas of the New Forest. NFDC would like to be fully involved in the progression of proposals regarding the SANG given its location within the New Forest District. The Council considers that it would be useful if it was invited to future meetings of the Urban Extension Advisory Group (a group of key stakeholders that meet to discuss the proposed urban extension) so that it could be kept informed of issues associated with the proposed SANG and other cross boundary issues of interest.</p> <p>In NFDC's response to the Options for Consideration consultation, NFDC outlined that the traffic impacts within New Forest District, of the proposed development north of Christchurch, must be properly assessed. The Council stated in its response that the development north of Christchurch should not be progressed if these impacts are shown to be</p>	<p>A Transport Assessment should be carried out to assess impacts of the proposed development north of Christchurch on roads within the New Forest District. The proposed development north of Christchurch should not be progressed if these impacts are shown to be unacceptable.</p>	<p>Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination</p>	<p>In order to explain the Council's position.</p>	298	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>unacceptable.</p> <p>The supporting text to Policy CN1 details that background work on transport impacts has focused on potential impacts on roads within Dorset and that potential impacts on roads within Hampshire have not been considered. NFDC has particular concern regarding potential transport impacts on the B3347 (Avon Valley road) and the A35 (including through Lyndhurst). NFDC considers that potential impacts on these roads should be properly assessed and the proposed development north of Christchurch should not be progressed if these impacts are shown to be unacceptable. Without an assessment being undertaken and it being proved that the impacts are acceptable, NFDC considers that Policy CN1 is unsound.</p>					
360597	Mr Gordon Wheeler		CSPS3394	Policy CN 1							<p>There are a number of questions that the Council need to answer before it gives its verdict on the new estate thus testing the Soundness of the project. With the growth of the airport and the new business park going ahead as I hope it will. Hampshire has Southampton and Devon has Exeter both thriving airports, so Dorset needs Hurn. BUT surely by building houses at Roeshot Hill to accommodate the new employees leads to a logistic problem of some magnitude. In other words how do you get from Roeshot Hill Estate to the Airport/Business Park on roads that are incapable of holding that amount of traffic at one time.</p> <p>The original brief on the new estate was to provide homes for the present population who cannot afford homes in this area. At the end of the project will this be achieved? I doubt it, the Council will still have the same number on their waiting list then as the have now.</p> <p>Roeshot Hill allotments have been in existence for over 30 years and over that time the ground has been well cared for and the crops harvested are not only abundant but of high quality (as stated by the RHA judge at the Allotment Summer Show). So why move this asset to an inaccessible area with dubious land quality which is sometimes waterlogged. The Council should be proud of this asset not so ashamed of it as to buy it in the back of beyond as there is no reason to move in the first place as the 850 houses/dwelling can be built on the allotted land without including the Allotments.</p>				298	
508440	Mr Angus Macmillan		CSPS3506	Policy CN 1							<p>Roeshot Hill Allotments Site</p> <p>I am an allotment holder in the above for 10 years and write to strongly object to your proposal to build houses on our site. My main reasons for objecting to</p>				298	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	
											<p>the proposed housing development are as follows:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As a result of previous consultations it is apparent that the Council has chosen the least popular option of the four options placed before the people of Christchurch. This leads me to conclude that the democratic process is being abused with our preferred option being ignored • Given the severe difficulties of lack of mortgages and the high cost of property currently experienced by the younger generation who desire to buy their first house it is most unhelpful of the Council to reduce the affordable housing scheduled for the development from 40% to 35%. It is little wonder that local people are aghast at this particular proposal • As a regular user of the A35 road in the vicinity of the proposed site I am most concerned that the extra traffic generated will adversely affect the safety of road users. A related concern is how much more difficult it will be for cars leaving the new housing development to gain access to the A35 as the existing flow of traffic is already at a very high level. Accidents seem inevitable. • I realize that elected Councillors and Council officers are very busy but that is no reason for members of Roeshot Hill Allotment Association or its Committee not to be included in formal consultations. Surely that is the not the most helpful way to treat the very people who strive to make our community here in Christchurch a better place. Do not be surprised if elected Councillors are shunned at the next local elections. <p>I plead with the Council to stop the proposed development and meet and negotiate with our Association and together we can move forward and build both appropriate number of houses and retain our allotments.</p>						
654775	Mr David Monks		CSPS3472	Policy CN 1											298		
656198	Mrs P J Dunn		CSPS3377	Policy CN 1							<p>This policy is flawed as it doesn't make the case for building on Green Belt land. It relies on moving established allotments from the A35 to a new hub site on farmland in Burton. This is unsatisfactory for the allotment holders who have worked hard to establish good quality soil and established crops. This with proposals for the building development at Burton decimates a working farm. The new allotment hub site creates a potentially busy site on a narrow country lane the access to which is at the difficult corner at Salisbury Road, Summer Lane and Martins Hill Lane. 300-400 allotments with toilets, running water, parking facilities and possibly a shop would be a major</p>					298	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											development of this quiet rural area.					
656202	Ruth Siemaszko		CSPS3378	Policy CN 1							<p>This policy is flawed as it fails to make the case for building on Green Belt Land. It relies on moving established allotments from the current site on the A35 to a new hub site on existing farmland in Burton. The plan neither demonstrates why it is necessary to build housing on the existing allotment site nor shows that other sites have been considered. This is unsatisfactory for the current allotment holders, does not address the needs of prospective Christchurch allotments holders, and is potentially damaging to the village of Burton. This, with proposals for the development of Burton, eliminates a working farm. The allotment hub site is also a large proposal on what is currently a narrow country lane. The access to which is from a known difficult road junction at Salisbury Road, Summer Lane and Martins Hill Lane. Furthermore, if it is to provide up to 400 allotments with toilet and water facilities, associated parking facilities and potentially a shop for produce etc. this is a major development of this quiet rural area.</p> <p>The strategy background paper says that allotments should be in a suitable location accessed by a range of transport which this site patently is not!</p>				298	
656204	Zygmunt Siemaszko		CSPS3379	Policy CN 1							<p>This policy is flawed as it fails to make the case for building on Green Belt Land. It does not show why this site is preferable over other building sites in the area. It relies on moving established allotments from the current site on the A35 to a new hub-site on existing farmland in Burton. This is unsatisfactory for the allotment holders who have established crops on good quality land. There are currently 200 plus holders with a waiting list of 80 which means a potential site with room for expansion could be up to 400 plots with associated water, parking, shop and toilet facilities. The identified site is on a farm currently used for cattle accessed from a quiet farm lane with little safe access. The route to which is from a known difficult junction at Salisbury Road, Summer Lane and Martins Hill Lane. This represents a major development of this quiet rural area and with proposals for the development at Burton eliminates a working farm.</p>				298	
656619	Mrs Kay Power		CSPS3469	Policy CN 1							<p>I am writing to respond to Christchurch and East Dorset Pre-Submission Core Strategy Document Policy CN2.</p> <p>I feel this policy is not justified because it involves the development of 45 properties on Green Belt land. The national Planning Policy Framework states that only in exceptional circumstances can the Green Belt be changed. The Green Belt exists to prevent areas of</p>				298	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	
											<p>development to join, forming large conurbations. This development in Burton will increase the spread of conurbation. If this development occurs, it opens the way to future development, thus losing the distinct nature of Burton village as a separate entity.</p> <p>The document states that development will make appropriate contributions to traffic improvement. I feel Martins Hill Lane and Salisbury Road are not wide enough to carry the extra traffic that would be generated by the development of houses in Burton, particularly if the proposed relocation of the Roeshot Hill Allotment site to the area north of the railway line in Burton does take place. The current bus service does not serve the area to the right of Martins Hill Lane along the Salisbury Road railway line, increasing the need for the use of cars.</p> <p>Salisbury Road is a Conservation Area, and a development would destroy many features that are part of the Conservation Area Plan. These include: The working agricultural views, the buildings of Burton Farm, which contribute a great deal to the rural atmosphere of Burton, and a cow herd which regularly crosses Salisbury Road.</p> <p>There are currently swallows seen on the overhead wires next to the farm, therefore nesting in the area. It will be a very sad thing if the building and major upheaval drove them away.</p> <p>Other more suitable brown field sites have been suggested for development, with less damage to the Green Belt and Conservation Area.</p> <p>These are the reasons I feel that Policy CN2 is not justified.</p>						
656623	Mrs Penny A Bellars		CSPS3483	Policy CN 1							<p>I write to object to the following proposals: 1) CN2 The Housing Development on land at and beyond the corner of Salisbury Road and Martins Hill Lane, Burton, presently used by Burton Farm. 2) CN1 The making of land to the south of Burton Farm and east of Salisbury Road into a 'hub' for Allotments from a wider area than Burton village.</p> <p>I write in the form of a letter because I find the 'Response Form' inhibiting and ambiguous.</p> <p>One must presume that Christchurch Borough Council has competent legal advice to prepare 'the Document' well, and is endeavouring to provide solutions to challenging problems, but I would question the justification, effectiveness and consistency of these particular proposals within National Guidelines and previous recommendations.</p> <p>Current National Policy for Green Belts (PPG2) is designed to prevent urban sprawl and creep from large built-up areas; to maintain openness rather than allow</p>					298	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>the merging of such areas; to preserve and, by implication, relish and enjoy the 'identity' of our historic towns and individual settlements. The Green Belt Review in 'the North Christchurch Extension' identifies and includes 'land to the east of Burton' and suggests it is ...' a key consideration/constraint on development within the section north of the railway line' and 'of importance to the village setting'; it talks of any development being in 'clear conflict with this Green Belt purpose.' What is the point of having all these expensive reviews, only to ignore them when it suits? We should fulfil the obligation to provide our share of new housing by identifying derelict urban land and brown sites to develop, and not use land within the Green Belt; we must safeguard the countryside at all costs.</p> <p>Burton prides itself in remaining separate from Christchurch; the meadows, river and railway have helped to protect the character and identity of the village, and we must and will resist all efforts to change this.</p> <p>I recognise that there is a national need for more housing, and that there is pressure on Councils to provide suitable land for it. I contend that, locally, there have been, and probably still are, opportunities to re-categorise land abandoned by failed commercial stores. The Council should allocate the land for homes, rather than succumb to the enticements of yet more cut-price supermarkets; the area is already flooded with them. I question the justification, effectiveness and consistency of these proposals.</p> <p>2) CN1 Whereas I approve of Allotments in principle, the proposed site is part of that working farm and the land is used for grazing; it should not, therefore be considered. However, the suggestion that it become a 'hub' for the whole area is totally unacceptable; it smacks of a bargaining tactic to release the Roeshot site for nicely profitable development. Burton does not want or need such a hub; it is unjustifiable. It would cause a vast increase in traffic through the village; the existing infrastructure would be inadequate and put considerable stress on the area; this would inevitably lead to demands for additional provision, (access roads, water and sewerage, permission for ever bigger sheds, superior facilities – did I even hear a shop being mentioned? And yet more traffic) and cause further disruption. All this makes the proposal ineffectual. As mentioned above, the land is not lying fallow and unused; this appropriation would cause the last farm in the area to disappear. Before long, planning permission to build all the way along the east of Salisbury Road would be sought and the village</p>					

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename				
											would lose its character for ever; totally inconsistent with all previous assessments and decisions. I hesitate to question the roll of the Landowner in this, he has, after all a business to run; but it would be reassuring to know that our Council is not swayed away from Good Practice by sycophancy or behind-the-scenes bargaining. We do not actually need a new Village Hall now. The last one was allowed to deteriorate to such an extent by the same landowner that there was no alternative but to close it. (Is it cynical to suspect that the farm buildings have been neglected for the same reason?) The two Churches and the school provide adequate facilities for the normal needs of village life today, and the Scouts are well under way with their plans to build a new hut. I object to the fact that we are not even sure of how many houses are proposed, the number varies widely; yet we are expected to believe in an open and transparent process. We, your constituents and voters, would like to feel that we have a voice, a stake in our Future. I urge you to reject these proposals.									
656625	Mr Andrew R M Bellars		CSPS3488	Policy CN 1							Dear Sir I object to the following proposals: 1) CN1 The formation of a 'hub' for allotments on land to the south of Burton Farm, and the east of Salisbury Road. This 'hub' would be provision of Allotments for a much wider area than Burton Village. 2) CN2 A Housing Development on land at and beyond the corner of Salisbury Road and Martins Hill Lane, Burton, presently used by Burton Farm. Because of the design of the 'Response Form', which I find ambiguous and confusing, I am writing my response as a letter. Christchurch Borough Council must have access to sound legal advice, but the whole character of these proposals seems designed to create obfuscation and confusion. I question their justification, effectiveness, and consistency with respect to National Guidelines, and previous recommendations [Local Plan 2020]. 1) CN1 Allotments are excellent in principle, but the proposed site is part of a working farm; the land is grazing land, and appropriation would be the finish of yet another healthy and productive dairy herd, and consequent job losses. (If it is true that the Meyrick Agent suggested that it was time to give up milk-production from disease-ridden dairy cattle, then that is actionable, and inexcusable.) So not only should the plan fail in this respect, but also the suggestion that it become an area 'hub' is unacceptable. A 'quid pro quo' to release the Roeshot site for profit to the Landowner would be								298	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>totally wrong. We do not need or want this in Burton, so it is plainly unjustifiable. There would be a vast increase in traffic; we have heard that there may be some plan to create a right turn off the bypass onto Salisbury Road, meaning a roundabout just where the new footbridge is slowly being constructed. The existing infrastructure would be inadequate, and demands for access roads, water, sewage, bigger sheds, and improved facilities such as a shop, would cause more disruption and yet more traffic. This makes this proposal ineffectual. This last family farm in the village would have to close after 130 years tenancy. It would then mean that planning permission to build in the Conservation Area along Salisbury Road would open the 'flood-gates' and destroy the character of the village. This is totally inconsistent with all previous decisions.</p> <p>PPG2 (Current National Policy for Green Belts) is meant to prevent urban creep and sprawl from large built-up areas. Also to keep areas open, rather than merging, and also to preserve the identity of our historic towns, villages and their communities. The Green Belt Review of the 'North Christchurch Extension' specifically includes 'land to the east of Burton', and suggests it is ...' a key consideration/constraint on development within the section north of the railway line', and 'of importance to the village setting'. It states that any development would be in 'clear conflict with Green Belt purpose'. Why does the Local Taxpayer have to pay for all these expensive reviews, when the Borough Council then ignores them? [Meanwhile, our verges remain untrimmed, litter lies everywhere, and ever-increasing numbers of vehicles speed through our village].</p> <p>We should provide our share of new housing by using derelict urban land and brown sites for development, and not use land within the Green Belt. We must safeguard the countryside. In addition, land to the east of Salisbury Road is in a Conservation Area. Burton is proud to be a separate community from Christchurch, with a beating heart. The River, Railway, and Meadows have helped to protect the character and identity of the village, and we will resist all attempts to change this.</p> <p>While noting that there is a national need for more housing, and that Councils are pressed to provide suitable land for this development, there does appear to be some glaring local examples where land could be re-allocated under these 'exceptional circumstances'. Not only the Bailey Bridge site, with its vast car park only half full, but the plethora of failed commercial sites in Somerford, could be used for homes, rather than</p>					

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	
											<p>further cut-price supermarkets. Has anyone asked the splendid Co-op management for an opinion? To sum up, I question the justification, effectiveness, and consistency of these proposals.</p> <p>I hope that the Council has maintained good integrity with respect to the wishes of the Landowner. The people of Burton Village have had a very short time to understand the aims and ramifications of the joint plans. Following the neglect of the Village Hall by the Meyrick Estate, causing its closure, the village has responded with plans for a new Scout Hut, and the use of the two Church Halls, so it seems we do not need a Village Hall quite so much.</p> <p>I respectfully urge you to reject these proposals,</p>						
656627	Mr Alan Levy		CSPS3512	Policy CN 1							<p>I wish to voice my objection to the proposed planning for Burton Village CN1/CN2 my objections are as follows: CN1&2 Burton is a village approx. 3 kilometres from Christchurch Town Centre and according to the "CONSERVATION AREA APPRAISAL & MANAGEMENT PLAN" adopted by Christchurch Council in FEBRUARY 2007 – is within a conservation area designated on 30th Jan 1986 – amended 15th June 1995 – and adapted as above in Feb. 2007 – points mentioned were. OPEN RURAL ASPECT THE SURVIVAL OF FARMS AND BUILDINGS The proposed plans seem to go against all of the above. Also the land in question is categorised as GREEN BELT, which would eventually cause the loss of the only working, farm in the village, unemployment for the formworks and will interfere with the whole Village Status, Character and Scale. Our village is a rural area so in no way does it require an URBAN DEVELOPMENT. The above report ends under the heading of CONCLUSION as follows:- "The semi informal spatial qualities of Burton Green enclosed by high quality historic buildings, the hamlet of Martins Hill Lane with its small intimate scale and the Valuable Survival of Burton farm: a working Farm of historic farm buildings and farmhouse all contribute to the high quality historic environment and the distinct since of peace in Burton" all the above would and could be destroyed. CN1 ALLOTMENTS ... The proposed CN1 plan is to site 400/500 allotments on land at Summers lane, at the rear of the only working farm in the village, this forms part of Burton Conversation Area Plan as adopted by Christchurch Council in February 2007. This site will remove a large</p>					298	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>part of arable land used for feed and grazing of a large beef/dairy herd.</p> <p>The plan CN1 and Core Strategy P21 talks of Allotments that should be in a suitable accessible location, Summers Lane is a single track road from Hawthorn Road to Salisbury Road crossroads with Martins Hill Lane, where, it will as per the allotment own report have a possible usage of 50 plus cars a day, based on 10% visiting the site but this estimate could be way out. The traffic is a major problem as said above these roads are single track, and more over the access and exit route to Christchurch would be via Martins Hill Lane that at the moment has seen a significant increase in traffic especially since the traffic calming came into force in Salisbury Road. I cannot see how any proposed road improvement could be carried out on this road unless houses were demolished. Improving public transport will have no consequence as people with an Allotment normally use their own transport and have trailers. All this mayhem, that has no benefit for the villagers of Burton.</p> <p>CN1 & 2 ROADS SALISBURY ROAD Main spine road running through village SUMMERS LANE Side road at the cross roads with Martins Hill Lane opposite, this is single track road leading to Hawthorn Road MARTINS HILL LANE Side road at the crossroads and again opposite SUMMERS LANE, any access to the proposed site would enter and excess near this crossroads on Salisbury Road and wither go down Salisbury Road to the BY-PASS, or down Martins Hill Lane to Stony Lane where at peak times the traffic queues back beyond the turn to Martins Hill Lane the traffic chaos that the proposed that 45 houses and allotment traffic would bring beggars belief that someone has came up with this plan.</p> <p>TRAFFIC The plan mention road improvement to Stony Lane Fountain Roundabout, Bargates, Barrack Road, Fairmile and lford this list goes on and on, never ending as all it does is move the traffic further along. There is no mention of any improvements to the village i.e.: traffic calming, speed enforcement or even street lighting Who will pay for this? Do you expect us, as council taxpayers and pay extra as we have Parish Council or the developer or even the landowner who seems to make money from land sales and gravel sales a no loose situation.</p>					

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>SUMMERY The plan to build 45 new properties along with light commercial units and allotments on GREEN BELT FARMLAND is something we the residents of Burton do not want or need. When the proposed ROESHOTT HUB could quite easily accommodate 45 extra units, if as the CORE PLAN says CHRISTCHURCH requires this number of units. Where or how these proposed extra vehicles would navigate the GRIDLOCK that is CHRISTCHURCH I DO NOT KNOW.</p>					
656628	Mrs Mary Levy		CSPS3510	Policy CN 1							<p>CN1&2 Burton is a village approx. 3 kilometres from Christchurch Town Centre and according to the "CONSERVATION AREA APPRAISAL & MANAGEMENT PLAN" adopted by Christchurch Council in FEBRUARY 2007 – is within a conservation area designated on 30th Jan 1986 – amended 15th June 1995 – and adapted as above in Feb. 2007 – points mentioned were. OPEN RURAL ASPECT THE SURVIVAL OF FARMS AND BUILDINGS The proposed plans seem to go against all of the above. Also the land in question is categorised as GREEN BELT, which would eventually cause the loss of the only working, farm in the village, unemployment for the formworks and will interfere with the whole Village Status, Character and Scale. Our village is a rural area so in no way does it require an URBAN DEVELOPMENT. The above report ends under the heading of CONCLUSION as follows:- "The semi informal spatial qualities of Burton Green enclosed by high quality historic buildings, the hamlet of Martins Hill Lane with its small intimate scale and the Valuable Survival of Burton farm: a working Farm of historic farm buildings and farmhouse all contribute to the high quality historic environment and the distinct since of peace in Burton" all the above would and could be destroyed. CN1 ALLOTMENTS ... The proposed CN1 plan is to site 400/500 allotments on land at Summers lane, at the rear of the only working farm in the village, this forms part of Burton Conversation Area Plan as adopted by Christchurch Council in February 2007. This site will remove a large part of arable land used for feed and grazing of a large beef/dairy heard. The plan CN1 and Core Strategy P21 talks of Allotments that should be in a suitable accessible location, Summers Lane is a single track road from Hawthorn Road to Salisbury Road crossroads with Martins Hill Lane, where, it will as per the allotment</p>					298

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>own report have a possible usage of 50 plus cars a day, based on 10% visiting the site but this estimate could be way out. The traffic is a major problem as said above these roads are single track, and more over the access and exit route to Christchurch would be via Martins Hill Lane that at the moment has seen a significant increase in traffic especially since the traffic calming came into force in Salisbury Road. I cannot see how any proposed road improvement could be carried out on this road unless houses were demolished. Improving public transport will have no consequence as people with an Allotment normally use their own transport and have trailers. All this mayhem, that has no benefit for the villagers of Burton.</p> <p>CN1 & 2 ROADS SALISBURY ROAD Main spine road running through village SUMMERS LANE Side road at the cross roads with Martins Hill Lane opposite, this is single track road leading to Hawthorn Road MARTINS HILL LANE Side road at the crossroads and again opposite SUMMERS LANE, any access to the proposed site would enter and excess near this crossroads on Salisbury Road and wither go down Salisbury Road to the BY-PASS, or down Martins Hill Lane to Stony Lane where at peak times the traffic queues back beyond the turn to Martins Hill Lane the traffic chaos that the proposed that 45 houses and allotment traffic would bring beggars belief that someone has came up with this plan.</p> <p>TRAFFIC The plan mention road improvement to Stony Lane Fountain Roundabout, Bargates, Barrack Road, Fairmile and Iford this list goes on and on, never ending as all it does is move the traffic further along. There is no mention of any improvements to the village i.e.: traffic calming, speed enforcement or even street lighting Who will pay for this? Do you expect us, as council taxpayers and pay extra as we have Parish Council for a plan that gives us falling house prices, no village, and a sad change in our lives caused by the endless volume of traffic congestion and problems this plan WILL caused</p> <p>SUMMERY The plan to build 45 new properties along with light commercial units and allotments on GREEN BELT FARMLAND is something we the residents of Burton do not want or need. When the proposed ROESHOTT HUB could quite easily accommodate 45 extra units, if</p>					

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											as the CORE PLAN says CHRISTCHURCH requires this number of units. Where or how these proposed extra vehicles would navigate the GRIDLOCK that is CHRISTCHURCH I DO NOT KNOW.					
656629	John Campbell	Roeshot Hill Allotment Association	CSPS3509	Policy CN 1							<p>We take this opportunity to participate in the consultation process regarding Christchurch and East Dorset Draft Core Strategy Document. We appreciate that the strategy within the Document relates to a wide geographic area and the rationalisation of demands from a wide range of competing interests. Whilst the interests and concerns of Christchurch allotment gardeners may seem almost incidental in such context, they are by no means so. We have examined the Document from three perspectives: (1) proposals affecting Christchurch; (2) allotment provision in Christchurch and (3) the impact on the rural environment of Christchurch. We have found that a number of the issues that concern us touch upon fundamental principles contained in the document.</p> <p>HOUSING POLICY - Christchurch</p> <p>The Document draws upon a number of assessments of housing supply and predicted demand to conclude that urban infill will be insufficient to meet future housing needs. After briefly reviewing the physical constraints on building elsewhere in Christchurch, it is proposed to adjust the Green Belt area at Roeshot Hill, Burton and Marsh Lane to accommodate housing developments.</p> <p>1. We consider these proposals to be unjustified in that:</p> <p>1.1 They rest on the assumption that 'housing trumps environment' in a Borough which is characterised by its urban, rural and coastal mix, which makes 'life pleasant' for its inhabitants and which attracts a large volume of visitors and vacationers. Our view is that the assumption in the document is merely a subjective assessment, and that it fails to grasp the inconvenient truth that Christchurch cannot accommodate all who may wish to live in the Borough whilst maintaining its present character.</p> <p>1.2 The proposals for housing at Burton fail to explain how an additional 45 dwellings will serve the 'specific needs' of the village. On the contrary, the effect of the proposal would be negative by turning Burton from a village into a conurbation.</p> <p>1.3 The Document contemplates the development of 'exception sites' in order to meet the need for affordable housing in the area. This weakens the case for provision of new market homes at the expense of the rural environment.</p>		Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination		298	2267876_0_1.pdf

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>2. The proposals are ineffective in that:</p> <p>2.1 They would adversely affect the Green Belt by releasing some of the 'best and most versatile agricultural land' at Roeshot Hill and substituting unspecified land of lesser value.</p> <p>2.2 They do not ensure the reduction of local demand for new market homes in the absence of a residential qualification (such as applied elsewhere in Dorset) and/or other measures to ensure that local residents have the ability and opportunity to absorb new housing as it becomes available. The document admits the attractions of Christchurch as a retirement location, and the phenomenon of 'supply stimulating demand' could well result in migrants from other areas of the country exacerbating rather than reducing the demands on local resources without reducing local housing needs.</p> <p>3. The proposals are non-compliant with section 110 Localism Act 2011 Christchurch shares a housing market area and travel to work area with Bournemouth and Poole, New Forest Council and adjacent local authorities in Hampshire. It is mostly a matter of preference rather than strategic issues that determine where people live. If it is the case that Christchurch cannot accommodate more than 2060 additional homes without impacting on its rural villages and Green Belt, the question arises as to whether there has been a reasonable allocation of resources to absorb regional housing needs. Despite some reference to joint working with neighbouring Dorset authorities (but not Hampshire) there is no evidence of any specific arrangement whereby unmet requirements in Christchurch might be met by neighbouring authorities, particularly by Bournemouth, which is by far the largest authority. We feel that it is reasonable to conclude that the Christchurch Borough Council and East Dorset District Council have failed to fully exhaust the duty to co-operate with adjoining local authorities within the spirit of section 110.</p> <p>4. The proposals are non-compliant in respect of Sustainability The Sustainability Assessment is not on consultation and is only referred to in paragraph 1.21. By not have the SA open for consultation in the same way as the Core Strategy the Council are failing to complete stage D of the Sustainability Assessment effectively and thus the Core Strategy is unsound. This could be subject to Judicial Review.</p> <p>MATTERS SPECIFIC TO CN1 We have already made comment on the housing strategy in general, but there are additional matters</p>					

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>specific to this development to which we make objection.</p> <p>Policy CN1 proposes the development of the Green Belt site at Roeshot Hill to accommodate 850 houses. The scheme involves the relocation of the statutory allotment site and the removal of electricity pylons. The relocation of Roeshot Hill allotments is of special concern to us.</p> <p>Stage 1 of the Master plan commissioned by CBC synthesised a number of variables into four options, which were by no means exhaustive, but which were all predicated on the basis of a large-scale urban development. The public was consulted as to which of the four options was the most favoured. Subsequently the CBC selected option UE1, which, subject to modifications as to the number of dwellings to be built and the provision of retail and recreational facilities, is presented in the Document as Policy CN1.</p> <p>We regard the proposals in Policy CN1 to be unjustified, ineffective and non-compliant for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. They are unjustified in that the process whereby the Council eliminated the other options (UE2-4) was flawed. UE4 (a variant of EU3) emerged as the public's preferred option, with UE3 the second choice, whilst UE1 was rated third. There is therefore strong evidence that the public wanted a smaller scale development with the allotment site retained. Had the Council taken the results seriously, then by the simple expedient of burying the electricity cables underground it would have eliminated objections to UE3/4 ('marketability' and 'pinch point') without significantly reducing the housing volume below that which is now contemplated. There is, of course, far greater revenue benefits to the Council from selling the allotment site and our members are concerned as to the extent that this may have influenced the decision. In summary, the CBC's consultation process was unduly prescriptive, and the results finessed in favour of a scheme of particular favour to the Council and on which there had been several years of talks with the major landowner and prospective developer. 2. They are ineffective in that a segregation of the bulk of Christchurch's allotment amenity runs counter to key 'neighbourhood' principles in the Christchurch Allotment Strategy and the Document itself. It also fails to exploit the virtues of 'shared space' as contemplated by paragraph 70 NPPF. 3. They are ineffective in that para 6.54 does not adequately address arrangements for the proposed relocation of the allotments. Christchurch Council does not at present own any land within the statutory 					

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											geographic limits for relocation of the allotment site, nor has it made any proposals to offset the losses and expenses of relocation. 4. They are non-compliant with paragraph 112 of the NPPF in that the land at Roeshot Hill is designated amongst 'the best and most versatile agricultural land'. 5. They are non-compliant with paragraphs 83 and 84 of the NPPF in that the proposed altering of the Green Belt boundaries is inadequately addressed and thus unjustified.					
656638	Mrs E A Waugh		CSPS3371	Policy CN 1							I strongly object to the proposed building of houses and moving of allotments to Burton under the Local Plan. I object on Planning Grounds as set out in the leaflet I received from you. These are – CN1, CN2, CS2 and KS10. Also there will be a considerable impact on Burton Primary School and the Medical Centre. The loss of this Green Belt land will affect all who live in Burton and want it to stay apart from Christchurch.				298	
656641	Peter Crawford		CSPS3363	Policy CN 1							I am the plot holder of number 32A and 36A at the Roeshot Hill allotment site and feel that the proposed movement to a site north of the railway line at Burton is a wrong decision if it happens. The A35 at the entrance to the Roeshot Hill allotment site is a junction where you have to take some time to pass by car due to the volume of traffic. If a housing estate was built on the Roeshot Hill allotment site then a set of traffic lights would have to be installed at the entrance to the existing allotment site creating a bottleneck on the already busy single carriageway A35. I have had my plots for about 5 years but I understand that some people have had theirs from the start, about 35 years ago. My neighbour is one of those people. I have a degree in biochemistry so have a very good knowledge of how living organisms work. I am a strict vegetarian (vegan) and feel that growing your own food should be strongly promoted for ethical and environmental reasons so I feel allotments are essential. The possible move to the new site I feel would put many other plot holders off from taking an allotment again as it takes a few years to get a new plot into full cultivation. I am a fit relatively young man and would definitely, but reluctantly take up a plot at the proposed new site. Not everybody is as fit as me and they may not wish to continue if relocated.				298	
656642	Mr Mike East		CSPS3382	Policy CN 1							I would like to make an objection to the proposed relocation of allotments to land in Burton village under the planning grounds CN1 and CN2. The area is within a conservation area and Green Belt				298	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											and would therefore be severely damaged by the change of use, the impact of the enormous increase of traffic and adverse effect to the visual amenity of the area as a whole. The proposed number of allotments is out of keeping with the size of the village and the lanes and roads infrastructure would be comprised and the lanes could not support that amount of traffic. It would be detrimental and harmful to the rural and undeveloped character of the green belt and conservation area.					
656655	Kate East		CSPS3384	Policy CN 1							I would like to make an objection to the proposed relocation of allotments to land in Burton village under the planning grounds CN1 and CN2. The area is within a conservation area and Green Belt and would therefore be severely damaged by the change of use, the impact of the enormous increase of traffic and adverse effect to the visual amenity of the area as a whole. The proposed number of allotments is out of keeping with the size of the village and the lanes and roads infrastructure would be comprised and the lanes could not support that amount of traffic. It would be detrimental and harmful to the rural and undeveloped character of the green belt and conservation area.				298	
656659	Mr W Street		CSPS3350	Policy CN 1							Objection to Allotment Move I strongly object to the resiting of Roeshot Hill allotments because the council has not consulted the Roeshot Hill allotment association directly. Of the four options offered the least popular has been chosen by the council. What justification is there for moving the allotments to a poorly accessed site.				298	
656803	Mr A M Atkins		CSPS3354	Policy CN 1							With ref to housing and allotments plan for Burton, I wish to strongly object to these proposals.				298	
656807	Andrew O'Connor		CSPS3351	Policy CN 1							I wish to register my strongest possible objection to any house building development that uses Green Belt land. I think any Council that even contemplates doing this, is showing their complete contempt for the existing residents of Christchurch. It should be a prime objective of any Council to protect Green Belt land under its control and to resist the temptation to cede to the overtures and pressures of property developers. Aside from the Green Belt issues, what possible rationale can the Council use to justify a massive building programme, when the property market is stagnated and is likely to remain so for years to come. I thought the inessential extension of the Christchurch Library, demonstrated the insular and confused thinking of the Council in the middle of this economic downturn. Councillors should be keeping their efforts				298	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											focused on the substantial problems that already exist in Christchurch and not creating new ones.					
657133	Mr Peter Quibell		CSPS3376	Policy CN 1							I wonder if Christchurch council is in its right mind to give into pressure to build on Green Belt land at Burton ??? The roads in Burton and surroundings are at breaking point and chaos reigns at Stony Lane roundabout from 7am in the morning. Burton Primary School is not up to Ofsted standards, the Grange Academy will not be able to cope. There's no decent street lighting, pavements aren't good either. What about a bigger doctors' surgery and more practice nurses. Transport:- 1 bus an hour??? Reasons are many more, you need to know.				298	
662349	K Kitchener		CSPS3261	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).				298	
662353	Ms Julie Berry		CSPS3263	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).				298	
662362	B Williamson		CSPS3264	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield				298	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).					
662368	Mr Chris Burgess		CSPS3267	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).				298	
662373	A Preston		CSPS3273	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).				298	
662374	C Macklin		CSPS3275	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).				298	
662380	JD Sims		CSPS3276	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. 				298	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).					
662384	C I Cave		CSPS3285	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).				298	
662385	E Ceen		CSPS3286	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).				298	
662385	E Ceen		CSPS3287	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).				298	
662424	G Zimmeruzan		CSPS3289	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).				298	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											(5).					
662429	N A Jenner		CSPS3290	Policy CN 1											298	
662478	R Jenner		CSPS3318	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).				298	
662481	R Weeks		CSPS3319	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).				298	
662484	Mrs F M Hush		CSPS3323	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).				298	
662491	C J Knight		CSPS3324	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield 				298	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).					
662499	P Dilley		CSPS3328	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).				298	
662535	Mrs Anna Burke		CSPS3343	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).				298	
360598	Mr Alan Ruck	Roeshot Hill Allotment Association	CSPS3605	Policy CN 1							Response to Christchurch and East Dorset Pre-Submission Core Strategy "The natural environment of Christchurch including Christchurch Harbour, the beaches and heathlands will continue to be the most important asset for the area". We are asked to comment whether the Core Strategy is Justified and Effective. I think this is too narrow and too restrictive. There appears to be precious little detail upon which to develop any argument. There are also meaningless policies like LN3-50% affordable housing unless someone in charge wants something else! The original public consultation saw the people of Christchurch given four options on which to express their preferences for the future of the borough all of which showed some building on land at Roeshot Hill. As at West Parley the views of the voting public were ignored with decision makes choosing to base development plans around the least popular options. As an allotment holder at Roeshot Hill I support the idea of some building to alleviate need for starter homes, sheltered homes for the elderly and family housing. All could be built without moving or realigning the allotment site. Yet the plans show only up to 35%				298	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>affordable housing which means that 65% is not – more second homes and homes for retired incomers perhaps? For this the council appears ready to scrap cherished Green Belt policies and is that precious heathland shown on CN3 at Marsh Lane?</p> <p>CN1 shows the full concreting over of some of the best agricultural land in the borough. The planners walled in a new housing development between the railway embankment, the Christchurch by-pass and the A35. At no point have they showed how people will enter and leave onto an already very busy and congested A35 or how they find work, presumably at the expanded Bournemouth Airport? It is such a pity that the road links are often choked and at a near standstill. The development at Westfield Gardens some years ago meant that the road was blocked off because of the volume of traffic. Now, with even more traffic including gravel lorries there is a vague mention that something will be put in place. As an allotment gardener trying to leave the site at different times of the day I remain to be convinced.</p> <p>I have said nothing about the effects of relocation of the allotments on the community there because this appears to be of no interest to planners and decision makers. We cannot argue against providing homes for young families and for the old and needy. I can and do argue that mass building without any accompanying infrastructure is not what the borough needs. Children, old people, anyone without a car will be almost trapped on the estate. The planners should listen to the people of Christchurch, think again and consult before the decisions are made.</p>					
496152	Ms R Iveson	Roeshot Hill Allotment Association	CSPS3611	Policy CN 1							<p>ROESHOT HILL ALLOTMENT SITE</p> <p>I am horrified that the Council has proposed to take the option to develop our allotment site for housing. The Council must not under any circumstances relocate the tenants at the Roeshot Hill site to new area of land at Burton.</p> <p>As any horticulturist knows, it takes very many years to bring soil up to a high state of fertility which is necessary to grow quality fruit and vegetables. This has been achieved at Roeshot Hill by tenants who have lovingly built up the structure and fertility of the soil over a very long period of years. To now take this away from them and ask everyone to start again and bring new ground into cultivation which will take many years to attain, is morally wrong and totally incomprehensible. This is comparable to asking an artist who has taken a lifetime to paint a masterpiece to destroy it and then give him a blank canvas to start again.</p>				298	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											Why have the Council now decided to ignore the original chosen Option 3, The Roeshot Allotment site must remain in its present location and any new housing can be erected on the land in Burton. Under National Government Rules entitled Planning Policy Statement Three: Parks, Recreation Grounds and Allotments are excluded from the Brownfield Definition. Surely the Council has a moral obligation to play fair with their own residents.					
656182	Mr John De Wit		CSPS3604	Policy CN 1							<p>Proposed Development of Roeshot Hill Allotments - Core Strategy Document</p> <p>With reference to the consultation for the proposed housing development and site transfer of Roeshot Hill Allotments, I would like to raise the following objections and seek answers from the Council regarding their proposals for the scheme least favoured by the residents of Highcliffe/Christchurch and especially the allotment holders.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Why when the reason given by the Council that there is a shortage of affordable housing the percentage has been reduced to 35% and the remaining 65% will be used for new higher income residents from outside the Borough. 2. In view of the opinion stated by Councillor Nottage, the area of Purewell, Somerford and the A35 is so congested that he is requesting a by-pass to be considered by Dorset County Council. 3. No access on the A35 is shown on the plans as to improvement and access to cater for the increased traffic (approximately 1000 additional cars a day) 4. No details are shown as to where the proposed site for the new allotments will be located. 5. I have been an allotment holder at Roeshot Hill for over 20 years. Over this period my health as deteriorated. My Consultant at Bournemouth Hospital states that the activity, social meeting etc which I enjoy and enables me to continue with the help of my wife, friends and other allotment holders is very beneficial to me. Should the allotments be moved north of the railway I would have to give up my allotment. 6. Why does the comparatively small area of land, squeezed between the railway and the A35 need to be built upon as very few people would wish to live here especially the higher income people you are expecting unless the affordable housing is intended to go there. 7. There is no mention regarding the financial details of the transaction and what the Council and its partners will receive from this unwanted development. 8. As a statutory protected site the Council is required by law to provide equally good or better sites for allotments, so why has there been no consultation with 				298	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	
											<p>Roeshot Hill Allotment Association. I understood that under the National Planning Policy Framework that planners' decisions regarding the use of gardens, greenfield sites, allotments etc. were to be bequeathed to the next generation in a better condition than they are now. To build on first class agricultural ground seems a travesty to me. This is obviously not in Christchurch Council's plans. **</p> <p>9. Once again the Council shows complete disregard to its statutory obligations, wishes of its residents and in providing information about its financial and environmental plans.</p>						
656211	Bernard Green		CSPS3603	Policy CN 1							<p>Policy CN1 - North Christchurch Urban Extension Strategic Allocation</p> <p>I am writing in response to the Core Strategy Pre-Submission Document and the council's proposal to take the option to develop the Roeshot Hill allotments for housing - Policy CN1.</p> <p>I object to the closure of the Christchurch community allotments at Roeshot Hill and to selling off the fertile grade 2 green belt community owned land. These plans are unwanted and unwarranted. The core Strategy fails tests for Soundness on many points of justification and effectiveness.</p> <p>There is insufficient provision of allotments currently and this is evidenced by the waiting list for them and the considerable delay in their being obtained. Has the council carried out a detailed survey of the actual demand for allotments? Additional allotments are needed rather than their replacement.</p> <p>The Roeshot Hill allotments have been present as a valuable local community facility for over thirty years and with more than 70% occupancy. Why has the relocation of these statutorily protected allotments been planned without the arrangements being discussed with the allotment holder tenants and the Roeshot Hill Allotment Association? Has permission been sought and granted by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government for the sale of this land? Meeting the developers' requirements by burying the electricity cables currently carried by pylons, together with sufficient land for the dwelling objective of 850 new homes being released by Sir George Meyrick has negated the need to relocate Roeshot Hill allotments.</p> <p>Why has the council taken the least popular option? Why do the allotments have to be moved when the site has more than enough room for the affordable housing the council needs? Would that not also allow for the number of allotments to be increased?</p> <p>I object to replacing current allotments which have</p>					298	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>been cultivated to a high standard over a long period of time by allotment holders who have invested and input much time, effort and expenditure in order to enjoy them as they want them. The current allotments provide community facilities close-by to local residents. No details have been given of the proposals regarding the replacement allotments. Where, how many, what condition and standard of the site and ground? How will they be prepared for use, to what standard and by whom? Will the allotment holders be expected to break-in rough meadow land? What assistance, both physical and financial, will be provided to prepare the new allotments and to transfer from existing ones? What access and parking facilities, together with sufficient water points and toilets will there be? Many of the existing allotment holders will be driven away from and be deprived of continuing enjoyment of their allotment, as they will be unwilling - or more likely unable - to repeat the considerable time, effort and expense of taking on a new allotment from scratch. Many will not be able to do this due to advancing years and so will be deprived of their hobby/interest/pastime which they currently look forward to. What compensation will be provided for those losing out? With regard to the proposed housing development. Why has the ratio of affordable housing been reduced to 35%? Was not the generation of affordable housing the prime reason? Why is a new housing estate being planned in such a location - surrounded by a raised mainline railway, a dual carriageway by-pass and the busy A35 drag up Roeshot Hill; together with gravel workings very close by? There appears insufficient safe access to the proposed development. Currently it is often difficult to access the allotments, across the day. How will the residents fare, particularly at the peak times found with estates. If access to the new allotments is through the development - rather than via the by-pass, the Stony Lane roundabout, back down the by-pass and turning off to go under the railway on Salisbury road - would this not be even more traffic going through the housing and be regarded as a 'rat-run'? Would residents of Burton also use this route to access Sainsbury's and Highcliffe and its schools? This would clearly make a negative contribution to transport improvements on ground of congestion and safety. I therefore reiterate that I object to the proposed Policy CN1 development and in particular the relocation of the Roeshot Hill allotments. The above shows failure in tests of Soundness in its justification and effectiveness.</p>					

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	
656217	Mrs M A Green		CSPS3602	Policy CN 1							<p>Re: Plot 44A Roeshot Hill</p> <p>I took over a 5 rod plot at Roeshot Hill in April of this year together with my husband and have paid for the use of the land. We have spent a considerable amount of money on this plot in the short time we have had it. We are very keen to grow our own vegetables for the exercise and peaceful enjoyment.</p> <p>I am, therefore, writing to express my concern over the possibility of the council selling the allotments at Roeshot Hill in order to profit from building houses. It seems to me that having not been able to build on and profit from the sale of the land at the Mudeford Wood Community Centre site that the council has turned its eyes on the land where allotments have been present for over 30 years with more than 70% occupancy.</p> <p>I understand that you require but do not have the permission of the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government to sell this land to a developer but negotiations have proceeded as far as a developer stating their requirements to purchase this land i.e. they want pylons buried underground. It is my understanding from the allotment committee that Sir George Meyrick has released sufficient land to build 850 homes and this negates the necessity of selling of the land at Roeshot Hill. So why is the council considering it? Local authorities are bound by statute to provide allotments. Please advise by what statutory instruments you are proposing to sell this land at Roeshot Hill presently used as allotments.</p> <p>This allotment is established and there is a lengthy waiting list. I understand that the land proposed for the new allotments has an access problem. It is accessible by my having to travel along the busy bypass to the Stony Lane roundabout and then travel back on the other side. I feel the whole point of allotments is that they should be local to the people i.e. within walking distance. There are no allotments, for instance, in Highcliffe although there is sufficient land hereabouts for the council to establish allotments e.g. The Meadow where the land has been left by a previous resident of Highcliffe for the enjoyment of the local people not just people who walk dogs, fish or play bowls. With the allotments where they are now I can cycle or catch a bus. I would not want to cycle along the bypass where there have been several fatalities of cyclists being knocked on their bikes by inconsiderate motorists. And what is the provision for getting there other than by car? There is such a demand for allotments that plots are being divided in half yet the council is considering taking away the allotments at Roeshot Hill and allocating land away from the various villages. This amounts to the council not supporting its</p>					298	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>own ratepayers at a time of serious recession when people naturally turn to growing their own food to save money. Also there is a movement away from the heavily chemicalised and standardised food sold by the average supermarket and the wish to reduce the carbon footprint i.e. to grow our own strawberries rather than purchase those flown in from overseas. We wish to eat food grown in season on our allotments. However, moving the allotments will create, in my opinion, a greater carbon food print due to the allotment holders having to use their cars to get to the new proposed allotments.</p> <p>The creation of 850 houses will itself create a burden on existing infrastructure and services (we can only hope the houses would be affordable to young families).</p> <p>I understand from the allotment committee that there is concern about water provision at the proposed new allotment site and that at the current site the allotment committee paid for the provision of 4 extra water points as there was insufficient points provided by the council initially.</p> <p>Some of the people who have plots at Roeshot Hill have been maintaining their plots for the 30 or so years since the allotments were created. There are a lot of elderly people, therefore, who would not be able to create a new allotment especially on perhaps substandard meadowland. They simply would not have the heart to do so after lovingly tending their plots for so many years. Quite a few of them cycle or walk in to the allotments as they do not now drive so how are they supposed to get to the new proposed site? I also will give up driving within the next few years. I therefore feel discriminated against by the allotments being moved so far away. Oh, I appreciate as the crow flies it is not that far but I am not a crow and wish to retain my existing allotment out of convenience.</p> <p>I was bitterly disappointed having waited so long to get half a plot to find out that the council is planning to profit from allotments which are needed by our community. I thought the National Planning Policy Framework was aimed at preventing land grabbing by councils. Additionally, this is a Grade 2 community owned greenfield site. Greenbelt land should not be used for housing when there are other sites available e.g. empty retail sites which have been lying empty for years. We need more allotments not just new supermarkets.</p> <p>I understand that the allotments are 'running at a loss'. Please explain under the Freedom of Information Act how this can be so. What type of overhead is being applied to this land to create a deficit. Water is</p>					

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>provided – what other costs are applied. Modern accounting practices of applying overheads smacks of creative accounting where a piece of land is concerned in my opinion. The waiting list administration is done by the committee who do an excellent job also of running and maintaining the site on behalf of the council for the benefit of the plot holders. It stands to reason that if this piece of land is ‘running at a loss’ that the proposed new allotments will also run at a loss unless, of course, the council is planning to hike up the fees considerably. A new gate and fences were put up this year at Roeshot without, I believe, consultation with the allotment holders who were not even advised the work was being carried out – is this a way of ‘proving’ that the allotments are running ‘at a loss’. As a ratepayer I would like to know how much these ‘improvements’ cost and if they are a requirement of the proposed sale to the developer. I am a reasonably fit woman but find the gate heavy and cumbersome to use. Has anyone at the council actually used this gate for themselves. As for keeping out thieves and vandals – they would open the gate just as allotment holders do. Though at night the gate is locked it is my understanding thieves steal during daylight hours too. I would like to point out that since we moved here in 1986 Hoburne have built an estate which included playgrounds for the families it was presumed would live there. These rusted as the people who moved in were largely retired to reflect the age of the population in the Christchurch area and eventually the swings and slides were taken away. Why has the social housing element of the proposed housing been reduced. Our children moved out of the area due to the high cost of housing. Councils should be providing social housing not selling houses off to make a short term profit. Or indeed selling off allotment land again to make this short term profit. If the 850 houses are to house newly retired people coming into the area – tell me, what is the point if it is not to house local people? Incidentally, how many of these might require allotment plots.</p> <p>The site of the proposed development is hardly conducive to peaceful living being as it is located next to a noisy railway line, noisy bypass and the busy A35 oh, and a gravel pit the other side. Access in and out on the A35 is bad enough for allotment holders at the moment let alone a housing development. It is my understanding that when Hoburne built their development, the existing road i.e. Westfield Gardens which was linked to the estate was closed off so access to the estate was NOT via the A35.</p> <p>I wish to reiterate my objection to the proposals as I do not wish the land at Roeshot Hill to be sold off for</p>					

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename		
											development.							
656222	Mrs Jane Atkinson		CSPS3601	Policy CN 1							<p>Re: Roeshot Hill Allotments</p> <p>I am writing to protect strongly against the banishment of the allotmenters currently cultivating land at Roeshot Hill to farmland in Burton.</p> <p>At Roeshot Hill, we have land brought to a healthy tilth by generations of gardeners. My own plot is far from exemplary, and had been badly maintained when I took it over, but in the eight years I have had it, I know it has had huge quantities of compost and manure spread upon it, no chemicals, and digging it the other day I was struck by what good soil it now is.</p> <p>By contrast, I understand from a conversation a relative had recently with the lady who farms the land, the proposed new site is not only quite unsuitable for allotments - it isn't even suitable for farming. In the winter, the cows refuse to walk on the waterlogged land – so no way could this be used for allotments.</p> <p>Sadly, I feel this shows contempt by the council for the well-being of tis citizens. It is a statutory right that they should have access to some good land for the purpose of feeding themselves – this is not a sinecure, either, but a job which requires hard work and commitment, but contributes both to the health of the gardener and that of his/her family who eat the food produced.</p> <p>This is quite beside the politics of vacating our land for housing. I understand there to be plenty of space for affordable homes as well as allotments, although I question whether it would be sensible to add extra traffic to this busy and dangerous road. Many are the times when my digging has been accompanied by the sound of emergency vehicles and the road has been closed.</p> <p>Please listen to the citizens who contributed the majority view that the allotments should be retained in their current position. Should the allotments be used for low-density housing, I consider this would be dereliction of duty by the council to its poorest citizens, and those who wish to grow good quality food at a time of economic hardship, not only those currently doing so but also those on the huge waiting list.</p>					298		
656704	Ms Nicole Keenan		CSPS3434	Policy CN 1							<p>Objecting to housing in Burton (CN2) and allotments in Burton (CN1)</p> <p>I wish to object to the above for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The land is green belt and should not be destroyed there are alternative sites that could be used without using this land • The proposed site is in Burton's conservation area. Again this will damage the infrastructure and further ruin an unspoilt area • The proposed site is a flood risk area and adjacent to 						298	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	
											<p>further at risk area. If building is undertaken there the waters will be displaced to endanger nearby properties</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a farm which is in the middle of the proposed site. This employs people so jobs would be lost • The roads in and around the village are not designed to take any more traffic; they will become congested and dangerous • The increase in the population will therefore require more facilities i.e. schools, shops, doctors, pharmacy, leisure areas and outlets, general shops etc. There are no plans to do this. Current outlets are not enough • The new residents would want to go into Christchurch and Bournemouth – but the bus service is very limited • The proposals do not show anywhere where people can walk into the village from the new houses. As they therefore would be unlikely to walk, the increase in cars would be damaging to the existing roads • The roads are not big enough to cope with much more traffic this will result in major hold ups which would have a knock on effect back to other areas and even discourage visitors. The increase would also risk danger to children and elderly and pedestrians • Also, if the allotment sites are moved as proposed, there will be a massive increase in persons, cars, congestion, danger and movement. The existing roads cannot sustain this. • It will add further traffic and thoroughfare problems, causing more wear and tear on roads. • The increase in individuals would mean a less safe village, as there are no facilities for teenagers and youngsters one would expect the crime rate to increase... 						
656708	Mrs Ann Goodchild		CSPS3449	Policy CN 1							<p>Comments for CN2 reproduced here - see point 10 reference to allotments relocation to Burton I should like to record my strongest objections to the development detailed above.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This land is green belt. I feel this should not be eroded and am angered that it can be used and destroyed for purposes of housing. Green belt and lands are reducing I feel this belt in Burton should be preserved. There are many other sites that are NOT green belt – please use one of them 2. There is a farm which is central to our village life. This should not be destroyed. The farm is also an employer and getting rid of it will result in loss of jobs 3. The proposed site is in Burton's conservation area. This area will therefore be damaged and many houses will mean many more pedestrians and car drives. This will harm further the area. 4. The roads in and around the village are not designed to take any more traffic; they will become 					298	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	
											<p>congested and dangerous.</p> <p>5. The increase in population will therefore require more schools, shops, doctors, pharmacy, childcare, leisure areas restaurants to name but a few. We do not currently have the facilities to support such an increase.</p> <p>6. The increase in individuals would mean a less safe village, it may encourage loitering of adolescents and an increase in crime as there is no facilities for teenagers and youngsters.</p> <p>7. Any/all new residents would presumably wish to travel into Christchurch/Bournemouth – we do not have adequate roads and bus services to enable this.</p> <p>8. The proposals do not give any natural walkways into the village centre. Are we to understand therefore that everyone will use cars as it is too far to walk? – Further damage to roads and danger to children and elderly and pedestrians.</p> <p>9. The proposed site is a known flood risk area and adjacent to. If building is undertaken there the waters will be displaced to endanger existing properties.</p> <p>10. If the allotment sites are moved as proposed the massive increase in persons using it will add further traffic and thoroughfare problems, causing additional wear and tear on roads, congestion, anger and danger.</p> <p>I feel the proposal is rushed; we were not informed until Stage 3.</p> <p>There are other more appropriate sites.</p>						
656725	Mr and Mrs Tinkler		CSPS3462	Policy CN 1							<p>Comments reproduced here for Policy CN1 as refers to allotments in Burton.</p> <p>HOUSING AND ALLOTMENTS IN BURTON</p> <p>I wish to object to the planning proposals most strongly for the following reasons:</p> <p>1. Loss of valuable Green Belt land, surely you have alternative sites available for development that are not in the Green Belt.</p> <p>2. The roads through our village cannot support the huge amount of extra traffic that will be generated and as for the Stony Lane roundabout, that is already an absolute nightmare! Goodness knows what it will be like in the tourist season and what a marvellous welcome to our beautiful Christchurch where time is pleasant..well, they will certainly have plenty of time sitting in the traffic to digest that little gem.</p> <p>3. The proposed site is in the Burton Conservation area which will be severely damaged by such a large development, and what about Burton Farm? The loss of this will surely mean loss of valuable jobs.</p> <p>If these plans are approved, Burton will eventually lose its village identity and become part of the</p>					298	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											Christchurch/Highcliffe conurbation, like a mini Bournemouth and what a planning concrete joy that is!					
656732	Ms Celia Burch		CSPS3499	Policy CN 1							<p>I am writing to object strongly to the Planning Proposals for 45 (maybe possibly a lot more) new houses in the land south of Alder and Medlar Closes, and also the relocation of allotments. I have lived in various parts of Burton since 1982, and purchased 9 Alder Close two and a half years ago, because of its quiet cul-de-sac location and lovely views of the fields with cattle and horses.</p> <p>Planning policy CN2 NOT JUSTIFIED – The proposed site lies within the Burton Conservation area, and this would be severely damaged. The area is Green Belt, which is direct contravention of national policy - it is not justified or consistent with this. There is no exceptional reason here to reduce Green Belt. There are alternative sites which are not in the Green Belt that are available. Burton already has a substantial amount of affordable housing, therefore reduction of Green Belt to accommodate this is not acceptable. This could be just the start, as it opens up corridors for future development. Burton is a VILLAGE and that it how it should stay - not eventually joining up with Somerford/Christchurch.</p> <p>Burton Farm, which is an integral part of our village, will be lost, with the consequential loss of jobs, as a direct result of CN1 and CN2. The village's roads cannot take any extra traffic, it is already bad enough trying to get out of Burton at the Stony Lane roundabout and slip road onto A35. Not many people will walk or cycle, this is unrealistic. With regard to flooding, which is a risk around this area, it is not possible to demonstrate and so is not deliverable. CN1 – moving of allotments and further housing. These should be in a suitable accessible location for a range of transport – this is contradictory and therefore undeliverable.</p> <p>In conclusion, my property would lose value if the end of Alder Close were opened up for access, either by car or just as a pathway. Youths would undoubtedly gather in any alley/footpath. This would ruin the peaceful and picturesque Close that I live in making it harder to sell should I want to move because of the development proceeding. Burton is a lovely quiet and peaceful village – let us keep it this way!</p> <p>I urge the Planners to think again regarding these developments. They are not wanted or needed in this part of our village. Please look again at other much more suitable sites within the Borough.</p>				298	
656736	Ken Ramsay		CSPS3465	Policy CN 1							I have a plot at Roeshot Hill allotments. Like other plot holders I grow gooseberry bushes and strawberries				298	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											and all kinds of vegetables. If anyone needs help they receive it. It is a social thing where experienced plot holders will advise you when to plant crops and when to harvest. This is an institute which would be broken up with a loss of friendships. The housing quota could be located elsewhere. I say no to housing were the allotment would be.					
656770	Mrs Monica Warr		CSPS3592	Policy CN 1							I am writing to you - to PLEAD not to sell off Roeshot Hill Allotments. This is an important part of my life, especially as my late son set this up for me. My plot (38) is my pride and joy, and very special to me, and where I find inner peace. Also the community spirit very supportive.				298	
656776	Mr and Mrs S V King		CSPS3593	Policy CN 1							I am writing about the Roeshot Hill allotments which I have one. Please don't take the allotments away from us. Many people especially some elderly people enjoy coming down to the allotments to enjoy the gardening the fresh air and exercise and also meeting some very nice people to have a chat so have a heart and let us all enjoy our hobby without the council taking it away from us.				298	
656778	Derek Keetch		CSPS3594	Policy CN 1							Re: Roeshot Hill Allotments As a plot holder who was on the waiting list for three years for my plot I object to the proposal to relocate the allotments to another site and to build dwellings on the existing one. There is an ongoing need for allotments, as evidenced by the waiting list, and do not feel the new site is the best option. More plot holders will need to travel to the new site by car, will there be adequate parking? The roads in this area are always busy and with these new homes the situation will be made even worse. In the overall scheme of things are there plans and funds allocated for road improvements, additional school places and other services? As the scheme will go ahead with no regard to plot holders feelings or comments I would enquire if there will be any compensation available to assist in the moving, or replacement of greenhouses and sheds etc				298	
656786	Mrs Debbie Hart		CSPS3595	Policy CN 1							I write to object to the proposed building of forty five new houses on the land south of Alder and Medlar Closes, Burton on planning grounds. I believe that the local roads are at capacity especially in the summer and therefore will not be able to cope with the additional traffic this development will bring. Also, this is green belt land and a conservation area. Do these titles mean anything. How of these proposals got this far anyway.				298	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
656789	Mr G R Chester		CSPS3596	Policy CN 1							<p>HOUSING & ALLOTMENTS IN BURTON CN2 & CN1 – LOCAL PLAN</p> <p>I object to the above proposals on the grounds that the land in question is valuable green belt land separating Burton from Christchurch Town. Alternative sites not in the green belt are available.</p> <p>It is obvious that the proposal is being driven by the landowner and is no doubt tied up with possible proposed gravel excavation and possible future housing on land adjoining the A35 Roeshot Hill.</p> <p>The roads in Burton are not adequate now and the movement of 70 or 80 vehicles from CN2 together with a large unknown quantity of vehicles from CN1 are going to bring further chaos to the roads within the village & Stony Lane roundabout.</p> <p>In addition I do not want to see the loss of Burton Farm which is within Burton Conservation Area together with the loss of associated jobs.</p> <p>Let's make sure that future generations grow up appreciating agriculture which in time will be vital for food production.</p> <p>I am lucky enough to have been born in Christchurch some 70 years ago, let's make sure that all parts of the borough do remain a place where time is pleasant, it is in your hands.</p>				298	
656794	Pam Higginson		CSPS3515	Policy CN 1							<p>It has come to my knowledge that there are several housing planning applications by Christchurch Council in process all around where I live.</p> <p>It is nigh impossible to find out any details via the web, and it is only through 'word-of-mouth' or some person I know having received information that I have found out about this.</p> <p>Why is it that all these applications are not made known to all Christchurch residents in an easily accessible form?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Roeshot Hill housing 2) Burton Farm (Farwells) 3) Transfer of Roeshot Hill allotments 4) Business/retail outlets on south of Somerford Rd 5) Gravel extraction to north of railway line Burton Common area <p>My objections to ALL OF THESE mainly concern the unnecessary destruction of 'green belt', and the excessive traffic all this housing/allotments/gravel extraction will bring to the already busy A35 and Stony Lane.</p> <p>Apart from destroying green belt, the building of houses south of the railway line to the bypass, and from Salisbury Rd, Burton right up to Roeshot Hill is unbelievable! Who, in their right minds, would want to buy a house right next to a railway line anyway!!</p>				298	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	
											<p>Combined with the building on fields in the area of Burton Farm, all this will totally destroy the rural feel of the area. Green belt should REMAIN GREEN BELT - otherwise it makes a mockery of the classification?! The increase in cars/lorries from all these plans will cause an excessive increase in traffic - particularly out onto the A35, Salisbury Rd and Stony Lane, where congestion already occurs.</p> <p>More retail/superstores are NOT needed in this area. Additional housing should be built on these Brownfield sites. If a site off Grange Rd can be allocated for building for gypsies!! Then it should now be used to building homes for those residents in need locally. 2035 new homes is excessive, considering the number of properties that are already up for sale around the area. This area is well-known for attracting second-home/holiday home buyers, so who would monitor that these 'affordable' houses will only be bought by local young people who are in need? Or that the prices will stay affordable?</p> <p>Please accept this letter of objection.</p>						
656798	Mr Peter Collins		CSPS3558	Policy CN 1							<p>I would like to take this opportunity to register my complete objection to various items within the above document.</p> <p>As someone who was born in the village of Burton in 1957 I have seen many changes to the appearance of the village but feel enough is enough if the village is to retain its rural charm and character.</p> <p>Policy CN1 Location and scale of housing. North Christchurch Urban Extension Strategic Allocation. This is not positively prepared, not justified, cannot be effective and is not consistent with national planning policy framework due to the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The land is greenbelt and should remain so 2. The relocation of the Roeshot Hill allotments to the area to the East of Salisbury Road and South of Summers Lane will cause increased traffic congestion in Salisbury Road and Martins Hill Lane and further congestion at the Stony Lane and Fountain roundabouts. 3. By taking a large portion of the farms pasture land it will most probably make the farm unworkable causing the farm to fail with the loss of jobs. The farm has been worked by the Farwell family for well over 100 years and is a strong part of the village community and should most definitely remain so. 4. The provision of suitable alternative natural Greenspace (SAGS) to the North of the railway line running East from Salisbury Road to Burton Common SSSI is already in place as natural farmland but this is under threat by the proposed gravel pit from Hawthorn 					298	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>Road to Burton Common. The loss of this Greenspace for gravel extraction if allowed will last years and is totally unjustified.</p> <p>5. The proposed development will cause significantly increased traffic problems entering Christchurch and around the Bargates area together with greatly increased traffic at Staplecross</p> <p>6. Ambury Lane at present provides access for horse riders to Burton Common safely and unhindered by traffic, this will be negated by this proposed development</p> <p>7. Will the current sewage works at Stony Lane be able to cope with the increased numbers of residents that this development will create?</p> <p>8. Will the existing schools be able to accommodate increased volumes of pupils that this development will create?</p>					
656827	Mr R Sutton		CSPS3586	Policy CN 1							<p>Having rented an allotment at Roeshot since 1984, I feel that I have to write to express my concerns over the proposed moving of said allotments to an as yet unknown site, to make way for what turns out to be the most unpopular of the 4 development options that the public were asked their opinion on. My first question is why ask the public their opinion and then completely disregard it? Is it just a case of having to have public consultation as a public relations exercise and then finding that it wasn't what the Council wanted to hear? Why hasn't the Council consulted with Roeshot Hill Allotment Association directly regarding the proposed development? Surely it is only common courtesy to work directly with the Association, something seemingly lacking in this day and age.</p> <p>I have never driven a car, preferring to rely on Public Transport, Bicycling or walking, so any changes to the siting of the allotments is going to be of extreme concern to me. It takes me about 15 minutes from home to walk to my exiting plot or 5 minutes by bicycle. Walking is the only way that I can take any gardening tools or plants over to the plot from home, so it would be completely impractical for me to do that if the site was moved further away. I hear a potential site could be in the Burton area. Would that be within the statutory ¾ miles from the existing site? That would mean yet more cars on the already overcrowded by-pass and incredibly difficult for others without any transport - I know of several other plot-holders in the same position as myself.</p> <p>I would like to feel that I have a voice in this matter as I have been a Council Tax payer since 1982 and have not sent a letter of objection to the council until now. With Council services being whittled away, I feel now</p>				298	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											is the time to make my voice heard.					
662780	Mr Anthony Page		CSPS3476	Policy CN 1	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes		<p>Para 6.40 - The 'Council has prepared a borough wide allotments strategy (2011) which has identified current and future requirements for allotment provision across the borough over the plan period and sets out standards to be applied to the provision of new allotments. The replacement allotments for Roeshot Hill will form part of a larger 'hub site' contributing towards current unmet need and future Requirements'</p> <p>This statement was duly dismissed following previous consultation where identified numbers were proved to be inaccurate and overly inflated. It was also duly proved that the notional use of 'ghost' numbers- those would apply if the waiting list was less, was also proved to be biased and have not scientific sounding and based on no accurate information, but solely based on conjecture</p> <p>It is not clear on the legality of the term 'Pinch Point' and what such a term is attempting to imply a need to rationalize the removal of the Allotment site. The plans show now impact of such a statement, in fact the proposed exit from the proposed new build provides a very high risk to those using such an exit onto a very congested and busy A35 major link road.</p> <p>I read with dismay and disbelief that the Council's proposed strategy document, even after consultation, the Council have chosen to the most unpopular option for the Roeshot Allotment site.</p> <p>It is incredulous that no consideration or discussion has been given, as to the consequence on the Mundeford and surrounding community wards. The impact on the allotment community will be devastating, and will disadvantage many of the more mature and vulnerable populous, who add depth and diversity to the community as a whole.</p> <p>After many years of careful cultivation of the land and cropping, many of the older community have concerns that they would not be in a position to start over again, given their age and health. It unbelievable and unclear why the Council has taken such a stance, which clearly disadvantages a key part of the community in which they serve though our taxes.</p> <p>The proposed new site not only exceeds the statutory minimum distance, it impacts on the majority of the community holders, which increases journey time, which require additional transport costs, this also includes the crossing of an already congested dual carriageway and at times navigating a potentially hazardous roundabout with fast moving traffic.</p> <p>In short, I object to the Christchurch Core Strategy</p>	The Roeshot Hill Allotment Provision to remain at the present location and the current allocation of the new site used to built any additional housing as identified in the Council's Strategic Housing Market Assessment (2011)	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		298	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	
											document on the grounds that: The plans are discriminative to the community, forcing those who are unable to travel to the new proposed site by car, too old and of poor health to start all over again to give up their passion of allotment growing and community enrichment. The new proposed site increases the journey from the existing site to the new site, which exceeds the current permissible under the statutory protected allotment criteria. No clear justification has been provided for moving the Allotment site and the devastating impact on the community, whilst increasing the communities overall costs. The term 'Pinch Point' has no clarification or meaning and serves no relevance other than providing a vague attempt to rationalise the move						
662829	Mrs Jane Merrett		CSPS3495	Policy CN 1		No	No	No	No	No	Positively Prepared - No: Re allotments - information none re farm. A non-biasd decision. Consistent with national policy - No. Statutory site and under the Allotment Act - we are not surplus to requirements 6. 1) You have not researched and provided information about the allotments as you have not talked to us (other than TOLD us). You have no idea what is done for the community and hence there is no information in the Core Strategy documents to enable ANYONE to make an unbiased decision on our behalf. 2) We are a STATUTORY SITE and are NOT surplus to requirements. 3) From page 300 of the Core Strategy document October 2010 sect 14.18 first paragraph, the relocation of our allotments is not justified as under UE3 (+ burying the pylons) and the Meyrick land is sufficient for affordable homes.	Please see 6 above. You are the people who can make the document legally compliant and sound but please bear in mind before relocating us that our allotments have been summed up as 'OUR PRIDE AND JOY' (spoken by a non-allotment holder of Indian extraction who definitely knows the local community better than the Council and Councillors!).				298	
662947	Mr Neville Voysey		CSPS3536	Policy CN 1	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Green belt must be protected. Inappropriate development. Will not prevent urban sprawl. Does not protect countryside. Does not prevent towns and villages merging. There are no exceptional circumstances to allow building. Adverse effect on character of village.	Have a local referendum to determine if residents approve of urban sprawl. This will make the whole thing legal and sound	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	Someone needs to tell the truth about the extent of urban sprawl.	298		
662967	Mr Ronald Brailey		CSPS3550	Policy CN 1	No	No	No	No	No	No	Re the moving of allotments to the Hawthorn Rd/Summers Lane Area One of the criteria you state is case of access. I live off Summers Lane and the congestion and inconvenience caused on a Sunday by either a cycle meet or a half marathon is quite substantial. So the extra traffic created by a potential 400 allotments down these narrow roads would be a nightmare.	Leave the allotments where they are as shown on other options.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		298		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											Also in Holly Gardens we have a problem with rats from the farm. The farmer does try to keep them under control. Would the allotment owners ?					
663076	Mrs S Richards		CSPS3617	Policy CN 1							<p>CN1 Allotments</p> <p>I oppose the relocation of allotments to the fields behind Burton Farmhouse referring again to the Broadway Malyan Master Plan of 2010. The plan to make this area an allotment hub for Christchurch with in excess of 300 allotments could necessitate the building of a toilet block, produce shop and car park on the site, not to mention the presence of myriads of users' sheds. This would be in contradiction to the Plan.</p> <p>Traffic (CN1 and CN2)</p> <p>The traffic generated around Burton by both schemes would have a great and detrimental effect on the locality. The 45 (possibly 135) houses could potentially generate double that number of cars or more, with children being ferried to schools in Burton, Somerford or Christchurch. In the case of the allotments, not everyone travels by bicycle or walks, so the number of users' cars, possibly more so at the weekends, could be enormous, on country roads not built for such traffic. Salisbury Road could have backlogs of traffic waiting to go out onto the fast-moving by-pass, including cars coming from the Burton end of the Roeshot Hill housing development. This could be a recipe for accidents. The impact on Stony Lane out to the by-pass roundabout, already with problems of tailbacks, would be huge. Not to mention the onward effect of all this traffic on the Fountain roundabout.</p>				298	
663358	Judith M Ward		CSPS3646	Policy CN 1							<p>I object to the above mentioned proposals for the following reasons:-</p> <p>It is wrong to build homes on green belt land when there are alternative sites that could be used and is a direct contravention of national policy. CN2 has not been in the previous stages of consultation and I believe it is only in now, due to the intervention of the landowner.</p> <p>This development is in the Salisbury Road Conversation Area, the character of which will be changed by the housing and the relocation of the allotments from Roeshot Hill. It is also taking land from Burton Farm, a working farm, which makes a valuable contribution to the Conversation Area, this will be lost together with jobs.</p> <p>Allotments should be sites in the most accessible locations, Salisbury Road and the lanes of Burton are inadequate and not possible to improve. The amount of traffic generated by this housing and allotments will</p>				298	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename		
											be huge, access to Stoney Lane and Christchurch bypass is already difficult at certain periods of the day and the volume of extra traffic generated would be impossible, causing more back-up in Barrack Road and Fairmile Road. I have lived in Christchurch all of my life and in this lovely area for the past forty six years and I urge you most strongly to reject these proposals and not spoil the character of the village of Burton.							
663473	Paul and Sue Walker		CSPS3657	Policy CN 1							We have lived in Christchurch all our lives and have noticed over many years how Christchurch has changed from a historic town with unique areas of natural beauty e.g. Mudeford Quay, Christchurch Quay to a modern town with new estates bordering Bournemouth, Highcliffe. If this continuous development is aloud to happen, soon Christchurch will be a suburb of a large residential area and it will change the town considerably. New developments cram people into small areas and produce all sorts of social problems e.g. neighbour disputes, small rear gardens so children play in the road, insufficient parking so cars park in gardens and on pavements, inferior buildings that won't last 100 years like some of the existing character properties in Christchurch, lack of schools, medical services, and pressure on all aspects of living. Having worked in the housing department at Christchurch, its social housing thats needed and not homes to buy. There is a glut of properties for sale in Christchurch and it was difficult to find people who qualified to purchase the new build shared ownership properties on Somerford estate two years ago. I am strongly against the above proposals.					298		
663486	Jill and Alan Brown		CSPS3658	Policy CN 1							As members of the Roeshot Hill Allotments for around seven years now, my husband and I are deeply concerned about the proposal to build housing on this site and surrounding area that consists largely of low density housing for incomers to the area who will be seeking retirement homes. This will be of absolutley no benefit to the people of Christchurch. We believe that the allotments, which are a community area and blessed with a strong community spirit, should remain in place and the housing built on Roeshot Hill should all be affordable properties aimed at the young families of Christchurch.						298	
663514	J Goodman		CSPS3663	Policy CN 1							The principle of building on greenfield sites, when brownfield land is available is totally unacceptable. I hope the number of new homes will be kept to the minimum. Separation of dwellings from linked open space is not						298	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	
											acceptable (esp. when the barrier is a railway embankment.) Retention of overhead cables through any new residential area is not acceptable. any 'affordable' housing should have guarantees that safeguard it remains 'affordable' any new retail units should remain in proportion to any new development, and not further reduce the viability of Christchurch's 'High St' shopping area						
359571	Mr Renny Henderson	Royal Society for the Protection of Birds	CSPS3715	Policy CN 1							We object to policy CN1, pending progression of a mitigation strategy necessary to avoid adverse effects on the European sites. In the absence of greater details on the SANG element, we are concerned over the potential impacts of this proposal. We do support the principles within policy CN1 to create a "river buffer", in-scheme open space and a SANG north of the railway which will be delivered in accordance with policy ME3. We also support the confirmation that the SANG will need to be in place prior to development coming forward within the site (paragraph 6.53), and the commitment to monitoring and "improvements" if monitoring indicates the SANG is not functional in respect of criteria in policy ME3.		Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	we would like to confirm that we wish to reserve the right to appear at the Examination into the Core Strategy, on the grounds the Core Strategy raises significant issues relating to the protection of internationally important wildlife sites (as highlighted in the HRA) and that there remains uncertainty over the delivery of appropriate and effective mitigation measures.	298		
361028	Ms Helen Patton	New Forest National Park Authority	CSPS3790	Policy CN 1							Chapter 6 Christchurch Urban Extension Housing Option UE1 The Authority supports the proposed option of locating new housing south of the railway line. The Authority has in the past stated that housing north of the railway line would have a far greater impact in terms of the visual and landscape setting of the National Park where long distance views are offered from Burton Common, when compared to development south of the railway line and this aspect of the urban extension proposal is supported. Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG) provision The Authority broadly welcomes the principles behind the proposed habitat mitigation measures, including providing a suitable alternative greenspace (SANG), to attract people away from the Dorset Heathlands, the New Forest National Park and Sites of Special Scientific Interest (including Burton Common in the National Park). These are an essential part of the infrastructure package required to support the scale of residential development proposed. The Authority however, would like to raise the following concerns regarding the SANG. There is a considerable lack of detail within the Submission draft Core Strategy on the proposed					298	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>SANG. It was only in April 2012 that the Authority was first informed through officer discussions that the principal area of SANG – a fundamental element of the infrastructure required to support the urban extension - is proposed to be located within the National Park (and therefore under the Authority’s planning remit), immediately adjacent to a SSSI in unfavourable condition. This proposal could run directly contrary to the stated aim of relieving pressures on the New Forest arising from the new development.</p> <p>The lack of publicly available details on the proposed location and size of the SANG within the Pre-Submission document means at this key stage of Plan preparation the Authority (and others) are not provided with an opportunity to comment on any of the details of a proposal. Based on the limited information received through meetings with the Borough Council and the landowner, we believe that planning permission would be required from the Authority for the provision of a SANG on what is currently agricultural land within the National Park. It would therefore have been expedient if the Authority as the local planning authority for the proposed SANG had been involved with the Urban Extension Advisory Group referred to in the “Christchurch Urban Extension Background Paper (April 2012).” Para 2.7 of this document refers to this group being established in April 2008 and lists neighbouring authorities as one of the attendees, yet the Authority has had no involvement in this group over the last 4 years.</p> <p>Paragraph 6.25 also refers to a SANG Strategy (2012) which has been prepared for the Urban Extension by the landowner (the Meyrick Estate) in consultation with Natural England as an acceptable approach to mitigating the impacts of the urban extension. However, despite the Core Strategy stating that this document is available online and several requests, a copy of the document has not been made available. This highlights the difficulty in responding to this aspect of the urban extension proposal in any detail. The Authority is concerned that there has been limited opportunities to be involved with discussions with the landowner, Natural England, Christchurch Borough Council and other interested parties on the future development of the SANG, the principal area of which will be located on land within the Authority’s jurisdiction. The Localism Act introduced the new legal ‘duty to co-operate’ across local authority boundaries and the SANG proposals illustrate where this co-operation and liaison should be occurring to ensure the delivery of the major proposal within the draft Core Strategy. It is vital that the Authority – which has</p>					

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>expertise available in landscape, access and biodiversity issues for example – is involved in the detailed development of the SANG proposals.</p> <p>Para 6.49 Minerals Working</p> <p>The Authority is pleased to note that reference has been made within the draft Core Strategy to the need for careful consideration to be given to the location of and access to the SANG in order to avoid possible conflict with identified mineral sites on land in Dorset and Hampshire. However, as stated above, the Authority is concerned that given the importance of the habitat mitigation measures, no details have been provided on the proposed location of the SANG within the consultation document for interested parties, such as mineral companies to have an opportunity to comment upon. Based on the limited information supplied following meetings with the Borough Council and the Meyrick Estate, it would appear that the principal eastern SANG will be traversed by the main lorry route proposed to serve the adjacent minerals workings. This raises serious questions about how effective this principal SANG would be in attracting people away from the protected habitats in Dorset and the New Forest.</p> <p>Transport Impacts</p> <p>As set out in our previous consultation response on the Options for Consideration document (January 2011), the Authority supports the recognition in the document that the urban extension will generate additional traffic which will have an impact on the capacity of the existing highway network. However, the Authority remains concerned that the South East Dorset Multi Modal Study and the A35 Route Management Study examined the impact of the urban extension on the highway network and only determined the specific improvements required to junctions solely within South East Dorset. The wider cross-boundary implications of an increase in traffic should be assessed, for example the likely increase in traffic on the A35 including through Lyndhurst, an Air Quality Management Area, and should not be confined to looking at the necessary junction improvements. It is unclear from the revised Core Strategy document whether these wider cross-boundary studies have indeed been carried out. The Authority reiterates that potential impacts on the Forest roads should be properly assessed and supports the view of New Forest District Council that the proposed development north of Christchurch should not be progressed if these impacts are shown to be unacceptable.</p> <p>There is a lack of detail within the Submission draft Core Strategy on the proposed SANG which is a key</p>					

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>element of the infrastructure required to support the 850 dwellings proposed. The principal area of this SANG is on land within the National Park and the Authority is therefore disappointed that this has only recently been brought to our attention despite the new 'duty to cooperate' on cross-boundary issues.</p> <p>The Authority remains concerned about the relationship between the SANG and the adjacent proposals for minerals extraction. If the principal eastern SANG is to be effective in attracting people away from the protected habitats in Dorset and the New Forest, it must not be blighted by the proposed lorry route crossing it to serve the minerals sites.</p> <p>The wider cross-boundary traffic implications of the proposals for the urban extension and the employment development at the Airport on the New Forest should be fully assessed.</p>					
490815	Mrs Trish Jamieson	Burton Parish Council	CSPS3669	Policy CN 1							<p>Burton Village is felt by those who live there to be a very special community. Despite the spurt of housing growth in the 1960s and 1970s the new development was confined to the area between Salisbury Road and Stony Lane and Burton's essential character as a rural village has been maintained. This is recognised by the establishment of the Burton Conservation Area, which protects the core of the old village and its essential features.</p> <p>The Parish Council, elected in May 2011, in commenting on these proposals has as its aim the preservation and enhancement of the character of the village and the lives of its residents by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> _ Preventing development inimical to the village _ Supporting and promoting appropriate developments <p>To this end the Council supports the need for a new Local Plan and Core Strategy and acknowledges that without the new plan there is a considerable danger that developers will be able to seek to pursue development proposals which might not be in the best interests of the Village.</p> <p>The Parish Council also accepts that the new Core Strategy offers opportunities to protect services and facilities in the village, and to develop new ones - for example, to pursue extensions to public transport, to protect local shops and facilities, and to secure improvements to private transport.</p> <p>Aware of the difficulties facing young couples with roots in the village finding housing, the Council welcomes the commitment to allowing a development of 100% affordable housing and will seek the adoption of a Rural Exception policy for Burton.</p>				298	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	
											<p>For these reasons the Council welcomes many of the new policies and proposals, but it has to be noted that it has serious concerns over proposed Policy CN2.</p> <p>2. The Green Belt The Council strongly supports Policy KS2. The Council in particular notes and stresses the need to protect the separate physical identity of Burton by maintaining the Green Wedge between the village and Somerford. The Council notes that this wedge will be eroded from the south by the inclusion of Ambury Lane in the proposed Roeshot Hill urban extension and notes that the boundary of the Parish runs along the centre of Ambury Lane: thus development south of the railway line but north of Ambury Lane will be within the Parish. The Council is concerned over this development.</p> <p>3. Transport While supporting this policy the Council points to the serious morning peak time congestion in Stony Lane North caused by the inadequate junction with the A35 at Stony Lane. The Council stresses that there is a very urgent need for improvements at this junction and that these are needed now, before any development takes place on the proposed urban extension.</p>						
524088	Mr Ken Parke	Ken Parke Planning Consultants	CSPS3636	Policy CN 1	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Please see attached representations document and appendices	Please see attached representations document and appendices	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	The representation has a significant bearing on the distribution of housing within the district and will require detailed oral examination.	298	2260318_0_1.pdf	
663352	Mr Gary Collins		CSPS3701	Policy CN 1							<p>I lived in the village for 24 years and when I married and moved to West Moors where I live at present with my wife, and two children.</p> <p>Due to work demands for both my wife and I we had decided to look to moving to Burton in order that we are near my mother, and father for child care reasons. On hearing of the above proposals we are putting our move on hold the reasons as follows:</p> <p>CN1 & 2 Polices will cause: FALLING HOUSE PRICES TRAFFIC CONGESTION BEYOND BELIEF THE DEMISE OF THE VILLAGE</p> <p>Burton is a village approx 3 kilometres form Christchurch Town Centre and according to the 'CONSERVATION APPRAISAL & MANAGEMENT PLAN' adopted by Christchurch Council in February 2007 – is within a conservation area designated on 30th Jan 1986 – amended 15th June 1995 – and adapted as above in Feb. 2007 – points mentioned</p>					298	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>were:</p> <p>OPEN RURAL ASPECT THE SURVIVAL OF FARMS AND BUILDINGS The proposed plans seem to go against all of the above. Also the land in question is categorised as GREEN BELT, which would eventually cause the loss of the only working, farm in the village, unemployment for the formworks and will interfere with the whole Village Status, Character and Scale. Our village is a rural area so in no way does it require an URBAN DEVELOPMENT. The above report ends under the heading of CONCLUSION as follows:- ‘The semi informal spatial qualities of Burton Green enclosed by high quality historic buildings, the hamlet of Martins Hill Lane with its small intimate scale and the Valuable Survival of Burton Farm: a working Farm of historic farm buildings and farmhouse all contribute to the high quality historic environment and the distinct sense of peace in Burton’ all the above would and could be destroyed.</p> <p>CN2 – HOUSES OBJECTION: FLOOD RISK & TRAFFIC CONGESTION The houses are planned for a piece of land which again is part of the above farm, the fields in question are low grade grazing, as the bottom half floods on a regular basis and contradicts Core Strategy P20 which states land should adapt to emerging demands of climate change through clear strategies to reduce risk of flooding, and Core Strategy policy ME6 says planning should demonstrate that flood risk does not increase as a result of development, not build on land that is highlighted as to be at risk. As national policy talks of possible sea-level increase of 1 to meters in height and possible storm surges that could extend flood risk zone far beyond the currant flood plain. The make up of the 45 properties within the proposed development is to include 50% low cost housing, the site is 150 meters closer to the existing sewer works in Stony Lane were on a bad day the aroma can be somewhat ripe. I fail to believe that private buyers would wish to purchase properties on a potential flood risk area, near a sewer farm and railway line, in a traffic congested area, thus the majority or all the properties could be offered as low cost housing, giving those residents little option but to live within the above described conditions. This is morally wrong. The access to the site will be on Salisbury Road near the crossroads of Summers Lane and Martins Hill Lane, through what has been described as a mix of low grade industrial units, thus making use of existing and part disused farm buildings, The plan talks also of</p>					

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>800 plus houses at Roeshot Hill why could these few houses at Burton be added to the proposed Roeshot Hill development doing away with this excessive over development of this south end of this village. Social housing should be built near the main town not away on the edge of a village with limited and at times no bus service.</p> <p>CN1 ALLOTMENTS---</p> <p>OBJECTION: TRAFFIC CONJESTION UNSUITABLE FOR VILLAGE</p> <p>The proposed CN1 plan is to site 400/500 allotments on land at Summers Lane, at the rear of the only working farm in the village, this forms part of the Burton Conversation Area Plan as adopted by Christchurch Council in February 2007. This site will remove a large part of arable land used for e feed and grazing of a large beef/dairy heard.</p> <p>The plan CN1 and Core Strategy P21 talks of Allotments that should be in a suitable accessible location, Summers Lane is a single track road from Hawthorn Road to Salisbury Road crossroads with Martins Hill Lane, where, it will as per the allotment own report have a possible usage of 50 plus cars a day, based on 10% visiting the site but this estimate could be way out. The traffic is a major problem as said above these roads are single track, and more over the access and exit route to Christchurch would be via Martins Hill Lane that at the moment has seen a significant increase in traffic especially since the traffic calming came into force in Salisbury Road. I cannot see how any proposed road improvement could be carried out on this road unless houses were demolished. Improving public transport will have no consequence as people with an Allotment normally use their own transport and have trailers. I cannot see any benefit for the villagers of Burton.</p> <p>CN1 & 2 ROADS SALISBURY ROAD Main spine road running through village SUMMERS LANE Side road at the cross roads with Martins Hill Lane opposite, this is single track road leading to Hawthorn Road. MARTINS HILL LANE Side road at the crossroads and again opposite SUMMERS LANE, any access to the proposed site would enter and excess near this crossroads on Salisbury Road and either go down Salisbury Road to the BY-PASS, or down Martins Hill Lane to Stony Lane where at peak times the traffic queues back beyond the turn to Martins Hill Lane the traffic chaos that the proposed that 45 houses and allotment traffic would bring beggars belief that</p>					

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											someone has come up with this plan. ROAD IMPROVEMENTS					
663376	Mr John Whiffen		CSPS3685	Policy CN 1		No		Yes	Yes		<p>Core Strategy: Pullout from Christchurch Courier, Spring 2012</p> <p>As with the Pullout from 2010, response to this document would have been so much easier to make had there been the opportunity to use tick-boxes. Perhaps they would have saved your colleagues much time instead of having to comprehend written answers. It has taken me much time to read and, therefore, to respond.</p> <p>Is it the fact, as it appears to be, that the entire business of the local development strategy in general and the core strategy in particular results from predictions of national, and, from that, local growth in population?</p> <p>Page 1</p> <p>What was the percentage of rate-payers who responded to produce the “excellent results”? If the responses really did “inform this stage”, how are you able to continue with plans to build on the allotments at Roeshot Hill when so many people do not want that to happen? It appears that the “consultation – responses”, evidence, surely, have NOT been used in drafting this stage. Had those responses from allotment-holders alone been included, you would not be showing planned roads on the land used now as allotments!</p> <p>Page 2</p> <p>1. Is not “Green Belt” intended as a protection against jut such intrusion? 850 dwellings will, quite likely but as a guess, house an average of three people. Over a thousand more cars in Christchurch, perhaps, but much ensuing congestion a certainty, especially into and from the roundabout at Sainsbury’s. All those people would need additional facilities (doctors, dentists, shops, another petrol-station, perhaps, restaurant/pub – what else?) which would take more land adding to the sense of increasing density.</p> <p>2. Affordable by/to whom? Such an unquantifiable expression is meaningless as evidence, surely. Who are to be the intended purchasers?</p> <p>3. You have identified space “south of the railway line”. Presumably such land is already available and you are planning to cover at least some if it with “retail/community facilities”. For whom? The additional housing/population will be occupying it, your plan appears to show.</p> <p>4. “Will be relocated”? Have you absorbed at all the representations from RHAA and individuals? Not much</p>				298	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>point in “consulting”, it seems. LEAVE THE ALLOTMENTS where they are and build your new houses north of the railway line. Would you like years of your work in your hobby to be buried – literally?</p> <p>6. I agree. Who wouldn't?</p> <p>7. Does this mean that the developer will be paying for some of the improvements?</p> <p>CN1 You ask if the policy meets the tests of soundness.</p> <p>It is not justified because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The number of British people is declining • It is unreasonable to build over or on excellent, friable, manured, allotments, tilled for decades, and to require allotment-holders to start again on a green field, losing year of effort • Efforts are being made to reduce the transportation of food and increase local production: the planned (no longer merely possible) move will work against both. (The Queen's new Jubilee Fund will, in part, be advancing the idea of growing locally.) • “evidence” of population-growth is merely prediction and seems not to take account of emigration, • The possible repatriation of immigrants from the EU when Britain leaves the EU and the reduction in longevity likely to arise from continued over-eating, lack of exercise, congestion and the stress of ever-increasing over-crowding <p>It is not appropriate because reasonable alternatives are to build houses north of the railway, providing there the transportation and other facilities now shown south of it and, thus, to leave the allotments as they are (and the decades-long efforts input into them by plot-holders), enabling the continuing production of food locally, and close to those who produce it.</p> <p>It is not effective in that open space in the borough will be lost permanently, as will excellent arable land (the allotments), and density of population, crowding and congestion will increase, all to the detriment of the interests of present rate-payers (who elected the council to administer those interests, not to damage them).</p> <p>What, precisely, does “deliverable” mean here? It usually means “capable of being delivered” but that would be far too vague for a document about policy, such as this, surely. “Flexible” or flexibility seems to be a contradiction when dealing with policy, or at least to be introducing uncertainty, especially for rate-payers and their interests. “Monitored”? Any project can be monitored. It sounds good to feed to rate-payers but it means merely comparing actuality to estimates/plans periodically.</p> <p>“Framework Masterplan”. Where is any alternative to</p>					

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>building on the allotments offered? Why is there not an alternative plan for building north of the railway? Your decision seems to have been made. Your plan shows dwellings likely to be blighted both by consequential increased noise from increased use of local roads and the railway and built close to either (or both). Time will not be pleasant for them nor for existing residents in that immediate area. That aspect seems not to have been considered. Have you considered cancelling altogether plans for further building?</p> <p>Page 3: Land south of Burton village</p> <p>1. Why are you utilising for housing ANY land in the "Green Belt", an area which the population understands as sacrosanct?</p> <p>2. The problem of defining "affordable" recurs and raises the same questions: by whom?, for whom? And in whose opinion?</p> <p>3. Does your statement mean that those whom you intend should undertake the development will make a financial contribution to improving "community facilities" (undefined)? If not, what?</p> <p>4. Does this mean that the developer will be paying for some of the improvements?</p> <p>Tests of soundness</p> <p>NO. The development cannot be justified as it is (also) based on prediction not evidence. Houses should not be built unless demand exists and is evident (as the Spanish have found in large measure) and not speculatively.</p> <p>Page 3: land east of Marsh Lane</p> <p>My comments are as for the other two areas.</p>					
359291	Mr Jeremy Woolf	Woolf Bond Planning	CSPS3809	Policy CN 1	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	<p>Whilst our clients generally support, jointly, the purpose and intent of Policy CN1 they consider that there are shortcoming with the wording of the policy which may lead to problems in its implementation. In particular there is concern that undue reliance is placed upon the Masterplan prepared for the Council which should be utilised for illustrative purposes only. This leads to an issue of soundness with the Plan.</p>	<p>Attached is a redrafted version of Policy CN1 which addresses the various concerns of our clients. They consider that if the policy is amended as suggested this will greatly help in their working together and delivering the proposals for the Roeshot site which are a central plank of policy for the Christchurch Borough part of the plan.</p>	<p>Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination</p>	<p>The three objectors are the principal parties involved with bringing forward the Roeshot Hill development comprising the landowner, housebuilder and the main retail operator. At the examination, the parties will explain/address the policy and implementation issues arising from CN1 and related policies in the Plan, and thus demonstrate that the site can be brought forward expeditiously.</p>	298	2267168_0_1.pdf
656731	Mrs Joan M Luck		CSPS3852	Policy CN 1							<p>There will be a loss of valuable Green belt when alternative sites not in the Green Belt are available. WHY?</p> <p>The proposed site is in the Burton Conservation Area</p>				298	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>which will be severely damaged by such a large development and relocation (Allotments relocation proposal is CN1) WHY? Burton Farm, mentioned in the Conservation Area Appraisal as making a valuable contribution to Conservation Area will be lost with the consequential loss of jobs WHY? The infrastructure of the village - its road network - cannot support the extra traffic which will be generated. Object on planning grounds:- How many of the 45 houses do you plan to be low - cost affordable houses for the young people of our village? thus ensuring a continuity of energy in our village. The wealthy, older in-comers would not care about the village, and it would die.</p>					
663516	Mr R McNair		CSPS3666	Policy CN 1							<p>I wish to raise my objection to this proposed development via email. I object to this development in total. It is not required in any form and the destruction of any greenbelt land for new housing is unwarranted. This development will destroy the character of a rural area and cause severe overloading of local services and amenities, as well as adding to the severe traffic congestion already present. Until a "Northern Bypass" or link to the Blackwater Junction exists all such major housing developments must be vetoed. Our existing road infrastructure is collapsing under the weight of current housing and could not sustain such an increase. This is just one valid argument there are many more such as capacity at local schools, local doctors and dentists, hospitals etc. Please listen to the wishes of local residents NOT the desires of faceless Dorset officials. We live in Christchurch, NOT "East Dorset".</p>				298	
663532	Mr Peter W Lucas		CSPS3672	Policy CN 1							<p>I wish to object to the plan for new housing and allotments in Burton. I moved to the village eight years ago and chose to live here because of its village atmosphere. In moving I have brought my business here with a number of local people now employed in it in Christchurch. If the plan goes ahead I will feel compelled to move and will move my business with me. I fervently wish to remain here and feel I am being driven out by the Council meeting the demands of property developers. My objections are: I have been constrained on what I can do on my property to maintain the conservation area yet a plan can be proposed which will severely damage the whole conservation area by development and the</p>				298	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	
											<p>relocation of allotments. I cannot see how this can be justified, is equitable or is sensible.</p> <p>The infrastructure of the village, particularly its road network cannot support the extra population and traffic generated.</p> <p>I frequently use the Stony Lane roundabout, in the mornings it can take 15 minutes to cross it. It is worse on Saturdays and bank holidays it cannot cope with any extra traffic and would be another reason to make me leave.</p> <p>There will be a loss to the valuable Green Belt that surrounds us when there are other options available.</p>						
663555	Mrs Trish Jamieson		CSPS3692	Policy CN 1							<p>Policy CN1 Christchurch Urban Extension</p> <p>There are many reasons why I cannot support the proposed urban extension at Roeshot Hill.</p> <p>a) There would be a big loss of valuable Green Belt when I am sure that there are other sites not in the Green Belt available.</p> <p>b) You state that “the Urban Extension will act as an attractive gateway to the north of the borough”. I believe that visitors to our lovely town would much prefer to see green space rather than a great sprawl of new modern houses.</p> <p>c) The A35 is the main route into Christchurch from the east and Roeshot Hill becomes extremely busy particularly during the main holiday periods. This traffic then becomes snarled up right along the route through Sainsbury’s roundabout, Stony Lane roundabout and right into the town centre along the A35.</p> <p>d) Traffic problems will be exacerbated by the number of cars in the new development. It is usual now for there to be more than one car per household and I believe that one and a half per household would be a modest estimate. People from these properties would have to travel to work places, schools, etc.</p> <p>e) Access points on Lyndhurst Road will also lead to difficulties which will be made much worse with the extra lorries going to and from the planned gravel extraction site at the top of Roeshot Hill. I believe the number will be some 50 movements in and out of the site per hour.</p> <p>f) Junction improvements along the A35 are expected to come forward between 2014-2019 whilst the proposed development would commence in 2014/15. How will the roads cope with extra traffic from road improvements and extra traffic from the start of the development?</p> <p>g) Moving the Roeshot Hill Allotments to land north of the railway line is being opposed by a large number of allotment holders. The proposed new site will again cause considerable traffic congestion. A large number</p>					298	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>of allotment holders have held their plots for a number of years and worked them to obtain good results. A new site would need a number of years in order to get to the same level.</p> <p>h) The infrastructure, schools, shops, medical services and roads need to be in place well before the start of any possible urban extension. The school situation in Christchurch is critical and must be addressed before any large development takes place.</p> <p>i) In addition to the above I am opposed to the proposed development in Policy CN2, land south of Burton Village. This will mean a loss of agricultural land and livelihood with a loss of valuable green belt that will infringe on the Burton Conservation Area.</p>					
663574	Mr Francis Hunt		CSPS3696	Policy CN 1							<p>I am writing to you to register my objections to Christchurch Council's intention to sell Roeshot Hill Allotments for housing and its intention to remove existing plot holders against their will to a vastly inferior site in Burton.</p> <p>I have been a full sized plot holder at Roeshot Hill for the past 10 years, taking it over from the previous holder who had cared for it for at least 10 years. This allotment, therefore, has had loving care given to it for at least those 20 years. It has a growing medium that is second to none due to the many hours spent on it. I produce a wide variety of organic vegetables and fruit which allow my family and I to eat excellent produce at low cost.</p> <p>I am currently 61 years of age and physically fit enough to cope with my allotment which is well maintained.</p> <p>My reasons for objecting to the proposed sale of this valuable green belt site are as follows : -</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) I believe the council has proposed to sell off Roeshot Hill Allotments against the wishes of the plot holders and the local community. 2) The council's decision has been made solely to raise funds and is effectively trying to sell the "family silver". 3) The council, if successful in the sale of this allotment land, intend to move existing plot holders to low grade, arable ground which floods with ease and will be almost unworkable during wet periods, particularly in the winter months. 4) The majority of existing plot holders are over 60 years of age or unemployed or suffer from ill-health. Many of these will be incapable of taking over poor, un-worked ground and will be lost to allotmenting. 5) Many of the allotments in question have been worked by the same plot holders for many years. I use my allotment as an example. I have a shed which is in 				298	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>good condition but is not suitable to be moved. I have an asparagus bed which is 5 years old with a life span of 20+ years. I have 4 apple trees, 2 plum trees, 6 gooseberry bushes, 2 blackcurrant bushes, 2 blackberry plants and 60 raspberry canes. All of these are established plants/trees and are not suitable for removal to another site without them dying.</p> <p>Most of the allotment plots have a similar infrastructure which would be almost impossible to replicate within the working lifetimes of their holders.</p> <p>6) The proposed site for re-settlement of plot holders would involve increased travel for those who live in the Highcliffe and Mundeford areas. Many of those with whom I have spoken, have stated that they would be unlikely to move to Burton or this reason alone. This is at a time when we are being encouraged to use our vehicles less.</p> <p>7) The current proposal put forward by Christchurch Council involves less houses being built on the farmland to the rear and the side of Sainsburys and Stewarts. The removal of the overhead electricity pylons on this site and their replacement by underground cables will allow the amount of houses proposed to be built on the available farmland without the use of the Roeshot Hill Allotments. The downside of this would mean that Christchurch Council would be unable to receive monies for the sale of our allotment site.</p> <p>8) The Council do not appear to have taken account of the fact that Roeshot Hill Allotments are a wonderful facility and a great advertisement for the Borough in which we live. If left alone our allotments will be available for use by future generations of Christchurch residents.</p> <p>9) I feel that Christchurch Council should consider building any additional housing at the site in Burton which we believe would be a better option than destroying the community at Roeshot Hill Allotments. As I have previously stated, I am 61 years old and I do not believe I will have the energy or the inclination to move to a new allotment site particularly to one that is as poor as that proposed. I do not want to start again. It would take me at least 5 – 10 years to get anywhere near that which I have at the present time.</p> <p>My wish is to remain at Roeshot Hill Allotment site where I can cope with my current plot, which is both excellent and manageable.</p>					
663576	Miss Simone McDevitt		CSPS3697	Policy CN 1							I wish to raise my objection to this proposed development via Email. I object to this development in total. It is not required in any form and the destruction of any greenbelt land for				298	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>new housing is unwarranted. This development will destroy the character of a rural area and cause severe overloading of local services and amenities, as well as adding to the severe traffic congestion already present. Until a "Northern Bypass" or link to the Blackwater Junction exists all such major housing developments must be vetoed. Our existing road infrastructure is collapsing under the weight of current housing and could not sustain such an increase. This is just one valid argument there are many more such as capacity at local schools, local doctors and dentists, hospitals etc. Please listen to the wishes of local residents NOT the desires of faceless Dorset officials. We live in Christchurch, NOT "East Dorset".</p>					
663585	Cheryl Twissell		CSPS3699	Policy CN 1							<p>Re the planned consultation, I would like to register that there is no destruction of the Green Belt in Christchurch. I am therefore completely opposed to any development. my views re this are defined by the complete lack of infrastructure to support any building of homes.</p>				298	
663588	Mr Roger Street	Christchurch Conservation Trust	CSPS3700	Policy CN 1							<p>1. POLICY CN1 CCT is reluctantly largely supportive of this policy to place new dwellings on this area of green belt, but considers this to be a one-off exceptional case for breaching the green belt boundary. However it is opposed to the relocation of the allotments at this site. Current Town Plan policy (pp. 155-156, at 8.74) states that allotments "make a valuable contribution to the recreational provision of communities". Additionally it is stated that "in the interests of communities and in view of the demand for such facilities it is proposed to protect these allotment sites from development". Policy CF6 confirms this statement with "planning permission for development resulting in the loss of allotment sites will not be granted unless there is no longer a demand for such facilities or an alternative site off comparable area in a suitable and convenient site of comparable and convenient location can be found". The allotment holders have made it quite clear to the Christchurch Borough Council that the new site, selected by the Council, is neither convenient nor suitable for their needs. It is therefore incumbent on the Council to exclude this allotment site from the proposed Roeshot Hill housing development. In the case of these allotments the green belt should be preserved. It is noted that the National Planning Policy Framework makes no specific comment on provision of allotments. CCT expresses concern that insufficient attention has</p>				298	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>been paid in the past to the setting of Staple Cross, which is an English Heritage scheduled ancient monument. Currently it stands in a sea of ugly traffic signs and CCT is concerned that the additional effect of the directly adjacent western boundary of this urban extension may lead to further deterioration in the Staple Cross setting. However, at 6.31, (page 63) we are informed that the development of the Roeshot Hill urban extension will enhance the setting of the Staple Cross, but no details are given as to how this will be achieved. CCT urges the Council to take this opportunity to restore the Staple Cross and enhance the overall setting of this scheduled ancient monument by incorporating a provision in a section 106 Agreement requiring the developer to make an appropriate financial contribution to allow appropriate works to be carried out.</p>					
663614	Everett Jones		CSPS3703	Policy CN 1							<p>I am not very good at letter writing but feel i should point out that the proposed idea and drught to develop the sight at Roeshot is far to excessive and is just another infill to the area there are many reasons not to build and expand the area which i am sure lots of people will cover but my main concern is why should it be deemed necessary to move perfectly good allotments which are used by the community to another village,For a start there would be the inevitable problem of access with such a large development on an already almost to busy road safety has certainly not been an issue with this application .Then there is the disruption of moving goodness knows how many allotment holders to another sight and i presume in the meantime the council will be quite sneaky and put up the rental charges on the plots to discourage and reduce the number of people who have allotments at the time of trying to move them off.Look i could go on and on but i do think that as our elected representatives the coucil are responsible for the care of our area and we certainly DO NOT need lots of new development chart back the last thirty years if we carry on like we are we will end up being a conibation no diiferent to say southsea being totally overrun by housing development and not very good development at that spoiling totally the esscence of the area.Please Christchurch Council take heed of what everyone is saying and put a stop to this crazy development idea at the end of the day the council own the land where the allotments are that is actually you and me you have the control of what you can do with it keep it as open space and as allotments for the community rather than setting a precident for total; urbanisation not to mention the damage it would cause give a</p>				298	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											thought for the community and the people who would be living there if the land was developed the railway line in itself being a good enough reason not to develop i should hate to live there with all that noise not to mention the problem and danger with an already to busy road. Regards from aquite disgruntled long time living in Christchurch resident.					
663627	Hugh Jones		CSPS3716	Policy CN 1							<p>Core Strategy Plan Policy CN1 North Christchurch Urban Extension Strategic Allocation</p> <p>I do not believe this policy meets the tests of soundness for the following reasons:-</p> <p>The site for 850 dwellings will generate, at the national rate of 1.5 cars per dwelling, 1,295 cars. Where are these vehicles going to enter and exit the site? The A35 at Roeshot Hill is already heavily congested at peak times and has been gridlocked during the peak holiday season. I travel this road at least twice a day to attend chickens on my allotment at Roeshot Hill and, on many occasions, I have had to wait in excess of five minutes to exit the site.</p> <p>I am led to believe that the cost of burying the overhead pylons will amount to £1,000,000 per pylon. This figure of £8,000,000 for the eight pylons which equates to approximately £9,500 per dwelling. This cost must be added to the value of the residential land for which I am sure the Meyrick Estate will want the full price. How can this relate to affordable housing!</p> <p>I understand there is an identified site in Burton to re allocate the Roeshot Hill allotment site. Under the 1922 Allotment Act the site must be within three miles of the existing site; of the same agricultural value (being Grade 2); of sufficient size to accommodate the existing tenants (i.e. 150) plus those on the waiting list (approximately 130). Under the 1922 Act an allotment plot is specified as 10 rods. Therefore, the new site allowing for roads and parking areas would have to be approximately 25 acres. Is this an accurate description for the identified site?</p> <p>It is stated that, in addition to the relocated allotment site, suitable alternative natural green space will be relocated north of the railway line. How does this fit in with the fact that both Dorset and Hampshire County Councils have approved gravel extraction north of the railway from Ringwood Road down to Salisbury Road? I understand this work will commence shortly and last for 15-20 years. How does this fit in with your proposals? Where is the evidence of consideration of road infrastructure to cope with the associated heavy traffic movements?</p> <p>It is stated that the development will make appropriate</p>				298	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>contributions to transport improvements. This would add considerable costs to the development of the site making each dwelling less viable. What would the transport improvements entail and how far from the site would these impact? I note that you show improvements to various roundabouts in the vicinity of the proposed site, but all these roundabouts disgorge traffic into the centre of Christchurch. The only road widening schemes appear to be well outside of the area.</p> <p>I consider that the policy is no way meets the test of soundness and cannot be justified on a robust and credible evidence base and cannot be effective as being deliverable. Houses on this site would not be affordable to local young families and would be bought by mainly retired people outside of the area, looking to relocate to the sea side. This will put local social services under considerable pressure for which you have not shown how this could be dealt with.</p> <p>In conclusion, whilst I appreciate the need to find extra housing sites, the Council appears to have no available land. The alternative is to develop brown sites -such as the unoccupied industrial land in Somerford Road. Consideration should also be given to allowing town centre unoccupied shops and offices to be converted into dwellings. Whilst this would not rejuvenate the ailing commerce in the town centre it would at least produce life!!!!!!!</p>					
523319	Mr Ryan Johnson	Turley Associates	CSPS3777	Policy CN 1		No			Yes		<p>Policy CN1 Thank you for the invitation to comment on the Pre-Submission Core Strategy DPD. I write on behalf of our client, Burry & Knight Ltd, who are the owners and developers of Hoburne Farm Estate, which includes land east of phase 8 of the Hoburne Farm Estate (SHLAA reference 8/11/0525); and are the owners and operators of Hoburne Caravan Park (SHLAA reference 8/11/0287).</p> <p>Our clients support the Council in their objective to progress and adopt a Local Plan for the area as quickly as possible. This will provide clarity and certainty for the development industry and all those who interact with the planning system. More importantly it will assist the Council in its efforts to address the significant housing land supply shortages in the borough, particularly over the next five years. We have reviewed the plan and its evidence base and conclude that revisions are needed if the Council are to satisfy the tests of soundness in the NPPF. The following paragraph/policy specific comments are therefore made to assist the Council in finalising the plan before it is formally submitted to the Secretary of</p>	<p>Suggested Change: Recommend the Council's housing trajectory is updated with the SHLAA prior to formal submission to the Secretary of State.</p>	<p>Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination</p>	<p>We would wish to participate at the Examination in Public to elaborate on these comments, particularly in the context of the lands controlled by our client.</p>	298	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>State. We would wish to participate at the Examination in Public to elaborate on these comments, particularly in the context of the lands controlled by our client. Christchurch Urban Extension Comment We would question the delivery trajectory proposed on such a complex and large site. Given the Core Strategy DPD is unlikely to be adopted until 2013, and factoring in the planning, infrastructure and land acquisition lead in for such a complex site, the delivery of 100 units before 2016 appears optimistic. We would suggest detailed evidence on the housing trajectory for this site is presented for comment prior to submission of the Core Strategy DPD, as any under provision on this site may need to be addressed through revisions to the Core Strategy DPD prior to its adoption.</p>					
664151	Mr B & J Postill		CSPS3781	Policy CN 1							<p>We strongly object to the proposal to build on Green Belt land. Also the traffic in Christchurch and the immediate area is totally at gridlock, especially in the summer months. A bypass would be an appropriate course of action to take to alleviate the traffic problems we have now. Therefore to build more properties without the infrastructure would create further chaos. Houses in this area have yet to be affordable !! Young families will not be able to even raise the cash for a deposit let alone live in an area that will not be able to support them with the necessary schools, doctors and dentists. We suggest Option 5: No destruction of Green Belt. No increase of traffic. Small scale affordable housing on EXISTING BROWNFIELD SITES.</p>				298	
664182	Geoff and Lorna Humphreys		CSPS3788	Policy CN 1							<p>We wish to express our objection to any development on the area of greenbelt land between Stony Lane and Roeshott Hill. Having seen the proposed plans we do not even feel that they would be appropriate anyway, as the proposed access points to the development are totally unacceptable. One of the access roads is on to Roeshott Hill. If that was acceptable one wonders why Westfield Gardens was closed off so that the residents of the Hoburne development could not use it to get on to the A35. Another access points would be on to the Somerford by-pass where traffic travels at very fast speeds and additional traffic trying to get on to the road would be an accident waiting to happen. If the development extends down to Stony Lane, that would simply worsen the existing problems traffic</p>				298	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											has getting on to the Stony Lane roundabout. This development has not been thought through adequately. However, we repeat our opening statement that we oppose greenbelt development per se.					
664262	P Mitchell		CSPS3801	Policy CN 1							I wonder if Christchurch council is in its right mind to give into pressure to build on Green Belt land at Burton ??? The roads in Burton and surroundings are at breaking point and chaos reigns at Stony Lane roundabout from 7am in the morning. Burton Primary School is not up to Ofsted standards, the Grange Academy will not be able to cope. There's no decent street lighting, pavements aren't good either. What about a bigger doctors' surgery and more practice nurses. Transport:- 1 bus an hour??? Reasons are many more, you need to know.				298	
664611	Mr Richard Humphrey		CSPS3828	Policy CN 1							Roeshot Hill Allotments I object most strongly at the Council's proposed new housing on the Roeshot Hill statutory allotment site, especially when only 35% housing is allocated for young families of Christchurch. Presumably the other 65% will be for incomers and not existing Christchurch residents. As existing Christchurch residents, the allotment holders feel that our amenity is being sacrificed by the Council, for at NO time have the Elected Members or officers met or talked to the Roeshot Allotment Association or other users. If they had they would know that the access from the site onto the busy A35 is difficult already, without many new houses requiring access and egress. ADDITIONAL RESPONSE RECEIVED I object most strongly at the Council's proposed new housing on the Roeshot Hill statutory allotment site, especially when only 35% housing is allocated for young families of Christchurch. Presumably the other 65% will be for incomers and not existing Christchurch residents. As existing Christchurch residents, the allotment holders feel that our amenity is being sacrificed by the Council, for at NO time have the Elected Members or officers met or talked to the Roeshot Allotment Association or other users. If they had they would know that the access from the site onto the busy A35 is difficult already, without many new houses requiring access and egress. I have written direct to my ward councillors and not had the courtesy of a reply.				298	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
664978	Mr Brian Epton		CSPS3858	Policy CN 1							<p>I wish to register my objections tot he proposed relocation of Roeshot Hill allotments. I have worked my plot for over four years now and found it to be much more than just an allotment. It is a very happy community of young and old, rich and poor who share their knowledge and expertise. Many of the older plot holders have been there years from the very start and would find having to start again very difficult if not impossible.</p> <p>There is in the proposed redevelopment, allocation of land to re site the allotments in an area that is waterlogged most of the autumn and winter. I know this to be a fact as our family is born and bred in Christchurch and we walk this area often. Why cannot this land be used for housing and the allotments left where they are? This would be possible as the development of water logged land off Burton Rd and Purewell was sucessful.</p> <p>Finally the over all proposed development, in my opinion, is far too large and the proposed site would create an infrastructure and traffic nightmare.</p>				298	
665027	Mr Malcolm Panton		CSPS3865	Policy CN 1							<p>I wish to register my objections to the proposal to build 45 new houses in the land south of Alder and Medlar Closes at Burton.</p> <p>I object on the following grounds: CN1/CN2 - The loss of Green Belt Land is completely unacceptable. Green Belt land should not be built on and should remain protected. The Burton Conservation Area again raises the same question - what is the point of conserving an area to then hand it over to developers when the council decide they want to without regard to those who actually live in the vicinity? The loss of the Conservation Area is totally unacceptable.</p> <p>CN2 - There will be a large increase in traffic and all forms of pollution which will threaten to destroy what little character remains of the area. More infrastructure will be needed. We already have plenty of problems with young people causing trouble in the area - the last thing we need is more of the same.</p> <p>We do not want this development in our village. I am also unhappy that this proposal has not been widely publised by the local or county councils. I only find out about it when a flyer produced by local residents is put through my door.</p> <p>Are those who are supposed to represent the local people frightened their real plans will be revealed?</p>				298	
665050	Mrs Rosemary Panton		CSPS3867	Policy CN 1							<p>I wish to register my objections to the proposal to build 45 new houses in the land south of Alder and Medlar Closes at Burton.</p> <p>I object on the following grounds: CN1/CN2 - The loss of Green Belt Land is completely unacceptable and</p>				298	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	
											<p>represents a lazy choice by the Council. What is the point of Green Belt Land if it is merely a way to keep it from being built on until you decide otherwise? Green Belt land should not be built on and should remain protected. The Burton Conservation Area again raises the same question - what is the point of conserving an area to then hand it over to developers ? The loss of the Conservation Area is totally unacceptable. There will be a large increase in traffic, rubbish pollution, noise pollution and population within the village, all of which will threaten to destroy what little character remains of the area. More infrastructure will be needed. We already have plenty of problems with young people causing trouble in the area - the last thing we need is more of the same.</p> <p>The Council must stop this wholesale destruction and damage to what little green space is left. These houses are not needed in Burton, they are not needed in Christchurch - by building more houses you simply encourage more people to come which creates even more problems. We do not want this development in our village.</p>						
360009	Mr Bob Gee		CSPS3959	Policy CN 1							<p>Dear Prime Minister.</p> <p>I would like you to consider the plight of all 200+ allotment holders at Roeshot Hill. It appears to me and many others that Christchurch Borough Council have and are acting in an undemocratic and thoroughly thoughtless way, in wanting to remove us from the site in order to sell the site for building. Whilst relocation is on offer there is no guarantee that, in spite of current legislation, this will happen. The proposed site is more than 3/4 of a mile from the current site and for many inaccessible. Please consider the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [1] The people of Christchurch were given till 24th December 2011 to vote on four options. Option 4 and option 3 both involved retaining Roeshot Hill Allotments in place, yet the borough council has chosen to put forward a proposal based on the least popular option as seen by the people of Christchurch. Why is this? • [2]One of the reasons put forward for building on the Roeshot Hill area is to provide affordable homes for young families in Christchurch. The Core Strategy is now showing a reduction from 40% to 35% affordable housing. • [3] No figures have been published as to the costs of and returns on the proposed scheme and that of the four original proposals. Simple mathematics show that 65% of the houses proposed on Roeshot Hill will be medium to low density, many therefore will be houses for incomers to 				298		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>choose for their retirement, without the infrastructure to go with the houses. The area of land earmarked for the lowest density housing is greater than the area of the allotments they will replace.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [4] Figures supplied by the local council showed that it was possible to build affordable homes for young families in Christchurch and retain the allotments in the present position. So Councillors voted for relocation!! • [5] At no time has any councillor or council official met the RHAA committee to give an indication of its plans or to seek comments and advice from the association members. • [6] When drawing up its Allotment Strategy there was evidence that the borough council did not have any idea of the numbers on the borough waiting list who actually wanted a plot rather than think it was a nice idea to have a plot. • [7] As far as this association is aware the borough council has no idea whatsoever as to how many people will wish to go to an allotment North of the railway line. • [8] As a statutory site Roeshot Hill allotments must be relocated no further than ¼ mile away from its present site. This means that it must be relocated between Salisbury Rd and Hawthorn Rd, if the borough council keeps to the rules. • [9] One of the reasons advocated for the relocation of the allotments is that the site creates a pinch point on the map. Is there any justification in planning rules for such a statement and should this be used as an excuse for relocation? RHAA thinks not. Is the data used to determine the type and density of housing actually up to current standards? RHAA has great reservations as to the Effectiveness of the scheme. A new housing estate is to be built surrounded by a major railway line, the A35 by-pass, Electricity Pylons and Roeshot Hill. • [10] There appears to be no provision to allow traffic from the estate to filter into the A35, difficult for a few allotment holders let alone a substantial estate. • [11] How will pedestrians, particularly older people and young school children safely travel to and from the estate given the volume of traffic to be expected in the area especially at peak holiday times throughout the year? What evidence is there that they will be safe? None!! • [12] What evidence is there that there is a demand from the people of Christchurch for a housing development mostly for the better off? None! • [12] Would indeed people who know the area choose to live there given its relative isolation and poor access? Will they be informed of the possible gravel 					

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>extraction just North of the railway line? The Committee contend that the allotment site should remain where it is and the housing on Roeshot Hill should primarily be for young families. There should be much greater efforts to integrate the development with the rest of the borough with substantial safe junctions built into the A35.</p> <p>The committee of RHAA has no confidence in the rigour of the planning process. Individual plot holders could give many an example of the projects, time and successes of allotment gardening and of the benefits to the community-plus what would be lost in relocation. Most plot holders feel that the provision for parking and facilities at a relocated site will be well below standard. The Committee find the scheme neither justified nor effective.</p> <p>Our voices and concerns must be heard. Prime Minister thank you for reading this. Yours gratefully</p>					
360533	Ms A Wood		CSPS3951	Policy CN 1							<p>I am horrified at the proposed plans to almost literally destroy Christchurch.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Why destroy the green belt when there are hundreds of unsold homes already. Use brownfield. 2. The traffic situation in Christchurch is already dreadful. 3. Doctors, dentists and hospitals can hardly cope now. 4. Why are there plans for yet another supermarket. The only suitable place would be the Bailey Bridge scheme where there are not so many. Also there is room for housing there which would not have such a negative impact. <p>Please keep Christchurch "A place where time is pleasant".</p>				298	
359291	Mr Jeremy Woolf	Woolf Bond Planning	CSPS3810	Policy CN 1	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	<p>Whilst our clients generally support, jointly, the purpose and intent of Policy CN1 they consider that there are shortcoming with the wording of the policy which may lead to problems in its implementation. In particular there is concern that undue reliance is placed upon the Masterplan prepared for the Council which should be utilised for illustrative purposes only. This leads to an issue of soundness with the Plan. (See also comment on CN1 on behalf of Taylor Wimpey Ltd and Bodorgan Properties (CI) Ltd from Woolf Bond Planning)</p>	<p>Attached is a redrafted version of Policy CN1 which addresses the various concerns of our clients. They consider that if the policy is amended as suggested this will greatly help in their working together and delivering the proposals for the Roeshot site which are a central plank of policy for the Christchurch Borough part of the plan.</p>	<p>Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination</p>	<p>The three objectors are the principal parties involved with bringing forward the Roeshot Hill development comprising the landowner, housebuilder and the main retail operator. At the examination, the parties will explain/address the policy and implementation issues arising from CN1 and related policies in the Plan, and thus demonstrate that the site can be brought forward expeditiously.</p>	298	2267168_0_1.pdf

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	
651620	Mr Nick Woodford		CSPS3974	Policy CN 1							<p>I am writing to strongly oppose any further development in Christchurch and Burton. Over the years, I have seen nearly all of the green sites within our town and village disappear. With the Purewell Meadows and Mudeford Airfield being some of the areas lost. Our town is unable to sustain any more development and interfiling. The infrastructure of roads and facilities will not cope. This is shown by the fact that any development would be contrary to Environment Policy H of the Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Structure Plan 2000, also the Policies H12 & BE5 of the Borough of Christchurch Local Plan 2001. The proposed site is within 5KM of a SSSI and part of the SPA and Ramsar Site. It is also part of the Dorset Heaths SAC. The proximity of these European sites (SPA & SAC) requirements of the habitat regulations need to be taken into consideration, with particular focus on Regulation 48 & 49. There are indications that it will be contrary to the Waddenzee judgement (ECJ case C-127/02) and Environmental Policies A, B, C & D of the Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Structure Plan, as well comments made by the Berne Convention Standing Committee, regarding Policy ENV 11. Any further development will also impact on the transport network on top of the proposed gravel extraction. These concerns have been looked at by CBC and DCC. These are detailed within the South East Dorset Transport Contributions Strategy. Any development in and around Burton would be contrary to Planning Policy Guidance note 13 Transport, ODPM Circular 05/2005 Planning Obligations, Policy E of the BDPSP and Policy T16 of the Bough of Christchurch Local Plan. These are rules laid down by Government and the Local Councils to protect our environment. This now seems to be completely rail road for meeting the country?s housing needs, while taking no view of how this will affect the local populous and their lives. Once these areas of green belt are lost, they is no going back. This will prove to be the start of the end for our town and village.</p>					298	
664138	Mr & Mrs M Heller		CSPS3947	Policy CN 1							<p>Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. The respondent has supported option 4 which includes the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Locates approximately 500-650 dwellings south of the railway line • Open space, retail and community facilities and allotments provided south of the railway line • Suitable alternative natural green space provided south of the railway line 					298	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											• Retain overhead power cables in current position					
665531	Mr & Ms Albert & Ann Lemmer		CSPS3921	Policy CN 1							<p>We are strongly opposed to any development that is allowed to use GREEN BELT land. There are sufficient BROWN FIELD sites to meet Christchurch Council needs towards new homes and affordable homes given that they must NOT overload our already stretched Roads, Medical Facilities, Hospital Facilities and Dental Facilities.</p> <p>Of the five options we have seen OUR VOTE IS FOR OPTION 5 i.e :-</p> <p>NO DESTRUCTION OF GREEN BELT NO INCREASE OF TRAFFIC SMALL SCALE AFFORDABLE HOUSING ON EXISTING BROWNFIELD SITES.</p>				298	
665670	Mr and Ms D&L Bowmer		CSPS3924	Policy CN 1							<p>We would like to provide input to the current consultation regarding developments from Stony Lane to Roeshot Hill, as follows:-</p> <p>A drive around the Christchurch area identified many brownfield sites that are being used for housing development or could potentially be used. Particularly in the vicinity of Somerford Road and Barrack Road. Current developments have already stretched the local infrastructure to the point where traffic intensity is unacceptable; medical and related facilities are coping badly (routine appointments at my doctors surgery regularly exceed 8 days and hospital appointments 3 months); school places are barely adequate for current population requirements.</p> <p>Local housing sales appear to be very slow and prices have dropped due to oversupply, so I would question the need to increase the housing stock even modestly, and definitely not significantly.</p> <p>The area is more than adequately covered by existing supermarkets. No more are needed.</p> <p>There is a general and political objection to the concept of a 15% increase in the overall UK population so any plans based on this premise are both premature and objectionable.</p> <p>Industrial facilities and therefore job creation locally is inadequate. The conversion of the old BAE site, various local pubs and the Shand Kydd sites to housing are examples. In the absence of new locally created jobs there should be no consideration of additional housing. Also development of further retail options should not be considered until current facilities (including within the town centre) are fully occupied.</p> <p>As regards the proposals for conversion of green belt land south of the railway line all the above factors are relevant. I would strongly agree with option 5.</p> <p>Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage</p>				298	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	
											of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).						
665678	Tarrant Tania		CSPS3925	Policy CN 1							I OBJECT TO ANY BUIDLING ON GREEN BELT IN CHRISTCHURCH MY PREFERENCE IS OPTION 5. Option 5 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt. • No increase of traffic • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites APART FROM ALL THE REASONS GIVEN BELOW, THE INFRASTRUCTURE - MAINLY SEWERAGE/WASTE WATER MUST BE AT CAPACITY AND CANNOT COPE AS IT IS WITH EVEN SHORT PERIODS OF HEAVY RAIN! WE ARE COVERING TOO MUCH OF OUR LAND WITH CONCRETE! THIS MUST BE CONTRIBUTING TO THE INCREASE IN FLOODING, WHICH HAPPENS QUITE REGULARLY ON THE ROADS AND WILL ONLY GET WORSE IF WE KEEP BUILDING OVER MORE AND MORE GRASS AND POROUS LAND ETC. TRAFFIC COMES TO A COMPLETE STANDSTILL WHEN ANY ROAD INTO CHRISTCHURCH IS CLOSED OR BLOCKED! ADDING MORE CARS TO OUR CONGESTED ROADS WILL BE AN ABSOLUTE DISASTER FOR THE TOWN AND ITS BUSINESSES AND MORE THAN FRUSTRATING FOR ITS RESIDENTS!					298	
665684	Mrs Margaret Drover		CSPS3926	Policy CN 1							I wish to object to the overdevelopment under consideration on this green site. The local infrastructure is already stressed and would be unable to cope with housing development as envisaged in the strategy plan. If development unavoidable - option 4 the least undesirable.					298	
665698	Mr Brian Sheasby		CSPS3927	Policy CN 1							I wish to register my concerns about the proposed North Christchurch Extension. I understand that there are 5 options being considered. I wish to make it clear that only Option 5 is acceptable. i.e. No destruction of Green Belt; No increase in traffic and small affordable housing on existing brownfield					298	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	
											sites.						
665798	Jenifer Abbott and Neil Barnard		CSPS3930	Policy CN 1							<p>I wish to lodge my concern about the proposed development on this Green Belt farming land, and intrusion into the "Village" of Burton, why are the Council so keen to distroy one of the few local rural areas left, people have paid a premium to live in this area due to its secure lifestyle.</p> <p>While I understand this is not a considered reason to reject a planning permission, but should at least be a consideration</p> <p>I also want to again draw your attention to the infrastucture of the Village, which will not be able to support the influx of new residents, this includes Schools Doctors and Access.road, such as the already conjested during busy periods Stony Lane Roundabout, and as an alternative mode of transport the low frequence bus service restricts working peoples movement too and from the village.</p> <p>More housing in this area will increase flooding concern of an already, vulnarable area.</p> <p>I again hope these concerns will be considered.</p>					298	
665831	Mrs Mary Goodman		CSPS3931	Policy CN 1							<p>I am writing to object strongly to the development of this green field site. Christchurch already has many undeveloped brownfield sites amd empty shops. I do not understand why green fields need to be destroyed. Although the arguments for building more houses in the south east are strong, it does seem odd that these are needed in Christchurch, where there are so many houses already on the market. Affordable housing is an attractive sounding idea, but with no control over what price the houses will be sold at when they change hands, they are unlikely to remain affordable for long. I deplored the selling-off of council houses, and the problems that that policy created were entirely predictable.</p>					298	
665869	Mr and Mrs Roderick & Janice O'Halloran		CSPS3932	Policy CN 1							<p>Our preference is option 5, we feel that the plans for building 2035 new homes in the existing are is ample for our needs, this plan will vastly overload the infrastructure on this side of Christchurch.</p>					298	
665901	M Newman		CSPS3937	Policy CN 1							<p>Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. The respondent has supported option 1 which includes the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Locates approximately 950-1250 dwellings south of the railway line • Open space and retail / community facilities south of the railway line • Move allotments and provide suitable alternative 					298	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											natural green space (recreational space) north of the railway line • Move the overhead power cables underground					
665912	Sheila Keeley		CSPS3938	Policy CN 1							I have grave misgiving concerning The Core Strategy Plan which proposes to develop Roeshot Hill Allotments / or Housing. Firstly, as there is enough room for both housing and allotments what criteria was used to vote against Options 3 and 4 which were the preferred choice of the people of Christchurch? Also no introduction is available as to other allotment sites, amenities, parking etc, actually the whole plan has had no consultation with the RHAA at all. Have any of the Councillors tried to access the busy A35 from the present allotment entrance, it doesnt bear thinking about should housing be developed. CHAOS. Lastly, as a pensioner who has put a lot of work into her plot over the years, as have many others, I would like to suggest that the council think again about this plan by a propser consultation with RHAA as to alternatives.				298	
665938	C A Stokes		CSPS3940	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. The respondent has supported option 3 which includes the following: • Locates approximately 500-650 dwellings south of the railway line • Open space, retail and community facilities and allotments provided south of the railway line • Move suitable alternative natural green space north of the railway line • Retain overhead power cables in current position				298	
665956	Mrs R Pink		CSPS3941	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. The respondent has supported option 3 which includes the following: • Locates approximately 500-650 dwellings south of the railway line • Open space, retail and community facilities and allotments provided south of the railway line • Move suitable alternative natural green space north of the railway line • Retain overhead power cables in current position Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the				298	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).					
665975	Mrs S Burzic		CSPS3942	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. The respondent has supported option 3 which includes the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Locates approximately 500-650 dwellings south of the railway line • Open space, retail and community facilities and allotments provided south of the railway line • Move suitable alternative natural green space north of the railway line • Retain overhead power cables in current position 				298	
665995	Mr and Mrs P Lanley		CSPS3943	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).				298	
666078	Suzanne Rusden		CSPS3945	Policy CN 1							Please if we need more affordable housing could you get change of usage for the Stony Lane site. We do not need another supermarket so close to town. Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. The respondent has supported option 4 which includes the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Locates approximately 500-650 dwellings south of the railway line • Open space, retail and community facilities and allotments provided south of the railway line • Suitable alternative natural green space provided south of the railway line • Retain overhead power cables in current position 				298	
666102	G Thorogood		CSPS3946	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage				298	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. The respondent has supported option 4 which includes the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Locates approximately 500-650 dwellings south of the railway line • Open space, retail and community facilities and allotments provided south of the railway line • Suitable alternative natural green space provided south of the railway line • Retain overhead power cables in current position 					
666181	C Upton		CSPS3949	Policy CN 1							1. Traffic flow between Highcliffe / Mudeford to Christchurch and bournemouth is bad enough now. 2. The only housing needed is to house young and less well off residents.				298	
667786	Mr Michael Goodman		CSPS3952	Policy CN 1							I hereby express my objection to the proposed housing development between the by-pass, the railway line and Roeshot Hill. Christchurch is already part of a large urban sprawl, and there are brownfield sites in the existing town that could be used for any possible further housing requirements. Increasing the housing density of the existing urban area, perhaps through the construction of taller buildings, is preferable to abusing the surrounding land.				298	
667790	Miss Emma Jane Cheney		CSPS3953	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).				298	
668557	Mrs S Cutler		CSPS3958	Policy CN 1							It has come to my attention this week ,only may I say through word of mouth and information through my door, that there are a number of housing planning applications being considered by Christchurch Council . Can I might add it is very difficult to find very much if anything on the web about them. The ones I have heard about are the following but can I please ask “ Why are the locals of Christchurch not openly told about them in easily accessible information.? I have only heard about a lot of them through talking to family and friends! 1) Roeshot Hill housing and the Roeshot Hill allotments				298	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>2) Burton Farm (Farwells)</p> <p>3) Business and retail outlets on south of Somerford Rd.</p> <p>4) Housing all the way from Stoney Lane to Sainsburys</p> <p>My objections to all of these mainly concern the destruction of the " green belt" , the amount of extra traffic it will bring to Christchurch which already cant cope with the traffic that exists now! And the effect it will have on the whole of the infra- structure of Christchurch.</p> <p>Doctors that cant cope with the number of patients it has now (I have very rarely been able to get an appointment on the day I have been ill!) Perhaps now I would be able to get one a week later!! The doctors wont be able to cope with any extra patients.</p> <p>Hospitals in the borough are already struggling with the present population. This will make matters worse. Dentists are already working to their maximum. I rang my dentist in May for a check up and the first available appointment they had for myself and my son was in August!! How are they going to cope with more patients?</p> <p>What about the affect on schools? Classes at the moment are generally classes of 30 children.How will schools cater for any more children?</p> <p>Where are these " extra residents" going to find jobs? Christchurch does not need anymore supermarkets Christchurch cannot cope AND DOES NOT WANT extra housing in excess of 1250 dwellings?</p> <p>With regard to the housing from Stoney Lane to Sainsburys who in their right mind is going to want to buy a property with a railway line one side and the Christchurch by pass the other side?</p> <p>How will the buying/selling of this new housing be monitored? The developments are said to be for housing needs? Where can we find the information to support this?At the moment there are hundreds of unsold homes in the area . NO MORE NEED TO BE BUILT! New guidance says 50% of new developments should be affordable but these plans only say 35%.</p> <p>Christchurch is a very desirable area to live in and many people buy second/holiday homes here.How can you ensure that these "new housing developments" will be sold to those in need of it? Who can ensure that these houses will stay affordable to those who need it?</p> <p>These new housing developments will totally destroy the rural feel of the borough Green-belt should REMAIN GREEN-BELT..... OTHERWISE WHY DO WE HAVE GREENBELT AREAS? It makes a mockery of it all.</p> <p>Additional housing should be built on the Brownfield sites.The site in Grange Road was being considered</p>					

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											for gypsies!! Why is not being considered as a site for these new housing developments? The "Southstyle site" that was being considered for yet another supermarket!! .. Why is not being considered as a site for these new housing developments? Please accept my letter of objection					
662342	Mr J Jordan		CSPS3954	Policy CN 1							Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. It also included an additional option (5) relating the North Christchurch Urban Extension that included the following points: • No destruction of Green Belt; • No increase of traffic; • Small scale affordable housing on existing Brownfield sites. The respondent has indicated support for this option (5).				298	
668660	Mrs B P Hamersley		CSPS3962	Policy CN 1							I wish to lodge my objection to the proposed developments on the Burton Farm Green Belt and the allotments relocation (CN2 and CN1). The roads in this area already very congested. Salisbury road in particular with commuters and school children walking and bicycling to and from the village to school. The lanes surrounding the fields are narrow and flood in heavy rain when the ground becomes waterlogged. This is a conservation area and must not be damaged by development and housing. I do hope it can be saved for the future.				298	
668736	Mr and Mrs Mike Fox		CSPS3965	Policy CN 1							Why is the Council reducing their plans for affordable housing from 40% to 35%. There is already enough land available for affordable housing over and above the original 40% without using the existing allotment site. The proposed site has three main disadvantages for private houses on the scale proposed, a) the railway line, b) the pylons, c) the very busy A35. re the latter entry/exit onto this road for a large estate will be a nightmare. I waited over 3 years to get a plot on the Roeshot site, finding an established site with very good soil for growing crops. A new site will have to be cultivated taking many years to get to standard matching the Roeshot site. It is excellent that it can be worked all year round not getting flooded or boggy. There is an excellent community spirit, with people getting to retirement age, possibly downsizing to a flat still able to spend their days enjoying a "garden" amongst their friends.				298	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											Following on from these comments, how will the council replace the existing site with something matching it when there is no need to. It would be better to leave it as it is, build the affordable and build private housing on a site elsewhere much more suitable.					
668741	Chris Allsopp		CSPS3966	Policy CN 1							Ref: North Christchurch Urban Extension I see no problem with housing since Sainsburys got planning it was always on the cards. Option 3 is the best, anything more than 850 units would create problems also allotments could be retained. Even with this option exits from new development must be provided both ends with new roundabouts (Sainsbury's roundabout cannot take any more) remember 850 houses means 1275 new cars using road (1 1/2 per household). This would allow new traffic to get directly onto Bournemouth carriageway and would slow down traffic (this section of bypass is an accident black spot) between Staple Cross and Sainsburys.				298	
668845	J E Goodchild		CSPS3968	Policy CN 1							I should like to record a very strong objection to the development in the above area. 1. The proposed site is known to be a flood risk area. And if built on where would the waters be displaced to? Only to endanger existing properties. 2. Why are you planning to build on Green Belt land when there are reasonable alternatives? 3. The infrastructure of the village can not cope with the extra traffic or residents. 4. The loss of Burton Farm resulting in loss of local jobs. 5. The proposed site is in the Burton Conservation area which will be severely damaged by such a large development. 6. If the allotment sites are moved as proposed the massive increase in persons using it will just add further congestion to a busy area. 7. Why are we trying to expand Christchurch to swallow up our rural heritage?				298	
668853	R Bobbitt		CSPS3969	Policy CN 1							I am opposed and disappointed that you are still trying to go through with all these areas of greenfields and also the allotments at Roeshot, to build "affordable" houses on these sites (5) you should all be ashamed to even think about building on these 5 sites, when you arrive from the forest what do you see, rural countryside from the Cat and Fiddle to the roundabout at Somerford then the by past fields and trees with a occasional glimpse of a house then Christchurch - The priory - Christchurch. You want to see houses dense housing from the top of Roeshot and forever housing,				298	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>never ending, until you reach the otherside of Poole. I feel you only think about the monetry side of things, trees, grass, wildlife does not come into your thinking, its about greed greed greed.</p> <p>The allotment at Roeshot is another way of life next to nature, the birds, rabbits, moles etc. Animals that you cant relate to, you obviously do not like gardening or know the feeling when you sow seeds and then they mature to a lovely plant or flowers or green lawn or a lovely vegetable you can eat, you only know the supermarket where the veg comes from spain etc. You wouldn't understand of cutting a twig off a bush and nurturing it so you have another fine bush of better quality. You've never known the proud moment when it flowers and you look at your garden and your allotment to see all the flowers and vegetables growing and say: I did that.</p> <p>You obviously do not do these things any of you or you wouldn't want to build build build, bricks and mortar everywhere, you obviously do not think of Christchurch as a town only as a monetry comodity.</p> <p>I hope you do not win on this one upsetting people for your own ends.</p> <p>Think again what you hope to achieve by doing this, as I and many many others are oppose to all of these workings of build build build.</p>					
668991	Mrs L Weeks		CSPS3970	Policy CN 1							<p>I am writing to object to the proposed North Christchurch Urban Extension. I have carefully considered the following points and believe I have based my comments on sound planning grounds.</p> <p>Insufficient Infrastructure - Although the site has good transport links, is close to local shops, surgeries and schools there is insufficient infrastructure to support such a large development. Using Green Belt land for such a development is unacceptable when there are several smaller area of Brownfield sites in the Christchurch area that already have the necessary infrastructure in place. Considering the current economic climate, I believe the enormous cost of providing the appropriate infrastructure required would be financially unviable and indeliverable.</p> <p>Schhols - Development on this site would limit access to local schools many of which are already full to capacity. Last year 66 children in Christchurch were refused places at their 3 preferred schools within their catchment areas. This was because there were not sufficient places (May 2012, Bournemouth Evening Echo). Two of the local schools are already full to capacity and are unable to offer children in their own catachment area places. Furthermore, they may not have sufficient space to increase class sizes as</p>				298	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>suggested.</p> <p>Health Services - There will be a need to provide local GP's and other health services which may already be full to capacity.</p> <p>Roads - There would be an unacceptable increase in traffic. Nearby Stony Lane rounabout has already been identified as a "bottleneck" at certain times of the day. The fountain Roundabout and A35 through Lyndhurst would become further congested. Additional public transport would have to be provided. Appropriate highway improvements would be costly and disruptive.</p> <p>Detrimental effect on Sensitive Environmental Site - This type of development would damage the surrounding sensitive environmental sites. The development will impact on Burton SSSI.</p> <p>Unacceptable recreational pressure would be put on nearby heath land and will endanger a nationally protected species, the Southern Damselfly.</p> <p>Furthermore, Natural England have stated that it is not possible to provide a SANG of sufficient size and quality to successfully divert recreational pressure away from heath land to satisfy the 2010 Habitat Regulations.</p> <p>I have carefully considered the points made above and believe I have based my objections on sound planning grounds.</p>					
670048	Mr William Diggins		CSPS3973	Policy CN 1							<p>Last year, I and several hundreds of other people were asked for our input into the proposed development of Roeshott Hill Allotments.</p> <p>I now see that you have ignored our comments/wishes, and propose to move ahead with the development.</p> <p>I have been a keen allotment holder all my life but now find that a major part of my leisure activity time is about to be removed at the behest of a council that is not listening to the people that they are supposed to represent.</p> <p>I accept that my views have to be considered in the light of the needs of others, but that does not mean that THE PLAN is the correct route forward.</p> <p>What other areas have been considered for redevelopment?</p> <p>Why choose a site that is severely constrained by the railway line on one side and the major A35 road on the other.?</p> <p>If the A35 is the only access point to the site then how do you propose to accommodate the in/out flow of some several hundred vehicles a day from the site. Assuming 300 homes are built with each having a car driver, there will be a minimum of 600 journeys each day. The figure is actually likely to be much more, as</p>				298	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>most households have more than one car owner. The close proximity of the Sainsburys roundabout coupled with the Roeshott Hill itself , makes it difficult to envisage a safe environment for drivers on what is already a very busy road, especially at peak times and holiday periods..</p> <p>What feasibility studies have been carried out as to the affect the new homes will have on local amenities - schools/doctors etc ?</p> <p>All in all there are many aspects that have not been resolved, but it strikes me that the council have gone for an easy option of a one-off large scale development without undertaking a full due diligence report.</p> <p>Just to make it absolutely clear I do not believe that the council have properly considered all aspects of the situation, although professing to have done so. I object to the closure of the allotments for all the above reasons.</p> <p>I regret that it is highly likely that a move as proposed to another site further from my home will see me having to give up a leisure passtime I have enjoyed for some 40 years.</p> <p>During the 5 years I have been on this site I have spent a lot of money putting in paving slabs and fruit trees to improve my allotment .</p> <p>How are you going to re-imburse me for the items I will have to leave behind?</p>					
670121	Susan Dean		CSPS3976	Policy CN 1							<p>I wish to register my opposition to the proposed changes to the Roeshot Hill allotment site outlined in the councils core strategy.</p> <p>My objections are based on the practicalities of the proposal to build houses in a location where the roads already become snarled with traffic at all times of the year. This surely cannot be good for the environment . I am sure that there are adequate brown sites across the borough where affordable housing could be built that would not have such an impact in one area. And what about the railway line and the gravel extraction nearby, and the pylons?</p> <p>Has the council considered building the new houses on the site where the allotments would be moved to? Surely this would be a more economic plan and would not involve the cost of moving the allotment site. The proposals seem to be excessively costly and not very practical.</p>				298	
670649	Tim Hallpike		CSPS3978	Policy CN 1							<p>Responded to a consultation that was distributed by Christchurch UKIP which referred to a previous stage of consultation and options that are no longer relevant. The respondent has supported option 4 which includes the following:</p>				298	2287865_0_1.pdf

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Locates approximately 500-650 dwellings south of the railway line • Open space, retail and community facilities and allotments provided south of the railway line • Suitable alternative natural green space provided south of the railway line • Retain overhead power cables in current position Should be significantly fewer houses limited to the area highlighted in yellow on the attached map. To minimise costs, electricity cables / pylons should not be moved BUT NO houses should be built close to the cables / pylon run. Area between the railway and the existing electricity / pylon run should be dedicated to allotments. Please see attached map.					
654026	Ms Bev Miller		CSPS625	6.57		No		No	No		NO LOSS OF GREEN BELT.		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		308	
654745	Mr Mark Hughes		CSPS914	6.58	Yes	No	Yes		Yes	Yes	Since the financial market crash in 2008, can you be sure that a 2006 survey still holds true - will the houses built be any cheaper than those planned. Today, there are currently 22 properties for sale in Burton valued between £100,000 and £200,000.	re validate the need for further housing in Burton village	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		309	
653852	Mrs Susan Newman-Crane		CSPS595	6.59	No			Yes		Yes	This may well be Burton Common and have rights attached to it.	Investigate the status of the land as a common and if it has rights which would need to go through a formal extinguishing procedure.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		310	
654026	Ms Bev Miller		CSPS626	6.60		No		No	No	No	Marsh Lane proposal. It would ruin the lane, which is at the bottom of the highly sensitive, high environmentally categorised, St Catherine's Hill and the para on Protection of Sensitive Habitats and Species is frightening with its reference to mitigation work to The Avon Valley Special Protection Area and Ramsar Site and Dorset Heathlands Special Protection Area! Marsh Lane will be the main access to these 90 houses: can you imagine a road widening appropriate for this – end of little, rural Marsh Lane?		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		311	
359614	Mr & Mrs McCammon		CSPS146	Policy CN 2							Most will be affordable housing whilst others will be buy to let with 50%+ affordable, unlikely to attract private owner / occupier buyers.				315	
359615	Mr Burridge		CSPS97	Policy CN 2							If Green Belt can be cancelled when convenient, then a Green Belt is pointless and the term Green Belt a joke / insult. Transport improvement is a meaningless phrase. The development will just create more traffic.				315	
360149	Mr John Urganhart		CSPS93	Policy CN 2							Yes, providing adequate improvement to local facilities is paid for by the developers.				315	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
360166	Mr TC Nicholson		CSPS101	Policy CN 2							It is assumed that the footbridge over the A35 bypass has been built to aid this proposal via Salisbury Road. However my suggestion to relocate the A35 bypass north of the railway will further aid this proposal and avoid pushing more traffic onto the existing bypass.				315	
589997	Mrs Clarke		CSPS78	Policy CN 2				No			No not justified because no infrastructure in place. Not deliverable i.e. schools, doctors, hospitals and social services. Please dont forget the Grange School is a failed school.				315	
647876	Mr Christopher Whitcher		CSPS106	Policy CN 2							So as usual Green Belt means nothing!				315	
647898	Mr Derek Beasley		CSPS116	Policy CN 2							Ok.				315	
648240	Mr Roger Haxby		CSPS150	Policy CN 2							<p>Objection 1: PPG2 Green Belts states there are five purposes of including land in Green Belts:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas; 2. To prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another; 3. To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment; 4. To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and 5. To assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. <p>The development encroaching on Green Belt land does not meet the first reason – since it leads to an unrestricted sprawl, the third reason, since the proposal encroaches on the countryside, and the fourth reason, since the historical riverside / countryside setting characteristic of Christchurch and surrounding villages is not being preserved. The policy does not meet the test of soundness because it is not consistent with national policy.</p> <p>Objection 2: Para 1.7 of PPG2 says “The purposes of including land in Green Belts are of paramount importance to their continued protection, and should take precedence over the land use objectives.” The policy does not meet the test of soundness because the Green Belt purposes are not given precedence over land use objectives, and so it is not consistent with national policy.</p>				315	
648788	Mr R Hewetson		CSPS159	Policy CN 2							How about flooding on occasion from the River Avon? Where is the money coming from!!!?				315	
648805	Mr John Cuming		CSPS163	Policy CN 2							Seems to meet the tests and the urgent need for affordable housing.				315	
648918	Mrs M		CSPS196	Policy CN 2							Yes the village already has public access to transport,				315	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
	Ramsden-Fisher										public areas, football field etc. Some play area for children required to be flexible. Flooding back up, drainage a possible worry.					
648946	Ms Barbara Hamilton		CSPS203	Policy CN 2				Yes			This is in wild life habitat and wont be "effective" due to the close proximity of the river and being prone to flooding at high water times. Not practical as the water barrier is not giving this area protection.				315	
648964	Mrs Sue Bruce-Burgess		CSPS205	Policy CN 2							100% should be affordable!!! Local people need housing.				315	
649982	Mr and Mrs Edward and Marion Slade		CSPS276	Policy CN 2							We do not like the sound of "The Green Belt boundary will be amended... etc." So we assume from this that it is Green Belt land, formerly untouchable, which is to be developed. Disgraceful!				315	
649998	Mr John Grainger		CSPS280	Policy CN 2							Yes - the high percentage of affordable properties gives the local population an opportunity to stay in their home area if they so choose. There is ample Green Belt land around Burton so there will be no noticeable imbalance to the existing community. Local and nearby resources should be more than able to accomodate the demands of such a number of new dwellings.				315	
650390	Mr and Ms T and E J Lodge and Cox		CSPS314	Policy CN 2							No objection but same comment in CN1.				315	
650428	Mrs R Davies		CSPS323	Policy CN 2							1. If land is to be excluded from current GB area to accommodate development then GB is rather a farce? Are the barns in this area of local listed interest? 2. Is the affordable housing for the local people - guaranteed? 3. Only if Drs appointments can be improved. Cars and speeding improved. Scout hut and fields in Martins Hill Lane improved. 4. How? cars and speeds are a huge problem in Burton.				315	
651353	Mrs Janice Targett		CSPS419	Policy CN 2							Yes justified.				315	
518223	Mr Gary Lammers		CSPS725	Policy CN 2							Ok but access to Christchurch bypass is already poor. There must be plans to improve the road network especially a link road from Stony Lane to Wessex Way / A338.				315	
653013	Mr Andrew Chambers		CSPS548	Policy CN 2	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	The plans erode Green Belt land, thereby nullifying its purpose and effectively linking Burton to Somerford. This continues the urban sprawl that Green Belt is meant to protect. We already have urban sprawl along the South Coast from Poole all the way along to Barton On Sea. When is a limit put on development if Green Belt is no longer protected? Linking towns and villages	Reduce the number of homes planned and decrease the ratio of social housing to better integrate different members of the community more effectively. Develop land that will not in	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination	315		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>with poorly planned development only further breaks down community ties as they lose their own identity. This invariably leads to social issues. Residents need to take pride in their communities and this will not happen unless they have an identity.</p> <p>A 50% mix of social housing will put off the potential buyers of the other properties in the development making it a very unattractive prospect for a developer. With a 50% ratio there will be a tendency over time for the development to become further skewed towards social housing and often the associated problems this can bring.</p> <p>The land selected for development floods regularly and it seems incongruous to be building new developments on flood risk land when we have seen in recent years the number of issues communities across the country have had due to flooding. This is only likely to get worse due to climate change.</p> <p>The A35 already has considerable traffic issues. This development taken into consideration with CN1 will put a huge extra demand on an already over stretched road infrastructure.</p>	<p>future flood, thereby mitigating against the unforeseen cost both financial and emotional to the local community.</p> <p>Ensure Green Belt land is protected to ensure that communities benefit from green open space and the future vision of the borough is not one of homogenised suburbs sprawling into one another and losing their character and identity.</p>				
653593	Mr Graham Richards		CSPS653	Policy CN 2	No		Yes	Yes			<p>The Broadway Malyan No 1 Masterplan 2010 report on the North Christchurch Urban Extension states in its Green Belt Review (page 83)</p> <p>A Green Belt Review was conducted as part of the South East Dorset Joint Study Area Report SED 04 "Development Options". (the Green Belt review). This review identified the town of Christchurch and the village of Burton as settlements whose separate physical identity is protected by the Green Belt.</p> <p>Figure 10 of the Green Belt review identifies the key gaps that provide this separate physical identity and which form a strategic element of the South East Dorset Green Belt.</p> <p>A key gap is identified south and south east of Burton which provides separation from Christchurch to the south.</p> <p>Further, the area immediately south of Burton is identified as a "Key Edge". Such key edges were defined by the Green Belt Review as those places where the width of the key gaps separating settlement's areas is 1km or less and where prevention of further erosion of the separating gap will be critical.</p> <p>The diagrams do not provide a precise definition of the location or width of these key gaps and key edges but their purpose is clear.</p> <p>Broadway Malyan state that its criteria for selecting the south site as opposed to the north site for the North Christchurch Urban Extension are as follows (Page</p>	<p>I believe that the population increase projected for the period in question and the housing increase required for that period should be questioned.</p> <p>Bournemouth has recently reduced its Housing Waiting List substantially.</p> <p>Christchurch should follow suit.</p>	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination	If necessary.	315	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											156); Coalescence – There are potential coalescence issues with this site. The village of Burton lies immediately to the west of the site and development here could potentially create an issue. Building onto the edge of Burton could affect the character and appearance of this area. Furthermore there are no clear defensible boundaries to this site and the introduction of development here could set a precedent for a future urban sprawl. Conclusions & Recommendations: Large areas subject to flood risk Possible impact on the Burton Conservation Area Potential coalescence issues relating to Burton A lack of defensible boundaries to prevent future urban sprawl Sensitive Landscape I believe that all these points apply even more strongly to the Land South of Burton in Christchurch Borough Council’s CN2 proposal.					
653852	Mrs Susan Newman-Crane		CSPS596	Policy CN 2	No	No		Yes		Yes	I agree with another comments as follows: objection 1: PPG2 Green Belts states there are five purposes of including land in Green Belts: 1. To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas; 2. To prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another; 3. To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment; 4. To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and 5. To assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. The development encroaching on Green Belt land does not meet the first reason – since it leads to an unrestricted sprawl, the third reason, since the proposal encroaches on the countryside, and the fourth reason, since the historical riverside / countryside setting characteristic of Christchurch and surrounding villages is not being preserved. The policy does not meet the test of soundness because it is not consistent with national policy. Objection 2: Para 1.7 of PPG2 says “The purposes of including land in Green Belts are of paramount importance to their continued protection, and should take precedence over the land use objectives.” The policy does not meet the test of soundness because the Green Belt purposes are not given precedence over land use objectives, and so it is not consistent with national policy.	Preserve the green belt.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		315	
653852	Mrs		CSPS597	Policy	No	No		Yes	Yes	Yes	This may be Burton Common. With common rights. If it	Protect this green belt area	No, I do not		315	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
	Susan Newman-Crane			CN 2							is, it's very ancient. It removes green belt land which is nationally protected. It does not try to provide the same number of houses on brownfield site infill.	and find a brownfield site alternative if possible.	wish to participate at the oral examination			
654055	Ms J Brown		CSPS638	Policy CN 2	Yes	No		Yes	Yes		The proposed loss of Green Belt is fundamentally unjustified when alternative sites not in the Green Belt are available. Additionally, the proposes site is in the Burton Conservation Area which will result in severe damage to that area by the construction of a large development and relocation of allotments. The human cost should also be considered as there will be job losses due to changes at Burton Farm.		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		315	
653593	Mr Graham Richards		CSPS768	Policy CN 2		No		Yes	Yes	Yes	The most southerly part of the space deignated for development in this map is to be set aside as Heathland Mitigation. Dog walkers and children playing here will be up to their knees in water and mud for most of the year.		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		315	
654341	Ms Chris Keats		CSPS666	Policy CN 2							No, the proposed policy to build approx. 45 dwellings is not 'Sound' if it will encroach on the Green belt. Green belt land is there for a purpose and should be preserved for future generations.				315	
654513	Miss H Rankin		CSPS688	Policy CN 2							I was most alarmed, when, waiting for a bus in Martins Hill Lane I learned that up to 85 houses were proposed on the land behind Waters Farm down to Sandy Plot. I have several objections to these proposed plans:- 1. I was under the impression that the land was prime Green Belt and a conservation area. 2. Waters Farm is an essential part of our village life. Where will the cows go? We would hate to see our farm go. 3. What about flooding? Once footings for buildings go down, water levels alter. I was informed that when my house was built - and it was only one, the garden next door flooded and drainage had to be put in. 4. I can see that these houses which are proposed would probably be the thin edge of the wedge - perhaps its chinese whispers but already 135 houses have been mentioned, once building starts it will gradually creep and creep up to the railway embankment, thus making Burton into an urban area. Are there not any brown field sites around. Why couldn't the Homefield schol have been developed for housing. 5. If you ever have to drive out of the village at peak times you will know that the ques extend up beyond the railway bridge in Stony Lane. Similarly, the cars outside the school in Salisbury Road are somewhat of a hazard.				315	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>Some evenings around 7pm it can take over 5 minutes to get out from the Stony Lane roundabout.</p> <p>6. Lots of affordable properties exist in Burton - two very large estates built in the 1970's. Almost every nook and cranny in the heart of the village has been built on - surely its reached saturation point.</p> <p>7. Lastly. I knew nothing of the proposed move of the allotments from Roeshot Hill until I attended a meeting held on the 13th June - a couple of hundred I believe. Do you realise how narrow the lanes are to accomodate the extra traffic. And then the proposed gravel pits extending from Hampshire to Dorset to Hawthorn Road. Already there are dozens of New Milton Sand and Ballast lorries in the area. All this would certainly mean curtains to the farm and farmland.</p> <p>There is a lovely community feel to our village people love the environment. I've lived here for nearly 37 years. Please dont take all these things away by letting Burton grow and grow until it loses its identity.</p>					
654686	Mrs J E Francis		CSPS770	Policy CN 2							<p>No. The Green Belt is there to protect our countryside and environment. It was meant not to be built on. Brown field sites should be used and these are enough for needs. Roads hospitals etc already overstretched.</p>				315	
653586	Mr Robert Stephen Homer		CSPS1125	Policy CN 2							<p>Policy CN2 does not meet the tests of soundness. It too entails destruction of working farmland and wildlife. Coupled with the mineral extraction threat also aimed at this area, this would result in a permanent loss of irreplaceable, accessible countryside. As a Burton resident I am not aware of any shortage of community facilities. The SANG is unnecessary if Policy CN1 is abandoned as it should be.</p>				315	
654674	Mrs Robyn Chambers		CSPS874	Policy CN 2	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	<p>The development will effectively link the village of Burton to Somerford/Christchurch thereby making Burton a suburb of Christchurch. This continued urban sprawl and development of green belt land is one step towards the loss of the village 'feel' and community that exists today. Much of Bournemouth is already blighted with urban sprawl and Christchurch should protect communities by having distinct local areas separated by undeveloped land.</p> <p>This could well set an unwanted precedent of continued development further undermining Burton's village status. The small gain in additional housing is far outweighed by the loss of a distinct separate community detached from Christchurch itself.</p> <p>The land earmarked for development is prone to flooding making it unsuitable for development, especially considering the extreme weather patterns that are now more prevalent due to climate change.</p>		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		315	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											Martin's Hill lane is not suitable for additional traffic with two already very dangerous corners.					
654745	Mr Mark Hughes		CSPS826	Policy CN 2	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	The green belt that exists between Christchurch and Burton exists to keep the two areas distinct. If this goes ahead, there seems to be no logical defence protecting the remaining land. The fear is that Burton will become a poor suburb of Christchurch.		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		315	
654780	Ms Sharon Davis		CSPS851	Policy CN 2	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	There will be a loss of valuable Green Belt land when alternative sites not classed as Green Belt are available. The proposed site is in the important Burton Conservation Area which will be severely damaged by such a large development with the added loss of productive agricultural areas to personal allotments. Burton Farm at the heart of the rural community as mentioned in the Conservation Area Appraisal as making a valuable contribution to the Conservation Area will be lost with consequential loss of jobs and true feeling of village life. The fragile infrastructure of the village road net work cannot support the extra traffic will be generated.	Surely Brown Sites should be utilised in the first instance, which have some of the infrastructure already in place.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		315	
654839	Miss Karen Mason		CSPS863	Policy CN 2	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	I was totally unaware of this development and proposal and as a resident of Burton I question why is this so; surely it is imperative that ALL RESIDENTS of our village are given the opportunity to consider. I have various objections as follows CN2 I strongly believe we should save and preserve our Green Belt and Conservation Areas. CS2/KS10 the additional traffic this will create will cause even more delays on Stony Lane which is already unable to cope with the current traffic generated from Burton and surrounding areas. CS2/KS10 The development will create more unsustainable vehicles in and around the village.		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		315	
654842	Miss Denise White		CSPS870	Policy CN 2								This land is on a flood plain, as a resident of Gordon Way we are already prone to flooding so by developing this land this situation will surely only become worse. The land is green belt and a conservation area, surely there are brown belt options which would be more practical and less detrimental to the environment. Burton, over the last 50 years+ or so has undergone major development, hence for it to retain its appealing village			315	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
												status, surely other boroughs around christchurch also need consideration as Burton has already played a major role in providing additional housing. The working farm is a major asset for village life and one which we should be proud of. The traffic at the stony lane roundabout and that on the A35 is already extremely busy during most times of the day and surely an increase in housing and allotments will only make this worse. As a burton resident I very rarely shop in christchurch town as it is difficult to access and park and southampton or castle point have become far more appealing options.				
654844	Mr Timothy Cooper		CSPS877	Policy CN 2	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	The proposed development (CN2) will have an extremely negative impact on the Burton Conservation Area irrevocably changing its character. The resulting loss of green belt will not only have a significant effect on the environment but will also create an "urban sprawl" connecting Burton with the rest of Christchurch. I am also concerned that the additional demand on the local infrastructure has not been adequately taken into consideration with roads, schools and medical services all facing increased strain. Finally, Burton Farm is a valuable part of our community and its loss and the resultant loss of jobs would be another blow to this precious conservation area.				315	
654962	Mr Christopher Chope		CSPS918	Policy CN 2	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Because the proposal involves 'amending' the Green Belt boundary which is inconsistent with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework which affords special status to the retention of Green Belt.	The removal of Policy CN2 from the Plan.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	Because of the strength of feeling of residents of Burton about the desecration of their valuable Green Belt.	315	
654700	Mr & Mrs F L Crabb		CSPS1114	Policy CN 2							What drainage provision? Low land liable to flooding as pasture. Acres of concrete and tarmac will create flooding problems for other parts of the village. There are already problems in the Martins Hill Lane Playing Fields, which the relevant authorities refuse to address.				315	
654704	Mrs J E		CSPS1055	Policy CN 2							Provided the infrastructure in Burton and District is in				315	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	
	John										place for more families, then this could work. People will need assurance and the truth about the number of houses and the number of affordable homes as well as social housing. As in all cases, social housing would need to be monitored once families take up residence, to provide fully then ordinary needs as families as well as social needs and difficulties if there are problems to be met. Extra school space must be found, patient care must be considered in the light of GP's, maternity services and public transport. Can Christchurch Council itself cope with any more residents and their needs. Yes we must have more housing here, so get the local council departments up to speed.						
654814	Mrs Carole Hughes		CSPS979	Policy CN 2	Yes	No		Yes	Yes		I am opposed to erosion of green belt land and the destruction of Burton Farm which gives our village its semi rural character . I think brownfield sites should be considered first. In addition more housing will increase the traffic on the roads serving Burton village. I also think that Burton has sufficient affordable housing.	Find an alternative site for these 45 homes and allow Burton to retain its farm and its semi rural location.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		315		
655005	Mrs Roxanna Fayer		CSPS980	Policy CN 2	Yes	No		No			No. The loss of our green belt is unacceptable, there are other sites which would be acceptable for affordable housing in the borough. Our roads would not be able to support the extra traffic this devolpment would bring. We strive on still being a village with a working farm and with this gone our conservation area would be lost aswell as jobs. This area is also a big flood risk.				315		
655432	Mr Andy Davies		CSPS1022	Policy CN 2							This perhaps is the lesser of the two evils. But again, do we need 45 dwellings? Why a large part of land for 45 houses? You could find an extra 45 dwellings scattered around Christchurch or on brownfield sites.				315		
655526	Mr Paul Morrison		CSPS1037	Policy CN 2							Of course, part from the fact that those 45 dwellings will need to be increased to 120 in 20-25 years time. 50% of all housing will not be affordable? You see massive hoardings outside new developments in India, bearing the legend air conditioned apartments for the privedidged few.				315		
654507	Mr David Archer		CSPS1373	Policy CN 2	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	I object to the Green Belt being amended to allow this development. PPG2 states "...limited alterations to the Green Belt may be made at local level subject to demonstrating exceptional circumstances" - I don't believe these circumstances have been demonstrated. There is no mention in the Core Strategy document of the availability or otherwise of alternative brownfield sites. Several large sites in the Borough seem to have been	Reconsider the need for any further development in Burton especially if this can only be achieved by building on Green Belt, Conservation Area and Flood Risk Land which will destroy its character and rurality.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		315		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename		
											linked to giant supermarkets rather than housing. The farm land and its buildings are specifically mentioned in the Burton Conservation Area Plan 2007 as defining the character of the village. There is a Grade II listed barn (English Heritage ID 101652) within the proposed development site. The site is in a flood risk area (SFRA - August 2009) and the effect of development on the land has not been demonstrated. I believe there will be traffic issues, especially if the proposed allotment hub site relocation (to land also within the Burton Conservation Area) as proposed in CN1, is adopted.							
657120	Mr Matthew Perry		CSPS1475	Policy CN 2	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	This proposed development directly contravenes the national policy when alternatives to Green Belt exist. In addition to this it falls within a conservation area, to which the farm is integral, clearly not justified or effective. The site is designated as having flood risk which again contravenes national policy. Development would further disrupt transport and traffic problems that exist in the area. As a resident of 25 years this proposal would ruin the character and sense of community in our village.	Withdraw proposal CN2.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	In order to convey my strong feelings on this issue and give great detail to support my argument.	315			
657121	Mr Ash Griffiths		CSPS1447	Policy CN 2	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Loss of "green belt", closure of local farm. Burton is not urban and is a 'close' village. It is a rural community. Displacement of flood plain and alternative sites have been offered which would provide better location.	Consider the use of 'Brown field sites'.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		315			
657126	Mr Ryan Hirst		CSPS1412	Policy CN 2	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	The development of houses will again close a working farm, causing unemployment and the villages identity. The greenbelt function is to prevent coalescence of settlements, any development therefore reduces this effect. This is important to keep a wedge in between Burton and Christchurch. Burton is a village and not a suburb of Christchurch! Salisbury Road a Martins Hill Lane are too narrow to accommodate increased traffic and will make the road become unsafe. It is not realistic to assume people will use public transport, in town maybe, but not in the village. The proposed land floods, even if you were to make remedies for that area, the water has to go somewhere! This proposal will destroy the characteristics of the village, which is underlined in the Burton Conservation Area Management Plan.	Alternative sites have been offered for affordable housing. These areas were far more suitable and would cause less damage to the green belt.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		315			
657129	Mrs Janet Hiriart		CSPS1409	Policy CN 2	No	No	No	No	No	No	This is a green belt and conservation area. To build many more houses will risk the status of our village. To potentially have the loss of Burton Farm would take away the character of the village. Burton should not	To make this document legally compliant we should maintain the conservation area and keep Burton as a	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		315			

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											become a suburb of Christchurch it should stay a village in its own right. Allotments to this scale will bring traffic that these small lanes will not be able to cope with.	village. To maintain the working farm. To ensure that there will be no flood risk.				
657135	Mr Colin James Fowler		CSPS1403	Policy CN 2	No			No	No	No	Reduction of Green Belt land, already affordable housing in Burton. Increase in traffic.		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		315	
657169	Mrs Jacqueline Bramall		CSPS1372	Policy CN 2		No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Any additional impact on traffic would be disastrous to the current road network, as this is already at capacity. Also any extra children would surely mean a need for extra schools, the Christchurch Infant and Junior schools are already at capacity, and so are the Stourfield schools at Southbourne.		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		315	
656952	Mrs Tina Esterling		CSPS1691	Policy CN 2		No	Yes	Yes		Yes	<p>Within the conservation area, the farm buildings remain in the use that they were originally intended for. The new building would change use and would very likely mean the demise of a working farm. This working farm adds to the character of the village and provides employment. The loss of employment appears to contravene the council's own policy stated in core strategy policy LNH (page 177).</p> <p>The proposed development would appear to be an add on to the original plan for development within the Christchurch area. Therefore this is not based on credible and robust evidence and it would seem that until the intervention of the landowner that this site has been included.</p> <p>The proposed site south of Burton, was, some years ago, either the site of a pond or within the immediate area. There is no evidence in the proposal to prove beyond doubt that there will be no risk of flooding and therefore contravenes the core strategy policy ME6 (page 162).</p> <p>The proposed building application is in direct contravention of the national policy - especially when there are brown sites available within the Borough.</p>				315	
656954	Mr Ian Esterling		CSPS1689	Policy CN 2		No	Yes	Yes		Yes	<p>This proposed development only seems to have been put forward after the intervention of the land owner and not considered necessary on the original draught. The core strategy of this document goes against the Burton area conservation document.</p> <p>The probable loss of the farm due to the loss of its fields would then open up the opportunity for future development added on which could carry southwards to the railway embankment turning a conservation area and the village becoming a small town.</p> <p>Due to the history of the proposed site there is no evidence to prove that this development will not cause any flooding problems to surrounding areas.</p>		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		315	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>The additional properties would cause and increase in traffic especially if the resiting of the allotments goes ahead and therefore cause congestion on the surrounding village roads (not forgetting the extra pollution). The suggested use of public transport seems exaggerated as no firm confirmation of a better service from the bus companies have been agreed and therefore a better comprehensive explanation would be required.</p> <p>I strongly object to the proposed development to the south of the village as Burton was designated a conservation area and adopted by Christchurch Borough Council on 21st February 2007 as well as it being in direct contravention of national policy on green belt development when other brown sites are available. The green belt area acts as a barrier zone between Christchurch urban areas and Burton's rural setting which must remain and not concreted over and built on.</p> <p>There is no evidence on record that proves that the estimation of 3020 properties by the year 2028 is proven as an accurate figure and that circumstances will not have changed by that time and therefore the need for this development be void.</p>					
507477	Mrs Sally Owen		CSPS1838	Policy CN 2	Yes	No				Yes	Transport - traffic - environment.	Consideration of all these.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		315	
653893	Mr Michael Bailey		CSPS1873	Policy CN 2	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	<p>I have no means of establishing whether or not the document is legally compliant. I can only assume that it is. The document is not sound. What does "positively prepared" mean? The document question "Do you consider the document is unsound because it is not (please answer yes or no)" appears in the form of a double negative see comment in para 7 below. The document is NOT consistent with national policy PPG2 and comments in para 8 below refers and is therefore not justified or effective.</p> <p>The question in para 5 should read. "Do you consider the document is sound (select either yes or no). Housing Development Proposal.</p> <p>Older parts of the village of Burton date back at least to the early part of the 18th century. Although falling within the boundary of Christchurch Borough Council the village has a distinctive village character and has benefited from the absence of "urban creep", commercial and industrial development.</p> <p>The village is on the edge of the New Forest National Park to the east and falls within the Green Belt and includes a conservation area following the Salisbury Road from the junction with the Christchurch bypass to the junction with the B3347.</p>		Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	To vocalise my objections.	315	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>In response to the demand for more housing, the Christchurch Borough Council, in conjunction with the Meyrick Estates, have stated their agreement to the construction of 45 houses on the land south of Alder and Medlar Closes. Although this area falls within the green belt the council have argued that the need provides "exceptional circumstances" for the amendment to the Green Belt boundary. This decision raises two questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - what are these "exceptional circumstances"? - what does the definition of the green belt and conservation area really mean if such developments can so easily override - how is it that such developments can so easily override the fundamental aim of Green Belt Policy. - Current national policy for Green Belts is set out in PPG2 which states "the fundamental aim of Green Belt Policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the most important attribute of Green Belts is their openness. It sets out five purposes of including land in Green Belts, namely - to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built areas - to prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another - to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment - to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns - to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land <p>There was always the thought in mind that Meyrick Estates would be keen to develop all the land in the area west of Salisbury Road to the conjunction of the railway embankment and Stony Lane. Should the construction of 45 houses noted above proceed, the pressure will be on to apply for planning permission to extend the area for further development into the land noted above. No doubt should this occur "exceptional circumstances" will again apply. This tactic is well documented in other areas of the country and is rightly referred to as "urban creep" a situation specifically ruled out within the definition of Green Belt Policy, quote PPG2.</p> <p>The proposal plays down the fact that the area is increasingly prone to the risk of flooding and with the increase in global warming this can only have an adverse effect. It should also be recorded that the piece of land being proposed is currently part of Burton Farm, a business that has been farmed by the Farwell family for the past 130 years, loss of land will have a material effect upon the viability of the business and a potential loss of jobs.</p>					

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>In accordance with PPG2 the council should be encouraging the development of derelict and other urban land for example brownfield sites of which there are a number within the area. The argument maybe put forward by the planners that such land is designated as commercial / industrial. There is nothing sacrosanct about this definition and it is suggested that such land could easily be re-designated for housing development by employing the expediant of "exceptional circumstances", a ploy so easily embraced in respect of the proposed land development.</p> <p>Allotments proposal - with regard to the proposal to allocate land for allotments north east of Salisbury Road formed between the junction of the railway embankment / Hawthorn Lane / Summers Lane. The loss of such a large area of arable land will have a further significant effect upon the vialbility of Burton Farm which could result in job losses.</p> <p>It is to be noted once again that half of this area is denoted as a conservation area. Again it begs the question as to what is the point of creating such areas if the planners can so easily change the rules.</p> <p>Not only will the establishment of a considerable number of allotments consume vital agricultural land but also lead to an increase in traffic movements, the construction of pathways, toilets, storage huts and water supplies etc. The infrastructure of the village can ill afford to accommodate such facilities.</p> <p>The proposals fly in the face of: Christchurch Urban Extension - (Core Strategy and Master Planning Document and the North Christchurch Urban Extension - 01 Masterplan Context report September 2010, in particular pages 83 and 84, and should be rejected.</p>					
656835	Mr Adrian Flower		CSPS1856	Policy CN 2	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	<p>Conservation and farm area. The farm and farm buildings give a genuine visual feel or rural atmopshere and ambience. To lose any part of this longstanding farm would be a catastrophe, and must remain a farm together with conservation area status.</p> <p>I do not understand or believe that Green belt land should be given up. Residentail development is wholly unacceptable on this green belt. It will reduce considerably the pleasant ambience inkeeping with the Burton area, forever!</p> <p>There is not any need whatsoever for more affordable housing in the Burton area. Consider the size of Burton, and it is quite abundantly clear that pro-rata it has enough social housing. Notwithstanding the increase on the incumbants, with extra burden on</p>	<p>This document is unsound and non compliant. It fails fundamentally with its complete disregard to the local and national attitude that GREEN BELT should remian GREEN BELT.</p>	<p>No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination</p>		315	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											schools, medical centre and of course the roads. Having lived in Burton for 26 years, the volume of traffic has increased considerably over this period of time. Salisbury Road and Martins Hill Lane in particular do not have the dimensions to accommodate the certain increase in traffic volume. The upsurge has not been satisfactorily addressed in the document. It is clear that as no regard has been given to the safety of pedestrians and vehicle drivers, accidents will be the consequence.					
656837	Mrs Sandra Flower		CSPS1849	Policy CN 2	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Burton has more than enough affordable housing and vacant properties. Utility services are already under pressure. Health, education and roads have already reached saturation point. The loss of Burton green belt will be a disaster for the community, future generations will not have a village, it will merge with Christchurch and Highcliffe. The green belt in question is a conservation area and is our duty to preserve for the future.				315	
656838	Ms Jeanette Trudgeon		CSPS1720	Policy CN 2	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	I object to the use of the area that is proposed to build the 45 new houses south of the village of Burton. This is Green Belt land and is part of the Burton Conservation Area. Building on Green Belt land and a Conservation Area goes against both national and local council policy. Burton does not need the extra housing and if this was given the go ahead would result in future further development seeing the end of Burton as a rural village.	Instead of using Green Belt and Conservation Area land to build extra housing on, there are many areas of redundant unoccupied Brownfield sites within Christchurch that could be used. Building on these brownfield sites that are already close to urban areas, would have less of an impact on the environment and in the long term would retain Burton as a rural village.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		315	
656840	Mr Steven Aries		CSPS1829	Policy CN 2	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	1) Building on Green Belt Land is an infringement of National Policy if it is deemed not required, which this is. This is an essential Green Belt area that leaves an area of land separating Burton from Christchurch that allows Burton to remain as a rural village. If accepted this would be just the start of development within this area and would attract future development proposals that would see the end of Burton as a rural village. 2)The addition of extra housing is not required in Burton. Affordable housing already exists within the village and a site for additional affordable housing for the young has been identified on a viable site in Vicarage Way. The building of urban housing is totally against the proposal that was created in the Burton Conservation Area of 2007. It states that the Conservation Area should have an open rural agricultural landscape and that the survival of farms	There is only one changed required and that is the removal of Policy CN2 from the Christchurch Urban Extension to satisfy the unjustified objections above. The extra 45 houses if required for the Christchurch Urban Extension can be combined into either Policy CN1 if approved or should be built on existing Brownfield sites that have remained unoccupied and run down for several years in the Somerford Road area.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		315	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											and farm buildings should be kept as a reminder of the strong agricultural origins of the settlement. 3) The building of housing and with the relocation of the allotments in Policy CN1 will result in the closure of Burton Farm. This is going totally against the Burton Conservation Area agreement, leading to a more urbanized area south of the village and the loss of employment to farm hands in an area with high unemployment especially to the young. 4) Wildlife that enhance the rural location that live in and around the farm buildings including owls, bats and foxes will be lost from this area making it more of an urban environment going against the Burton Conservation Area policy. 5) According to the Environment Agency Flood Risk Assessment (Level 2) there is a risk of flooding on part of this land which would be more extensive in the result of an extreme flood. With global warming and sea levels due to rise this would add a greater risk making the land unacceptable for urban housing. 6) There would be an increase of approximately 100 cars from the proposed development that would add to the traffic congestion already experienced on the A35. Extra traffic would also increase through Burton Village and its surrounding narrow roads, leading to congestion and away from the road safety setting associated with village life.					
656847	Mr M.P MacAuley		CSPS1705	Policy CN 2	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	This is against other government and local policies. The land is prone to flooding, which will be displaced to another area. This is green belt land for 'agricultural' use and not commercial. The farm is also part of the Burton Conservation Area.	Use of alternative brown field sites.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		315	
656848	Mrs Paula Hancock		CSPS1819	Policy CN 2	No	No					Loss of working farm, loss of Green Belt. Burton is a village not a TOWN and increase of traffic.	Use brownfield sites.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		315	
656852	Mr Kevin Jones		CSPS1818	Policy CN 2	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Loss of green belt The farm will close Burton is a village! Displacement of flood risk Traffic!	Use brown field sites! other sites have been offered	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		315	
656853	Mrs Lucy Jackson		CSPS1799	Policy CN 2		No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Loss of greenbelt land Loss of village life as proposed number of properties would make Burton just an extension of Christchurch. Increased traffic through village - safety issues - older people and children. How would need for extra schooling, doctors etc to meet demand be accommodated.		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		315	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
656855	Mr Steve Barwood		CSPS1796	Policy CN 2	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Not justified because: Loss of working farm Flood displacement - even if you took measures for this development, the water has to go somewhere! Loss of green belt, which is to prevent linkage of settlements and keeps a wedge between Burton, Christchurch and new development in Roeshot Hill.	Develop the sites that have already been offered or use brown field sites in Somerford, which would not cause as much damage to the green belt and more importantly not cause a working farm to be unworkable.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		315	
656860	Mr Ralph Hicks		CSPS1791	Policy CN 2		No			Yes		The area is subject to flood risk. At least two houses in Gordon Way, adjacent to CN2 and overlooking it are already experiencing flooding. It is therefore inevitable that CN2, land lower than Gordon Way, will be subject to flood risk.	Nothing can be done to change flood risk. However, there is land at a higher level than CN2 further north in the village of Burton.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		315	
656861	Mr Adrian Turner		CSPS1785	Policy CN 2	No	No	No	No	No	No	CN2 - planning policy relating to building 45 properties on Green Belt land, which would result in loss of conservation area, loss of Burton Farm and would impact on traffic on Salisbury Road and Stony Lane. Burton is a village NOT a suburb of Christchurch - it has its own Civil Authority.		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		315	
656862	Mrs Brenda Atkinson		CSPS1749	Policy CN 2		No		Yes	Yes		It rides roughshod over the notion of Green Belt by proposing to remove the valuable contribution to the Conservation Area made by Burton Farm, which is an essential element of village life so appreciated by residents of Burton, providing as it does a sense of rural community. There is a risk of flooding and displaced flooding on the pasture land. There are alternative sites - e.g. Roeshot Hill. The character of the village is irreplaceable. 'Vision' is a contradiction in terms.		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		315	
656867	Mrs Alison Ramsey		CSPS1726	Policy CN 2	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	The proposal for land south of Burton village is unjustified because: 1. Loss of Green Belt - any reduction of the Green Belt cannot be permitted without exceptional reason (National Planning Policy Framework) - who is to say that the estimation of 3020 properties required by 2028 is accurate? Out of these houses, only a number, maximum 35% will be affordable housing, so therefore it is unlikely that these will be bought by local people and who is to say that by 2028, circumstances will not change? The Green Belt is to prevent coalescence of settlements. Any property development at this location will reduce this affect, a wdge should be kept between Burton and Christchurch, that is indeed the purpose of the Green Belt. Burton is a village and not a suburb of Christchurch. It has its own Parish Council! 2. Loss of working farm - This farm has been worked by the same tenant farmer for almost 135 years, by development of this land, the dairy farm would become	Two alternative sites have been offered for affordable housing within the village, whcih have been ignored. These areas would cause far less damage to the character of the village and more importantly the Green Belt and loss of working farm. Burton has a number of affordable type houses which already exist in the village.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	This proposal is both unsound and unjustified and I would therefore wish to participate in the oral part of the examination to ensure all objections are considered satisfactorily.	315	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>unsustainable, causing, amongst other things, unemployment and the requirement to re-home farm workers. In the past 10 years, the number of dairy farmers in England and Wales has fallen by 48%. Most of these are for financial pressures, which is why I consider that if a farm is currently keeping its head above the parapet, then it should not be closed for unnecessary development!</p> <p>3. Flood riak - the proposed land can only be used by the cows for 6 months of the year, so how can it be justified to build houses on it? If, and this is a big if as it already has streams and natural springs, remedies could be found to continue with this, then there would obviously be flood displacement, the water has to go somewhere and with climate change flood mapping, this area is at increased risk of flooding, so this is hardly a long-term solutioun and would only push the problem of flooding to another area.</p> <p>4. Transport - Your own objective 3 'The impact of carbon emissons from transport will be reduced by more sustainable patterns of development in accessible locations and by encouraging travel by bike, on foot or by public transport' - This is unrealistic for a village, both Yellow and Red bus companies deem the service through the village uneconomical! Salisbury Road / Martins Hill Lane are too narrow to accommodate increased traffic and would just render the roads unsafe. Highway improvements would need to be much wider ranging than the A35 / Stony Lane roundabout. This would cause major disruption to overall traffic flow!</p> <p>5. This proposal was an afterthought, why? It was not in the original proposal!</p> <p>6. Burton Conservation Area Management Plan - This plan is used for planning purposes and planning applications have been turned down because of plans being 'uncharacteristic for the village'. Burton Farm specifically was included and adopted in this management plan in 2007. This is quoted from that document 'The open countryside views in part define the essence of the character and sense of place for Burton. They are a strong reminder of the agricultural routes of the former string of settlements and are part of the improtant wider setting of this semi-rural conservation area, Fig 24 which this relates to is in fact a photograph of where you propose to locate the allotments'. It continues to state about Burton Farm specifically 'Its wider setting also forms an important part of the character area. All the buildings in this character area contribute to a working group of some considerable significance and importance made more so by the fact they remain in their original uses etc etc.</p>					

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											Figure 7 and 8, which this refers is photographs of the buildings where the proposed development is located.					
656947	Mrs Gillian Macauley		CSPS1715	Policy CN 2	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	The proposed land use is on a flood plain that will cause excess water to find an alternative area. Will cause the closure and loss to the community of a working and established dairy farm with associated jobs. Is on green belt land set aside for agricultural use. Is within the Burton conservation area and not in keeping. Insufficient local amenities to cope, i.e. schools, utilities etc.	Find and use alternative 'brown field' sites. Make use of other sites where planning has been refused for supermarkets and stores, i.e. Somerford Road old South Style site.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		315	
657059	Mr and Mrs T R Beaumont		CSPS1891	Policy CN 2							Does not meet the test of soundness. No credible evidence justifying moving the Green Belt boundary for housing development. If the 45 dwellings proposed are required they should be built on existing brown field sites within the Borough.				315	
359824	Mrs Carol Hellicar		CSPS2088	Policy CN 2							1. Anti loss of Green Belt. 2. For local families.				315	
612430	Mr Nick Squirrell	Natural England, Dorset and Somerset Team	CSPS1916	Policy CN 2	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	Policies; CN 1, CN 2, CN 3, WMC 3, WMC 4, WMC 5, WMC 6, FWP 3, FWP 4, FWP 6, FWP 7, FWP 8, VTSW 2, VTSW3, VTSW 4, VTSW 8 etc are all proposing development and or mitigation in the form of SANGs on greenfield locations. In order to avoid a conflict with policy ME1 at a later stage in the planning process Natural England advise the authorities to bring to the attention of those with an interest in these locations the need to carry out a basic biodiversity survey eg Phase 1 habitat survey including assessment of the likely presence or evidence of other features likely to restrict or delay development eg badger setts, priority species such as reptiles, water voles etc in time for consideration at the EIP. In many cases this will simply be a statement as the proposer has already engaged an ecological advisor. These policies appear to have been brought forward in an absence of adequate information and assessment on the biodiversity features held by the policy land. There is reason to suspect that on some there may be a significant biodiversity interest owing to close proximity with designated sites and or other biodiversity sites. The NPPF requires that planning policies should be based on up-to date information on the natural environment (paragraph 165). These policies are not shown to be compliant with this requirement. Thus, irrespective of the above matters concerning other nearby designated sites, it is not possible to identify whether the policies are compliant with policy considerations in the NPPF on sustainable development for the sites alone, especially the aspect on sustainable development set out in paragraph 9 of	The policies may need to include specific paragraphs about features of biodiversity importance which are to be secured or enhanced. Natural England have raised a number of considerations, however we consider that the incorporation of modifications may best be achieved through discussion with the LPA.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	Natural England may wish to provide specific advice to the Inspector regarding the effects of the wording on European and internationally designated sites.	315	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>moving from a net loss of biodiversity to achieving net gains (for example on priory habitats and species). Policy CN2 Natural England objects to this policy with reference to the Protection of Sensitive Habitats and Species section. This section is incorrectly titled and worded. SANGs requirements relate to avoidance of harm to European sites in the vicinity rather than the undefined "sensitive" habitats and species. The text is too specific and should simply state that the development should provide a SANG of a suitable quality and functionality to avoid adverse effects. This SANG may link to the North Christchurch Extension however this should not be a policy requirement. No SANG proposal map or masterplan is available for consideration of this proposal at strategy level so it is difficult to consider if an area of suitable quality and functionality can be delivered. The Policy is not sound or legally justified because, whilst there is adequate available land to enable the authority to consider at this time that a SANG may be provided, which is both effective functionally and in its quality and size, this work has not been carried out. Paragraphs 6.61 and 6.62 identify the need to avoid adverse effects however the evidence to show this has not been made available. The NPPF affords significant policy protection on European and internationally protected sites and species (para 14, 117, 118 and 119. It is not therefore at this time possible to demonstrate that this proposal would not give rise to adverse effects on the nearby sites. Further the policy does not reflect the NPPF policy guidance requiring the need to "moving from a net loss of bio-diversity to achieving net gains for nature" which the provision of a SANG and suitable biodiversity enhancements in and around the development could achieve.</p>					
656738	Mr & Mrs Adamson		CSPS2031	Policy CN 2							<p>We are writing to convey our absolute horror at the proposal for housing and allotments in Burton. Burton is a village currently protected by green belt from the urban sprawl, and is a pleasant place to live. We list below some of the objection points that we feel are valid: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Salisbury Road is a rural conservation area with a long established farm, and the valuable grazing land taken from it would either run the farm down or force closure, resulting in job losses. • The proposed housing development & allotments would all but destroy the conservation area and would be a severe loss of green belt, especially when other 				315	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>less contentious sites could be identified. Any loss of green belt is unacceptable!</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The road infrastructure would not support the extra traffic...and the queues at Stony Lane Roundabout are getting worse all the time! Salisbury Road cannot be expected to take any more traffic. • Burton's village 'feel' and status would be lost forever. • The effects of extra demands on infrastructure and services would necessitate even more building and growth making Burton urban rather than semi rural. There are many other points of objection that could be raised, especially in the light of the estimated 3020 extra properties supposedly needed by 2028...who says so! And if this figure is realised what next? Another 7000 maybe...it will just generate growth in an area on the edge of its limit of viable expansion. 'Christchurch, where time is pleasant' ? But for how much longer for the residents? Burton is NOT A SUBURB OF CHRISTCHURCH, it has its own Civil Authority, and it must be maintained as a VILLAGE. We do not want ANY Borough -wide facilities in our village, nor any development as proposed. Most residents we have spoken to are equally upset at the proposals but see fighting it as a lost cause...How sad! Please listen to the voice of Burton residents and REJECT THESE PROPOSALS! 					
656832	Mr Paul Ramsey		CSPS2150	Policy CN 2	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	<p>Loss of green belt - against National Planning Policy. Loss of working farm - against your own policy plan. Unsustainable demands on transport infrastructure. Burton is a village and should remain so. We are not nor do we want to be a suburb of Christchurch. This proposal was not in the original plan, why try and include it now.</p>	<p>Other sites within the village have been put forward. These would not impact on the farm, nor would they breach the green belt.</p>	<p>Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination</p>	<p>This policy is unsound and I wish to ensure a full examination of the policy.</p>	315	
656843	Doctor Anthony Atkinson		CSPS2190	Policy CN 2		No		No	No	No	<p>The document supporting policy CN2 of the Core Strategy Document is unsound in three respects. The policy is unsound as it:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> requires the Green Belt Boundary put in place to protect the Conservation Area of Burton to be amended. erodes the Green Belt land which contributes to the separate identity of Burton village within the Christchurch community. inevitably erodes and affects the character of the village, historically a farming community, further promoting its move towards becoming a dormitory suburb of Christchurch. <p>The policy is unjustified as it will not achieve a key objective which is to produce 45 dwellings, 50% of which will allegedly be "affordable".</p>	<p>Changes which would help to make the policy document more legally compliant and sound include:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Put forward plans for development which do not erode Green Belt Ensure that access for such developments is onto roads constructed to cope with the increased size and volume of traffic. Avoid development which takes out established communities changing their innate character, because of 	<p>Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination</p>	<p>In order to be satisfied that any decision is soundly based, it is helpful to be able to assess the personal and professional character of the individual responsible for making the decision.</p>	315	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	
											<p>The concept of affordable housing is notional and obscure, as the time-scale of development, the vagaries of land and building costs, variable mortgage availability and changing demand are completely unpredictable and cannot be a basis for formulating housing policy.</p> <p>The policy is ineffective, as it will:</p> <p>a) not contribute to improved community facilities in Burton. It will instead impose a detrimental load on an already unbalanced community infrastructure, the elements of which have not kept up with developments over the years.</p> <p>b) not contribute appropriately to transport improvement, but will inevitably be to its detriment. Access to the road system will be via Salisbury Road, and / or Martins Hill Lane, narrow village roads already inadequate to cope with the volume and size of vehicles at present using them. Salisbury Road is already a twice daily rat-run used to avoid Stony Cross Roundabout, encouraging traffic to traverse the village, and the size of public transport vehicles and farm machinery have reached the limit of what the roads can cope with.</p> <p>The policy is inconsistent with National Policy, which aims to promote and protect Green Belt and Conservation Area Status at local and national level. The projected development runs directly counter to these objectives.</p>	its unbalancing effect on community physical and social infrastructure.					
656991	Mrs Netta Bailey		CSPS2173	Policy CN 2	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	<p>I have no means of establishing whether or not the document is legally compliant. I can only assume that it is. The document is not sound. What does "positively prepared" mean? The document question "Do you consider the document is unsound because it is not (please answer yes or no)" appears in the form of a double negative see comment in para 7 below. The document is NOT consistent with national policy PPG2 and comments in para 8 below refers and is therefore not justified or effective.</p> <p>I believe that the Green Belt and Conservation Areas should be the last areas considered for development and that suitable alternatives should be thoroughly investigated as there is absolutely no point in designating such areas if they can so easily be "grabbed" for development using the excuse of "exceptional circumstances". What are the "exceptional circumstances" for the development of the land for 45 houses on the land south of Alder and Medlar Closes. Experience tells me that this is the thin edge of the wedge and that as soon as the 45 houses have been built the landowner, Meyrick Estates, will put in planning permission for further development until</p>	<p>The question in para 5 should read, Do you consider the document is sound (select either yes or no).</p>	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination			315	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>no doubt the whole of the area west of Salisbury Road to the railway embankment and Stony Lane will be covered in houses.... so much for the Green Belt. I suppose planning permission will again be granted for "exceptional circumstances". I have NO faith in the Planning Authorities as it would appear that minds have already been made up and that they are merely going through the motions that at the end of the day will result in plans going ahead.</p> <p>The Green belt and Conservation areas currently designated should remain as such at least for the benefit of future generations.</p> <p>Flooding of the designated area is a distinct possibility and with global warming on the horizon such concerns should be taken into account and development should not be allowed to take place....remember what happened in Stony Lane in recent years.</p> <p>Further development will increase traffic densities. 45 houses could result in the addition of up to additional 100 cars on local roads.</p> <p>I have read the content of the planning policy guidance 2 on the subject of Green Belts and have concluded that the proposals are contrary to this policy. PPG2 encourages the development of derelict and other urban land for new build. Such areas exist within the Borough boundaries and should be used before eating into the Green Belt. No doubt the planners will say that a number of such sites are designated for industrial / commercial purposes and cannot be used for housing. I suggest that they think again and use the euphemism of "exceptional circumstances".</p> <p>Allotments - It is proposed to grant permission for the establishment of allotments in the area north east of Salisbury Road formed between the junction of the railway embankment / Hawthorn Lane / Summers Lane. This area is part of Burton Farm, a farm which has been farmed by the Farwell family for the past 130 years. A loss of such an area will have a significant effect upon the viability of the business with a potential loss of jobs. The area is half Conservation Area and half Green belt..... more "exceptional circumstances" no doubt apply here as well. Such a large scale proposal will result in the development of pathways, water supplies, huts, toilets as well as a considerable increase in traffic "toing and froing" from the site on roads which are not suitable.</p> <p>In conclusion the proposals are not sound, justified or effective and go against the policy defined - in PPG2 - Christchurch Urban Extension - (Core Strategy and Master Planning Document and the North Christchurch Urban Extension - 01 Masterplan Context Report</p>					

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											September 2010, in particular pages 83 and 84) and should be rejected.					
657039	Mrs Pat Brookes		CSPS2107	Policy CN 2							How much of the Green Belt will remain from the present. Consider your 50% housing should be increased.				315	
657048	Mr Ian David Kirchin		CSPS2072	Policy CN 2							Leave the greenbelt alone please. We have already seen Purewell Meadows and Hoburne Farm disappear in order to satisfy outside demand for housing in the area as opposed to local need. We cannot afford to lose anymore of our open spaces if Christchurch is to maintain its current quality of life for its residents.				315	
657052	Mrs Carol Cofhay		CSPS1955	Policy CN 2							I object to Policy CN2 because development of properties on green belt land is not justified. The green belt is there to stop settlements joining up and development here would reduce the gap between Christchurch and Burton.				315	
657055	Mr and Mrs Gavin and Daf Kewley		CSPS1921	Policy CN 2							The alteration of Green Belt is not appropriate in this case. Burton's residential growth is "separated from the urban area". Reasonable alternatives exist elsewhere. Pressure on Burton's growth have included burial ground, community recreation facilities and now the allotment relocation. Care is needed to protect Burtons character within its conservation area status. Development in conflict with "risk of flooding" national policy. Burton means "The farm that feeds the town".				315	
657057	Mrs C Moss		CSPS1903	Policy CN 2							I am against any changes to Green belt land.				315	
655853	Ms Lyn Marsh		CSPS2266	Policy CN 2							Proposed building of fourty five houses in Burton. I am writing to protest at the proposed building of fourty five new houses in the land south of Alder and Medlar Closes in Burton, Christchurch. This will mean the loss of valuable Green Belt land when there are alternative sites not in the Green Belt available, plus the site is in the Burton Conservation Area and will mean relocation of the allotments.				315	
656856	Miss Ella Perry		CSPS2223	Policy CN 2	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	There should be no building on previous greenbelt land when many reasonable alternatives exist. It is not justified or consistent with national policy. The conservation area will be ruined - what is the point of having one? The farm will go, the traffic will ruin the village and it is agaisnt national policy to build on land that will flood.	Build on brownfield sites - there are plenty - or find room in CN1. Abandon policy CN2.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		315	
656228	Mr Adrian Dwyer		CSPS2479	Policy CN 2							No. 1. This has not considered buiding on brownfield. 2. The evidence is that there is no demand as per the				315	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											unprecedented level of unsold properties.					
656658	Mrs Barbara Wilcox		CSPS2463	Policy CN 2							The proposed housing development site is a flood risk area and is also Green Belt. Any development would change the character of the village and reduce the available farmland with subsequent loss of jobs. The roads/lanes are not suitable for the increase of traffic. The landscape of Burton village will be destroyed by any proposed housing development.				315	
656635	Sarah Teague		CSPS2535	Policy CN 2							I think it would be misjudged to go ahead with development of this conservation / Green Belt area in Burton and severely damaging to it. Stony Lane roundabout is testing enough on a daily basis without adding additional traffic. Already I seek alternative routes when possible please dont make this situation worse. The farm contributes to the conservation area and if the land is lost one must also assume jobs will be. My whole reason for moving to Burton is to live in a rural environment close to work in Highcliffe and to Christchurch for shopping and socialising thereby minimising my carbon footprint. I walk my dogs locally, walk to the shop in Burton and do a minimal amount of driving. If the village were busier with cars walking would not be enjoyable. Please seek an alternative solution and leave Burton as it is - beautiful and rural.				315	
656650	Mrs Patricia Fear		CSPS2445	Policy CN 2							No. This development will spoil Burton. Burton is a village. Burton needs this farm. This is green belt land. Burton does not want these houses. Stop blackmailing about mere buses! due to more development. Leave the Roeshot Hill allotments alone. This is green land, not building land.				315	
656653	Mrs Anne Archer		CSPS2451	Policy CN 2							No. The site for housing is on Green Belt land, which is the dividing line between Burton village and the town of Christchurch. There are listed farm buildings on the site. Any further developments on farm land will change Burton's rural character, which contradicts one of the Council's Core Strategy Policies. More housing = more cars, on roads and roundabouts which are already inadequate, with increased safety risk. The site is already liable to flood - further buiding could potential make this worse.				315	
656664	Mr Glen Morrison		CSPS2458	Policy CN 2							The intended development of 45 new homes will add to the existing stress on teh Christchurch town's infrastructure as already mentioned in KS3. Also Green Belt is again being destroyed to make way for housing and accommodation stresses that need to be				315	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											alleviated as addressed under LN3 affordable housing.					
656781	Mr and Mrs T L Mutter		CSPS2540	Policy CN 2							<p>We wish to state our opposition to the proposals to build on the Green Belt land when other brown sites are available (CN2). It seems that you have bulldozed this through without any thought on the impact it will have on the local community.</p> <p>What of the consequences to Burton Farm and loss of employment (CN1&CN2). The infrastructure of the village - its road network cannot support the extra traffic that will be generated (CS2). Who will be responsible for the upkeep of existing roads, with respect you don't do a particularly good job at present! So how can you be trusted with what is there now plus your proposals?</p> <p>It must be assumed that the majority of any new residents will wish to travel Christchurch or Bournemouth and the Stony Lane roundabout is already at capacity (KS10). The proposals (KS10) give no natural links to the village centre. It is beyond normal walking distance and it is unrealistic to expect that people will walk or cycle. This will result in more unsustainable vehicle movements to the centre of the village.</p> <p>In conclusion, if your plan is to obliterate Burton, you could at least have the decency to take on board people's concerns, and bearing in mind the present economic climate, where is the funding coming from? To do this properly you cannot fund these proposals on a shoe-string.</p>				315	
656126	Mr Rodney Burton		CSPS2887	Policy CN 2							<p>I am writing to object to the CN1/CN2 proposed planning development in my village of Burton. It is not justified because using Green belt land – even for affordable housing is totally unacceptable. Burton already has a number of affordable type houses in the village.</p> <p>How will Burton cope with the extra traffic which will be caused by these developments? Martin's Hill Lane is only a narrow road and merges onto an already over loaded road (Stoney Lane).</p> <p>I do not feel this scheme is justified.</p>				315	
656132	Mrs Deborah Burton		CSPS2885	Policy CN 2							<p>I feel I must write to make know my objections to the proposed development in Burton Village. (Planning policy CN1/CN2).</p> <p>It is not justified because it goes against the National Policy, as this land next to Medlar/Alder Close, is green belt. How can you make an exception to this, when there are other reasonable brownfield sites available? Eg Somerford Road.</p> <p>If this plan goes ahead, Burton will merge into</p>				315	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>Christchurch, and will lose its village identity, it contravenes the council's own core strategy Policy LN4, as the development is not "small" or "in character" with the surrounding landscape.</p> <p>The loss of grazing land, would surely make Burton Farm, which has been in the same family for approx. 135 years, unworkable, not to mention, the hazard of more congestion when a herd of cows have to cross an even busier road.</p> <p>The junction between Martins Hill Lane and Salisbury Road is already badly sighted (more so from Summers Lane), with hundreds more cars, this would become a real danger.</p> <p>As Salisbury Road is a conservation area, the proposed plans would destroy all the characteristics which make it so! The loss of views across farm buildings and the working farm, means we would lose a part of the village which gives Burton its sense of rural community.</p> <p>Martins Hill Lane is already a busy road and most mornings traffic is 'backed-up' along Stoney Lane from the roundabout. The narrow roads of Martins Hill Lane and Salisbury Road will not be able to cope with the increased volume and congestion that will surely come if this development takes place. These are village roads/lanes and inadequate for this and impossible to improve.</p> <p>Many school children use Salisbury road to walk from Somerford to Burton Primary School, and Burton children use this road to walk to the Grange school in Somerford. A couple of years ago, one of them was seriously injured when hit by a car on the way to school. We do not need or want more cars speeding through Burton.</p> <p>Burton is a village not a suburb of Christchurch. If this goes ahead I feel it would be the "thin edge of the wedge", and I would like to keep a "green wedge" between us and Christchurch. Please find a more appropriate site which would not cause as much damage. Thank you.</p>					
656142	Ms Elizabeth Perry		CSPS2874	Policy CN 2		No				Yes	<p>I have lived in Burton for 25 years & feel very much apart of this village. My children have attended Burton Primary/Junior School. As a family we have very much enjoyed & valued The Village ethos. The children have been members of Burton Scouts/Rainbows/Football Club/May Pole dance troop which as residents we work so hard to maintain & present.</p> <p>I am utterly dismayed with the proposals sited in CN2, which are both unsound and inconstant with Natural Policy. I note that in the Core Strategy Policy LN4 p.177, quote 'The development is small scale &</p>		Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	I feel this process has been underhand & lacking honesty.	315	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>reflects the setting, form & character of the settlement & surrounding landscape' – This clearly contravenes The proposal & is neither sound or transparent. The loss of green belt sited in CN2, ie the land south of Burton is neither necessary or desirable. There are many brownfield sites available for such development, Someford being one – by imposing this proposal on our village, you destroy the character of the village. How can this be justified?!</p> <p>The proposed site is in the Burton Conservation Area, again I must refer to the Core Strategy Policy LN4 p. 22, quote 'control small scale works which might damage the character of the Conservation Areas' – where is the consistency? How can the removal of farm buildings, which are mentioned in the Conservation Area Appraisal be justified? The land in its present state accommodates much wildlife & fornication – it would seem that this is also inconsequential to your proposals.</p> <p>I believe that this plan has not been positively prepared & seeks to hoodwink residents.</p> <p>Furthermore I would wish to oppose any changes to traffic directions to Salisbury Road – how convenient is it that these changes are suggested at this time!</p> <p>I would wish to participate in the oral part of the examination with the Government Inspector as to date I feel this process has been underhand & lacking honesty.</p>					
656147	Mr K N Sheppard		CSPS2880	Policy CN 2							<p>The Key issues I wish to object to are –</p> <p>The 45 houses are to be built on Green Belt land, loss of pasture to Burton Farm, consequently loss of jobs and homes for the Farmers and their employees. The added congestion of traffic to the village and beyond. The disposal of more of our natural flood-Plain.</p> <p>The proposal to relocate all the allotments to Burton Farms' grazing pastures will see an end to Burton Farm and an end to Burton as a village it will lose its scale and character. This is a Conservation Area. The Country lanes will be inadequate to cope with all the allotment traffic. I urge you to leave our habitat the pleasant place it is.</p>				315	
656152	Mrs C A Rich		CSPS2878	Policy CN 2							<p>I wish to respond to proposal CN2 (the building of forty five new houses) and CN1 (allotments relocation) by strongly objecting to both proposals.</p> <p>My objection to the building CN2 areas follows</p> <p>This is green belt land, it ensures Burton as a rural village. There are other sites available that are not Greenbelt. This will be taking land away from Burton Farm. The only remaining farm in Burton. I understand there is already in place, plans for 850 new houses to be erected from Roeshot Hill through to Burton. These</p>				315	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>extra 45 houses will add to the bombardment of this area of Burton.</p> <p>The infrastructure of the village, its road network is already at saturation, 45 houses possibly equal 90 more cars, this builds to a gridlock situation at Stoney Lane roundabout, the fountain roundabout, Bargates and Barak Road.</p> <p>The proposed area to build on is part of the natural flood plain, it has underground streams, - build on those and the water has to go somewhere?</p> <p>Again there must be more appropriate sites</p> <p>Objections to CN1 Relocation of allotments</p> <p>This part of Salisbury road is a conservation area. The allotments will take a vast amount of green belt, conservation, grazing land from Burton Farm. Along with the proposed gravel extraction in this area there will be no land left to farm. The Farmers and their employees will lose their livelihoods and their homes. Burton would no longer be a rural village.</p> <p>Our pretty country lanes are not adequate for the impact of traffic generated by the allotment users.</p> <p>I wish my objections to be noted.</p>					
656160	Mr L Siegenberg		CSPS2882	Policy CN 2							<p>RE: PROPOSED BUILDING PLAN DEVELOPMENT SOUTH OF ALDER AND MEDLAR CLOSES.</p> <p>Please find below my reasons for opposing your above planned development.</p> <p>The prime reason I moved to the idyllic village setting of Burton, is that I did not want to live in a town. Surely there must be alternatives to the loss of valuable Green Belt land.</p> <p>I've noticed that the big supermarkets are vying for three sites near Christchurch; where we already have M & S, Waitrose, Coop, Lidl and Sainsbury's plus at Castlepoint – M & S, Sainsburys and Asda, not to mention various metro type smaller outlets. Why not develop these three sites? The infrastructure is already in place, and it is only a short walk or bus ride away.</p> <p>No emissions and healthy – that's affordable!</p> <p>Your development would require a new road network to cope with the extra traffic. The A35 and its roundabouts are overloaded already. New shops and amenities would also have to be built. Extra schools, a doctor's surgery would have to be provided.</p> <p>The centre of Burton is too far to walk and too small to accommodate another one hundred and fifty new residents.</p> <p>Where are these extra people coming from? Are they from within the Borough, or are they for key workers – e.g. nurses, policemen or firemen?</p> <p>The 'powers that be' are telling us to conserve and</p>				315	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	
											produce locally or in the U.K. this is a conservation Area dividing Burton from Christchurch. Burton Farm and allotments will be lost or relocated. At present there is only one bus per hour, and is already crowded at peak times – busy at other times. Three an hour would be required in the future – more traffic and drain on resources. If we, and I include all parties involved, are not careful a “city” from Poole to Barton-on-sea will soon slowly blend into one another. We could re-name it ‘Little London’/						
656176	Mrs B Smith		CSPS2877	Policy CN 2							I wish to object to the building of 135 dwellings on the land that is Burton Farm because of flood risk. The village of Burton has the R. Avon running along side it and as such will have many tributaries running off of it which will make the land unstable and saturated with moisture for the majority of time. I understand in Modern times land like this can be managed but why waste valuable money in this manner? Building 135 dwellings will displace water which will flow toward mine and other properties tracing its natural route to the R. Avon. I am facing south looking toward this farmland and my garden gets soggy and water lies. Others in this cul-de-sac have told me stories of their own experiences with floors indoors needing replacing after buckling in connection with the damp. A question that also needs answering is, “How much money do we intend to throw into managing the land from flood risk?” We are an aging population, and if we do find the resources for this project, there is the noise, dirt and dust involved which I know older people cannot tolerate and do not want. People worry about flood risk, it destroys property and peoples lives and experience has taught me that local and national politicians will say anything to meet their aims. I wish to object to the building of 135 dwellings on the land that is Burton Farm. This is Green Belt Land and therefore goes against the laws of building on Green Belt, which is consistant with national policy. Burton with lose its’ identity as a village if it looses its’ green belt and Burton Farm and also jobs if the farm goes. The scale and character of the village will be lost by the removal of Burton Farm and will also evoke the status of the Salisbury Rd conservation area. Traffic will increase to what is now already a miserable experience trying to get out of Martins Hill Lane onto Stony Lane. From Stony Land onto the Christchurch ByPass, which is an oxymoron in terms; what does it					315	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	
											bypass? Rather it cuts the town of Christchurch in half. Extra traffic in the village is not justified and also when you consider the impact of traffic from the new siting of allotments, it means also extra traffic. The further away from the centre of the village you build will encourage people to use their cars and indeed people with disability (age and infirmity) will want to anyway. And finally after building 135 dwellings, where will it end? Just another 135 here and 135 there and Burton becomes suburbia. Another village lost to a planning dream and others ideologies						
656369	Mr Timothy Peter Cook	John Reid and Sons (Strucsteel) Ltd	CSPS2766	Policy CN 2							Yes. Acceptable small scale development with very limited impact on countryside. Close enough to walk to town centre without need for car. Ok.				315		
656426	Mrs Pauline Pritchard		CSPS2726	Policy CN 2							I moved to Gordon Way in April 2011 from Frampton Cotterell Bristol. I was born in Dorset so wanted to return to the area and choose a village to live in. We lived in a village, Frampton Cotterill, but with ongoing development there it joined Coalpit Heath and was no longer a small community. We don't want this to happen to Burton. Objections to the development are as follows:- Village: Burton is at present a village and any additional properties may damage this status. It has a wonderful community atmosphere that should remain. People in the village already have the use of two church halls and a new scout hut is coming soon. Additional people will need more facilities, school places, transport, doctors etc which will add to more pressures in the village or will create a 'town' which I do not want! Green Belt Land - this area should remain as Green Belt - there are so few areas like this in the area and should not be used as development. The importance of keeping this land as Green Belt will ensure the conservation of the many large Oak trees that should have conservation orders. Also we have seen over 30 different species of birds on this land (and have numerous photos of them). Horses have recently used this land and the cattle use it for grazing. Farm - The farm is and has been part of the village for many years. It is valued and appreciated by all of the residents as being unique to us. It is important that the farm remains as many around the whole country have been lost because of development. Flooding: During the last year our front and back gardens have flooded several times especially during the heavy storms (which are likely to increase as extreme weather is much more common). By building on this green belt land, adding more concrete eg houses and drives - this is likely to increase the					315	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>flooding. Can you reassure us that any flooding of the properties, in the future, will be paid for by the developers? I doubt it. There is also a stream at the bottom of our garden and at the present time the farmer clears the ditch and helps to keep the water running. Who will be responsible for this if the lane is built on? It seems that the council / highways cannot maintain to clear the ditches and streams at the other many places in the village. There is nearly always water running Martins Hill Lane, whatever the weather. Traffic - additional properties add to traffic in the village. At present there are long queues of vehicles on Stony Lane during most of the day. Going along Salisbury Road leading onto the bypass is already difficult at times, additional traffic would cause even more chaos and be a danger to children returning from the schools. The noise and pollution from extra vehicles would affect the peace and quiet of the village, cause more health problems, environmental damage and have no positive additions.</p> <p>Housing: It has been stated in CN2 of the development plan that "approximately 45 dwellings" will be built. I have since heard that it's possible that 150 homes will now be built. If Green Belt land is made available for housing - where will this end? Developers will be given a free hand to do as they please and build whatever they want. Young people at the moment cannot afford any type of housing so people with money will be buying the houses as holiday homes or to rent which will affect the community atmosphere.</p>					
656527	Ms Nicole Cox		CSPS2810	Policy CN 2							Great idea.				315	
656529	T Pratt		CSPS2817	Policy CN 2							A minor extension makes sense.				315	
656534	Mr Rob Warn		CSPS2821	Policy CN 2							Makes sense as little impact.				315	
656536	Ms Wendy Voller		CSPS2828	Policy CN 2							Agree.				315	
656542	Mrs Deidre Harding		CSPS2843	Policy CN 2							<p>No. It:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Contravenes national Green Belt policy 2. Salisbury Road is a Conservation Area and will not sustain all the extra traffic. 3. Village status will eventually be lost and Burton will become an urban sprawl. 4. Loss of livelihood from Burton Farm. 				315	
656567	Mr Michael D Chappell		CSPS2861	Policy CN 2							No. Greenbelt should not be used especially when brownfield sites are available.				315	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
656752	Mrs Susan Williams		CSPS2563	Policy CN 2							<p>I wish to object to Policy CN2 in the Christchurch and East Dorset Pre Submission Core Strategy. My concern is the loss of Green Belt. The plans for these houses were not in the previous 2 stages (to which I replied in detail). There must be other sites in Christchurch which are not green belt. I am also concerned with flood risk. The road in which I live is adjacent to the proposed development land which I know floods.</p> <p>I also wish to object to CN1. The relocation of allotments would cause an increase in traffic both through the village and onto the bypass.</p> <p>I choose to live in Burton village and want it to retain its quiet village atmosphere. I feel both of the above will change the place I have enjoyed living in for the past 30 years.</p>				315	
656765	Mr G Lucas		CSPS2558	Policy CN 2							<p>I wish to record my objections to the proposed building developments on the Green Belt south of Burton. I am a long standing resident of Burton and enjoy its rural status and village atmosphere.</p> <p>As I do not wish to see Burton merged into Christchurch I want to see the green belt remain as it is currently. I believe that any building on the Green Belt now will open the door to future developments continuing until the whole area is covered in housing.</p>				315	
660156	Mrs E G Burgess		CSPS2644	Policy CN 2							<p>I am writing this letter to object to the proposed development of 45 houses on the land south of Alder Close, my road, with every possibility that number will increase. It has been suggested that footpaths may be opened up at the end of Alder Close, which I totally object to.</p> <p>I purchased my property 15 months ago because of its quiet location and lovely views of the field from my window, and I believed it to be Green Belt land, not land for building on. I am 81 years old and believed that this area would be a nice and safe location, where I would spend the rest of my days. This is now being threatened.</p> <p>I am concerned about the volume of traffic that this new development would bring to the roads and lanes of the village, and also the congested exit roundabout at Stony Lane and slip road onto the A35.</p> <p>Loss of Burton Farm will take away the real rural heart of our village, and would mean loss of jobs. It acts as a buffer between Burton and Christchurch. Development here could lead to joining up with Christchurch, losing its village status.</p> <p>Salisbury Road is a designated conservation area and obviously should stay that way, with no additional buildings. Burton has adequate affordable housing - it does not need anymore.</p>				315	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											You will no doubt conclude from the tone of this letter that I am totally opposed to the proposed developments. Please leave our village as it is, and use other suitable sites that are available.					
359478	Mr Rohan Torkildsen	English Heritage	CSPS2737	Policy CN 2							NPPF Section 12 – Conserving and Enhancing the HE Paragraph 129. Has the significance of the heritage asset been taken into account when considering the impact of a proposal on it, to avoid or minimise conflict between the heritage asset’s conservation and any aspect of the proposal? This site adjoins a Conservation Area (CA) and listed building (LB). There is limited assessment of the impact on the character of the CA and the development would appear to contradict its Appraisal report (open linear rural character).	More convincing evidence is required in relation to the impact on the significance of both the CA and LB. Refer to Allendale, Wimborne Policy WMC2 (below)*			315	
654838	Mr Paul Hogg		CSPS3239	Policy CN 2							I must object to the above policy. I do not consider it to be sound. I live adjacent to this green belt area and insist that this land must not be lost to housing. I frequently see Herons, Woodpeckers, Kingfishers, Ducks and Owls. The stream contains small fish and toads. And of course rabbits are prolific in the fields. The land in the wet season can become very boggy we do not venture into our garden until it dries out. Burton is a village and expanding the housing area will remove this status. Our village drivers have difficulty accessing the A35 during peak times and extra housing and the forecasted extra vehicles would increase this problem. There will be a heightened risk of flood which we are warned about quite often by letter telling us to clean the stream out! Will new house owners keep the stream clear as we and the farmer have done in the pastI think no!!				315	
656225	Mrs L M Collins		CSPS3231	Policy CN 2							The purpose of this letter is to voice my objection to the document referred to as the Christchurch & East Dorset Pre-submission core strategy policy, which proposes development of greenbelt farm land within the boundaries of Burton and surrounding areas. Policies CN1 and CN2 both propose development of a large area of greenbelt which if approved will change Burton from a semi rural village with a working farm into an urban sprawl with a lost identity. The proposed CN2 policy also encroaches on the boundaries of the Salisbury Road conservation area. The following statement is taken from the Salisbury Road Conservation Area Document 5.50.1. it states “Infilling or other further intensification of the housing within				315	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>Burton would continue to erode the basic village character of the settlement to the general detriment of the existing residential amenity.”</p> <p>As a resident of Burton for over thirty years, it concerns me that the proposed development of CN2. Land South of Burton Village if approved will partially be built on land subject to flooding. Moreover it will encourage and justify further planning and development proposals which will in time inevitably swallow up most of the green belt which separates Burton from Christchurch.</p> <p>A combined housing development on such a scale will no doubt cause a significant increase in traffic and amplify the strain on the already severely gridlocked congested infrastructure of the Christchurch area. It will increase greatly the strain on the current sewage works at Stony Lane and depending on the demographics of the population moving into the area, place added pressure on local schools hospitals and may increase unemployment.</p> <p>The proposed CN1 relocation of the Roeshot Hill allotments to the area East of Salisbury Road and South of Summers Lane along with the proposed threat of gravel extraction from Hawthorn Road to Burton Common will also further add to increased traffic throughout Burton, in particular the Staplecross area. At present Ambury Lane provides horse riders, dog walkers, rambblers, and bike riders’ etc relatively safe traffic free access to Burton Common. Should permission for gravel extraction be granted Ambury Lane will become a busy access road for heavy large lorries. The largest impact of the proposed housing developments, allotments and gravel extraction site will undoubtedly be to the existing farm and its financial viability. Should the farm loose the acreage to the proposed CN1 and CN2 development of green belt, it will result in loss of jobs, in particular the livelihood of the Farwell family who have farmed the land and been a part of the Burton village community for over a 100 years.</p> <p>I therefore strongly object to both CN1 and CN2 proposals for the development of Burton and surrounding area.</p> <p>Please acknowledge receipt of this objection and keep me informed of any further development concerning this matter.</p>					
360099	Mr John Foskett		CSPS3345	Policy CN 2							<p>Again - will 50% affordable be achieved !! I doubt it - who will pay ? The developers will certainly not want to construct such properties – they only want to put up high value houses.</p> <p>Otherwise no comment - don’t know the locality</p>				315	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
662295	Mr Luther Collins		CSPS3233	Policy CN 2							<p>Policy CN2: Land South of Burton Village.</p> <p>This proposed development has been added at the last minute and cannot therefore have been prepared adequately or with due consideration to the effects of the development on the village.</p> <p>This policy is not justified for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. This land is greenbelt and must remain so - the greenbelt is in place to prevent settlements merging into huge conurbations. This portion of land is an important part of the greenbelt which separates Christchurch and Burton. To allow this to be developed would eventually lead to this whole section of land being lost to further development and Burton losing its own identity. ii. Burton is not a suburb of Christchurch but a rural village that has no need for an urban extension. iii. The allowance of this proposal together with the allotments in policy CN1 will effectively see the demise of the farm, leading to the loss of jobs. (As per my objection to CN1 under point ii.). iv. The planned development will cause vastly increased traffic movements in Salisbury Road and Martins Hill Lane and even further congestion at the Stony Lane and Fountain roundabouts. (As per my objection to CN1 under point iv.) v. Part of this site is subject to flooding and therefore cannot possibly be suitable for development. vi. This proposed development is contrary to the Salisbury Road conservation area document 5.50.1: "Infilling or other further intensification of the housing within Burton would continue to erode the basic village character of the settlement to the general detriment of the existing residential amenity." <p>I hope you will take the time to consider my objections to these proposals as I do not feel the village of Burton is suitable for this development and I am greatly concerned about the inevitable adverse effects on the village.</p> <p>I would be grateful if you would acknowledge receipt of this objection and keep me informed of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. That the core strategy has been submitted for independent examination. ii. The publication of the recommendations of any person appointed to carry out an independent examination of the core strategy. iii. The adoption of the core strategy. <p>Thank you for your time.</p>				315	
662299	Mrs Rachael Crosby		CSPS3236	Policy CN 2							<p>Planning Policy CN2. Land South of Burton Village.</p> <p>This proposed development was not included in the original strategy document. It has been added as an afterthought and cannot have been prepared</p>				315	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											adequately with consideration of all the effects and impact on the village. This policy is not justified on the following points; a) This land is greenbelt and should remain this way. b) A greenbelt is in place to protect the unique character of rural communities and stop them being absorbed by expanding suburbs. This portion of land separates Christchurch and Burton keeping Burton the separate rural village that it should be. c) Burton is a rural village and not a suburb of Christchurch and has no need for an urban extension. d) The allowance of this proposal together with the allotments in policy CN1 will most definitely see the farm become unworkable and therefore the knock on effect of loss of jobs and livelihood. e) The planned development will cause increased flow of traffic in Salisbury Road and Martins Hill Lane and even further congestion at the already busy Stony Lane and Fountain roundabouts as already stated in objections to CN1. f) Part of this area is subject to flooding and therefore inappropriate for development. g) This proposed development contradicts the Salisbury Road conservation area document 5.50.1 Please take the time to consider my objections seriously and please acknowledge receipt of this objection.					
662305	Ms Teresa Hogg		CSPS3241	Policy CN 2							I must object to the above policy. I do not consider it to be sound. The area is green belt and must remain so Burton is a village and expanding the housing area will remove this status. There will be a heightened risk of flood				315	
662307	Ms Rachael Hogg		CSPS3246	Policy CN 2							I must object to the above policy. I do not consider it to be sound. The area is green belt and we must not lose it to housing Burton is a village and expanding the housing area will remove this status. The loss of the farm would cause job loss and change the character of the village There will be a heightened risk of flood The bad smell from from the sewerage works would increase with the increased amount.				315	
656619	Mrs Kay Power		CSPS3504	Policy CN 2							I am writing to respond to Christchurch and East Dorset Pre-Submission Core Strategy Document Policy CN2. I feel this policy is not justified because it involves the development of 45 properties on Green Belt land. The national Planning Policy Framework states that only in				315	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>exceptional circumstances can the Green Belt be changed. The Green Belt exists to prevent areas of development to join, forming large conurbations. This development in Burton will increase the spread of conurbation. If this development occurs, it opens the way to future development, thus losing the distinct nature of Burton village as a separate entity.</p> <p>The document states that development will make appropriate contributions to traffic improvement. I feel Martins Hill Lane and Salisbury Road are not wide enough to carry the extra traffic that would be generated by the development of houses in Burton, particularly if the proposed relocation of the Roeshot Hill Allotment site to the area north of the railway line in Burton does take place. The current bus service does not serve the area to the right of Martins Hill Lane along the Salisbury Road railway line, increasing the need for the use of cars.</p> <p>Salisbury Road is a Conservation Area, and a development would destroy many features that are part of the Conservation Area Plan. These include: The working agricultural views, the buildings of Burton Farm, which contribute a great deal to the rural atmosphere of Burton, and a cow herd which regularly crosses Salisbury Road.</p> <p>There are currently swallows seen on the overhead wires next to the farm, therefore nesting in the area. It will be a very sad thing if the building and major upheaval drove them away.</p> <p>Other more suitable brown field sites have been suggested for development, with less damage to the Green Belt and Conservation Area.</p> <p>These are the reasons I feel that Policy CN2 is not justified.</p>					
656623	Mrs Penny A Bellars		CSPS3480	Policy CN 2							<p>I write to object to the following proposals: 1) CN2 The Housing Development on land at and beyond the corner of Salisbury Road and Martins Hill Lane, Burton, presently used by Burton Farm. 2) CN1 The making of land to the south of Burton Farm and east of Salisbury Road into a 'hub' for Allotments from a wider area than Burton village.</p> <p>I write in the form of a letter because I find the 'Response Form' inhibiting and ambiguous.</p> <p>One must presume that Christchurch Borough Council has competent legal advice to prepare 'the Document' well, and is endeavouring to provide solutions to challenging problems, but I would question the justification, effectiveness and consistency of these particular proposals within National Guidelines and previous recommendations.</p> <p>Current National Policy for Green Belts (PPG2) is</p>				315	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>designed to prevent urban sprawl and creep from large built-up areas; to maintain openness rather than allow the merging of such areas; to preserve and, by implication, relish and enjoy the 'identity' of our historic towns and individual settlements. The Green Belt Review in 'the North Christchurch Extension' identifies and includes 'land to the east of Burton' and suggests it is ...' a key consideration/constraint on development within the section north of the railway line' and 'of importance to the village setting'; it talks of any development being in' clear conflict with this Green Belt purpose.' What is the point of having all these expensive reviews, only to ignore them when it suits? We should fulfil the obligation to provide our share of new housing by identifying derelict urban land and brown sites to develop, and not use land within the Green Belt; we must safeguard the countryside at all costs.</p> <p>Burton prides itself in remaining separate from Christchurch; the meadows, river and railway have helped to protect the character and identity of the village, and we must and will resist all efforts to change this.</p> <p>I recognise that there is a national need for more housing, and that there is pressure on Councils to provide suitable land for it. I contend that, locally, there have been, and probably still are, opportunities to re-categorise land abandoned by failed commercial stores. The Council should allocate the land for homes, rather than succumb to the enticements of yet more cut-price supermarkets; the area is already flooded with them. I question the justification, effectiveness and consistency of these proposals.</p> <p>1) CN2 (a) Burton has already provided a considerable amount of land for first-time buyers and social housing, (some might say more than its fair share over the past three decades)</p> <p>(b) Development on the above-mentioned plot would cause unacceptable additional pressure on the local amenities (school, doctors etc) and infrastructure. Traffic along Salisbury Road has already increased considerably over the last few years, in number of vehicles as well as speed; the additional vehicles from the additional housing would generate an unreasonable and potentially dangerous strain on our roads. This is totally contrary to the observations in the Core Strategy Policy Report of September 2010; this proposal is, therefore, not justified.</p> <p>(c) The proposed site is on marshland prone to flooding; with all the additional concerns that global warming implies, this makes it unsuitable (or should I say 'not effective' to qualify my comments for</p>					

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											consideration?) A number of councils have been heavily criticised in the past for ignoring wise practice by permitting developments on flood plains; we respectfully insist that you do not make the same error. (d) This land is not 'vacant' but part of a working farm, farmed by the same family for generations. Quite apart from the loss of jobs and livelihoods consequent to the success of this ill-conceived proposal, the very existence of this farm, last of several in the village, is crucial to the character of Burton and an essential element in its eligibility as a Conservation Area (see above). It would be inconsistent, therefore, to allow a development that would deliberately destroy it. (If it is true that the Meyrick Agent implied that the local dairy herd was disease-ridden and not worth keeping, that was shameful and slanderous. I would add that we need every one of our remaining farms to feed our ever increasing population; we ignore the destruction of our great agricultural tradition at our peril.)					
656625	Mr Andrew R M Bellars		CSPS3485	Policy CN 2							Dear Sir I object to the following proposals: 1) CN1 The formation of a 'hub' for allotments on land to the south of Burton Farm, and the east of Salisbury Road. This 'hub' would be provision of Allotments for a much wider area than Burton Village. 2) CN2 A Housing Development on land at and beyond the corner of Salisbury Road and Martins Hill Lane, Burton, presently used by Burton Farm. Because of the design of the 'Response Form', which I find ambiguous and confusing, I am writing my response as a letter. Christchurch Borough Council must have access to sound legal advice, but the whole character of these proposals seems designed to create obfuscation and confusion. I question their justification, effectiveness, and consistency with respect to National Guidelines, and previous recommendations [Local Plan 2020]. 2) CN2 a) Burton has provided much land for first-time buyers and social housing. b) Development on the above-mentioned plot would cause additional stress to the local amenities such as schools, doctors, and roads. The traffic on Salisbury Road has increased in quantity and speed in recent years, and more vehicles from the new housing would mean more tendency to gridlock. This development is totally contrary to the wording of the Core Strategy Policy Report of September 2010. This proposal is, therefore, not justified. c) The proposed site is prone to flooding; it is marshland. This makes it 'not effective'. You should not compound previous planning errors by making the				315	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>same mistake here. Flooding, exacerbated by climate change, will probably get worse.</p> <p>PPG2 (Current National Policy for Green Belts) is meant to prevent urban creep and sprawl from large built-up areas. Also to keep areas open, rather than merging, and also to preserve the identity of our historic towns, villages and their communities. The Green Belt Review of the 'North Christchurch Extension' specifically includes 'land to the east of Burton', and suggests it is ...' a key consideration/constraint on development within the section north of the railway line', and 'of importance to the village setting'. It states that any development would be in 'clear conflict with Green Belt purpose'. Why does the Local Taxpayer have to pay for all these expensive reviews, when the Borough Council then ignores them? [Meanwhile, our verges remain untrimmed, litter lies everywhere, and ever-increasing numbers of vehicles speed through our village]. We should provide our share of new housing by using derelict urban land and brown sites for development, and not use land within the Green Belt. We must safeguard the countryside. In addition, land to the east of Salisbury Road is in a Conservation Area. Burton is proud to be a separate community from Christchurch, with a beating heart. The River, Railway, and Meadows have helped to protect the character and identity of the village, and we will resist all attempts to change this.</p> <p>While noting that there is a national need for more housing, and that Councils are pressed to provide suitable land for this development, there does appear to be some glaring local examples where land could be re-allocated under these 'exceptional circumstances'. Not only the Bailey Bridge site, with its vast car park only half full, but the plethora of failed commercial sites in Somerford, could be used for homes, rather than further cut-price supermarkets. Has anyone asked the splendid Co-op management for an opinion? To sum up, I question the justification, effectiveness, and consistency of these proposals.</p> <p>I hope that the Council has maintained good integrity with respect to the wishes of the Landowner. The people of Burton Village have had a very short time to understand the aims and ramifications of the joint plans. Following the neglect of the Village Hall by the Meyrick Estate, causing its closure, the village has responded with plans for a new Scout Hut, and the use of the two Church Halls, so it seems we do not need a Village Hall quite so much.</p> <p>I respectfully urge you to reject these proposals,</p>					

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	
656627	Mr Alan Levy		CSPS3513	Policy CN 2							<p>I wish to voice my objection to the proposed planning for Burton Village CN1/CN2 my objections are as follows: CN1&2 Burton is a village approx. 3 kilometres from Christchurch Town Centre and according to the "CONSERVATION AREA APPRAISAL & MANAGEMENT PLAN" adopted by Christchurch Council in FEBRUARY 2007 – is within a conservation area designated on 30th Jan 1986 – amended 15th June 1995 – and adapted as above in Feb. 2007 – points mentioned were. OPEN RURAL ASPECT THE SURVIVAL OF FARMS AND BUILDINGS The proposed plans seem to go against all of the above. Also the land in question is categorised as GREEN BELT, which would eventually cause the loss of the only working, farm in the village, unemployment for the formworks and will interfere with the whole Village Status, Character and Scale. Our village is a rural area so in no way does it require an URBAN DEVELOPMENT. The above report ends under the heading of CONCLUSION as follows:- "The semi informal spatial qualities of Burton Green enclosed by high quality historic buildings, the hamlet of Martins Hill Lane with its small intimate scale and the Valuable Survival of Burton farm: a working Farm of historic farm buildings and farmhouse all contribute to the high quality historic environment and the distinct since of peace in Burton" all the above would and could be destroyed. CN2 – HOUSES The houses are planned for a piece of land which again is part of the above farm, The fields in question are low grade grazing, as the bottom half of the land floods on a regular basis and contradicts Core Strategy P20 which states land should adapt to emerging demands of climate change through clear strategies to reduce risk of flooding, and Core Strategy policy ME6 says planning should demonstrate that flood risk does not increase as a result of development, not build on land that is highlighted as to be at risk. As national policy talks of possible sea-level increase of 1 to 2 meters in height and possible storm surges that could extend flood risk zone far beyond the current flood plain. The make up of the 45 properties within the proposed development is to include 50% low cost housing, the site is 150 meters closer to the existing sewer works in Stony Lane where on a bad day the aroma can be somewhat ripe. I fail to believe that private buyers would wish to purchase properties on a potential flood</p>					315	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>risk area, near a sewer farm and railway line, in a traffic congested area, thus the majority or all the properties could be offered as low cost housing, giving those residents little option but to live within the above described conditions. This is morally wrong.</p> <p>The access to the site will be on Salisbury road near the crossroads of Summers Lane and Martins Hill Lane, through what has been described as a mix of low grade industrial units, thus making use of existing and part disused farm buildings, The plan talks also of 800 plus house at Roeshot Hill why could these few house at Burton be added to the proposed Roeshot Hill development doing away with this excessive over development of this south end of our village.</p> <p>Social housing should be built near the main town not away on the edge of a village with limited and at times no bus service.</p> <p>CN1 & 2 ROADS SALISBURY ROAD Main spine road running through village SUMMERS LANE Side road at the cross roads with Martins Hill Lane opposite, this is single track road leading to Hawthorn Road MARTINS HILL LANE Side road at the crossroads and again opposite SUMMERS LANE, any access to the proposed site would enter and excess near this crossroads on Salisbury Road and wither go down Salisbury Road to the BY-PASS, or down Martins Hill Lane to Stony Lane where at peak times the traffic queues back beyond the turn to Martins Hill Lane the traffic chaos that the proposed that 45 houses and allotment traffic would bring beggars belief that someone has came up with this plan.</p> <p>TRAFFIC The plan mention road improvement to Stony Lane Fountain Roundabout, Bargates, Barrack Road, Fairmile and lford this list goes on and on, never ending as all it does is move the traffic further along. There is no mention of any improvements to the village i.e.: traffic calming, speed enforcement or even street lighting Who will pay for this? Do you expect us, as council taxpayers and pay extra as we have Parish Council or the developer or even the landowner who seems to make money from land sales and gravel sales a no loose situation.</p> <p>FLOODING The area earmarked for properties is well known as in a high risk flood area, The ditch at the rear of Alder Close is fed from Treeby's Close which is also fed from</p>					

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>Salisbury Road, going back to Burley Road and the high land further away in Bransgore, Guss Common and Roeshot Hill.</p> <p>Outside 63B Martins Hill Lane a long term water problem which is far worse in the winter is ground water which enters a cable duct in Salisbury Road and as the duct is choked with roots seeps out and causes this problem. This will be exacerbated when the gravel is dug as this excavation leaves a large hole in the ground disturbing any existing natural water coarse, the water will find its own way out and as we live down hill of this, the obvious place it will end up is the ditch at the rear of Alder Close and any potential new houses on the field, this water will and does not discriminate against private or social houses, but again a very good reason why not to build in this field.</p> <p>SUMMERY</p> <p>The plan to build 45 new properties along with light commercial units and allotments on GREEN BELT FARMLAND is something we the residents of Burton do not want or need. When the proposed ROESHOTT HUB could quite easily accommodate 45 extra units, if as the CORE PLAN says CHRISTCHURCH requires this number of units. Where or how these proposed extra vehicles would navigate the GRIDLOCK that is CHRISTCHURCH I DO NOT KNOW.</p>					
656628	Mrs Mary Levy		CSPS3511	Policy CN 2							<p>I wish to voice my objection to the proposed planning for Burton Village CN1/CN2 my objections are as follows:</p> <p>CN1&2</p> <p>Burton is a village approx. 3 kilometres from Christchurch Town Centre and according to the "CONSERVATION AREA APPRAISAL & MANAGEMENT PLAN" adopted by Christchurch Council in FEBRUARY 2007 – is within a conservation area designated on 30th Jan 1986 – amended 15th June 1995 – and adapted as above in Feb. 2007 – points mentioned were.</p> <p>OPEN RURAL ASPECT</p> <p>THE SURVIVAL OF FARMS AND BUILDINGS</p> <p>The proposed plans seem to go against all of the above. Also the land in question is categorised as GREEN BELT, which would eventually cause the loss of the only working, farm in the village, unemployment for the formworks and will interfere with the whole Village Status, Character and Scale. Our village is a rural area so in no way does it require an URBAN DEVELOPMENT. The above report ends under the heading of CONCLUSION as follows:-</p> <p>"The semi informal spatial qualities of Burton Green enclosed by high quality historic buildings, the hamlet</p>				315	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>of Martins Hill Lane with its small intimate scale and the Valuable Survival of Burton farm: a working Farm of historic farm buildings and farmhouse all contribute to the high quality historic environment and the distinct since of peace in Burton” all the above would and could be destroyed.</p> <p>CN2 – HOUSES OBJECTION: FLOOD RISK & TRAFFIC CONJESTION</p> <p>The houses are planned for a piece of land which again is part of the above farm, The fields in question are low grade grazing, as the bottom half of the land floods on a regular basis and contradicts Core Strategy P20 which states land should adapt to emerging demands of climate change through clear strategies to reduce risk of flooding, and Core Strategy policy ME6 says planning should demonstrate that flood risk does not increase as a result of development, not build on land that is highlighted as to be at risk. As national policy talks of possible sea-level increase of 1 to 2 meters in height and possible storm surges that could extend flood risk zone far beyond the current flood plain.</p> <p>The make up of the 45 properties within the proposed development is to include 50% low cost housing, the site is 150 meters closer to the existing sewer works in Stony Lane where on a bad day the aroma can be somewhat ripe. I fail to believe that private buyers would wish to purchase properties on a potential flood risk area, near a sewer farm and railway line, in a traffic congested area, thus the majority or all the properties could be offered as low cost housing, giving those residents little option but to live within the above described conditions. This is morally wrong.</p> <p>The access to the site will be on Salisbury road near the crossroads of Summers Lane and Martins Hill Lane, through what has been described as a mix of low grade industrial units, thus making use of existing and part disused farm buildings, The plan talks also of 800 plus house at Roeshot Hill why could these few house at Burton be added to the proposed Roeshot Hill development doing away with this excessive over development of this south end of our village.</p> <p>Social housing should be built near the main town not away on the edge of a village with limited and at times no bus service.</p> <p>CN1 & 2 ROADS SALISBURY ROAD Main spine road running through village SUMMERS LANE Side road at the cross roads with Martins Hill Lane opposite, this is single track road</p>					

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>leading to Hawthorn Road MARTINS HILL LANE Side road at the crossroads and again opposite SUMMERS LANE, any access to the proposed site would enter and excess near this crossroads on Salisbury Road and wither go down Salisbury Road to the BY-PASS, or down Martins Hill Lane to Stony Lane where at peak times the traffic queues back beyond the turn to Martins Hill Lane the traffic chaos that the proposed that 45 houses and allotment traffic would bring beggars belief that someone has came up with this plan.</p> <p>TRAFFIC The plan mention road improvement to Stony Lane Fountain Roundabout, Bargates, Barrack Road, Fairmile and lford this list goes on and on, never ending as all it does is move the traffic further along. There is no mention of any improvements to the village i.e.: traffic calming, speed enforcement or even street lighting Who will pay for this? Do you expect us, as council taxpayers and pay extra as we have Parish Council for a plan that gives us falling house prices, no village, and a sad change in our lives caused by the endless volume of traffic congestion and problems this plan WILL caused</p> <p>FLOODING The area earmarked for properties is well known as in a high risk flood area, The ditch at the rear of Alder Close is fed from Treeby's Close which is also fed from Salisbury Road, going back to Burley Road and the high land further away in Bransgore, Guss Common and Roeshot Hill.</p> <p>Outside 63B Martins Hill Lane a long term water problem which is far worse in the winter is ground water which enters a cable duct in Salisbury Road and as the duct is choked with roots seeps out and causes this problem. This will be exacerbated when the gravel is dug as this excavation leaves a large hole in the ground disturbing any existing natural water coarse, the water will find its own way out and as we live down hill of this, the obvious place it will end up is the ditch at the rear of Alder Close and any potential new houses on the field, this water will and does not discriminate against private or social houses, but again a very good reason why not to build in this field.</p> <p>We all feel that Burton has reached saturation point. I have enclosed a document that was published in 2001 this confirms the substantial building during the 1960-80s that went on in Burton during that time. This is a VILLAGE and why I have stayed hear for 31 years. If I had wanted a town atmosphere I would have lived in</p>					

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											Christchurch itself. So many villagers echo this SUMMERY The plan to build 45 new properties along with light commercial units and allotments on GREEN BELT FARMLAND is something we the residents of Burton do not want or need. When the proposed ROESHOTT HUB could quite easily accommodate 45 extra units, if as the CORE PLAN says CHRISTCHURCH requires this number of units. Where or how these proposed extra vehicles would navigate the GRIDLOCK that is CHRISTCHURCH I DO NOT KNOW.					
656638	Mrs E A Waugh		CSPS3373	Policy CN 2							I strongly object to the proposed building of houses and moving of allotments to Burton under the Local Plan. I object on Planning Grounds as set out in the leaflet I received from you. These are – CN1, CN2, CS2 and KS10. Also there will be a considerable impact on Burton Primary School and the Medical Centre. The loss of this Green Belt land will affect all who live in Burton and want it to stay apart from Christchurch.				315	
656642	Mr Mike East		CSPS3380	Policy CN 2							I am writing to strongly oppose the proposed building of houses on Burton Farm. The plans are contrary to Green Belt policy and would mean the loss of Green Belt in the village which should be protected. The area has been identified as a flood risk and on these grounds alone the building plans should be discounted. The village and farm are important to the rural aspect of the village which green belt is supposed to protect. The farm employs people and provides a home for the farmers and I believe it should remain a working farm, the housing and jobs would be lost. Building houses on the site will mean a spread of development to the natural village boundaries and make it easier for future development. Living in a property adjacent to the field I can see how it would have an unacceptable adverse impact on the amenities of all the properties next to the field, by reason of overlooking, loss of privacy and a visually overbearing impact and would have an adverse effect on the visual amenity of the area as a whole. There are better and preferred sites within Christchurch which should be considered first i.e. brown field sites on the Somerford Road Meteor Park, land where the courts used to be off Bargates.				315	
656655	Kate East		CSPS3385	Policy CN 2							I wish to register my opposition to the proposed building of houses on Burton Farm which means the loss of Green Belt directly behind my house in Burton Close. I understand the Planning Grounds for this is				315	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	
											<p>CN2. I object for the following reasons: It will adversely affect the rural aspect of the village which green belt is supposed to protect. The siting of this development would have an unacceptable adverse impact on the amenities of the properties next to the field, including my property, by reason of overlooking, loss of privacy and a visually overbearing impact and would have an adverse effect on the visual amenity of the area as a whole. It will mean the closure and loss of the farm and the working jobs of the farmers. It should remain a working farm. It will make it easier for future development and create a corridor for building and would therefore affect the village boundaries. I believe building on Green Belt land is against government policy. I suggest the alternative brown field sites along the Somerford Road would be more suitable and the former courts site off Bargates. Even a change of use for the piece of land owned by Beagle Aircraft, who are eager to sell, would be more appropriate for new housing and links to the town centre and amenities.</p>						
656667	Mrs V Thrower		CSPS3398	Policy CN 2							<p>Objection to proposed development of Alder & Medlar Closes As there are suitable brown field sites available I object to the proposal to build on prime green belt land which appears contrary to planning guidelines. The infrastructure of the small village appears inadequate to accommodate such development as proposed for inclusion in the local plan. In particular the road network which has numerous small lanes surrounding the village. They were not built for heavy traffic, there charm could be lost forever.</p>				315		
656674	Mr M Thrower		CSPS3397	Policy CN 2							<p>Objection to proposed development of Alder & Medlar Closes As there are suitable brown field sites available within the borough the proposal to build on prime green belt land would appear diametrically opposed to revised planning guidelines and should be pursued no further. It would be difficult for the infrastructure of this small delightful village to accommodate the proposed development. In particular the road network which has numerous small lanes surrounding the village. They were not built for heavy traffic, there charm could be lost forever.</p>				315		
656691	Mr D V Ambrose		CSPS3400	Policy CN 2							<p>Ref Policy CN2 Land South of Burton Village I wish to object to the above proposal on the following planning grounds. CN2 This is green belt land and there are a number of</p>				315		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	
											trees with preservation orders against them. Why choose this site when other non green belt sites are available CN2 This proposal will mean the loss of Burton Farm a key feature of Burton village along with associated jobs CS2 Additional housing will mean extra traffic, the village will find it hard to cope with this. Also, Stony Lane roundabout already over capacitated at peak times will cause further queuing with no realistic alternative options for travel to Christchurch/Bournemouth CN2 There is grounds for concern regarding possible flood risks to this area.						
656695	Mrs G Ambrose		CSPS3399	Policy CN 2							Re: Policy CN2 – Land south of Burton village I wish to advise the council planning policy team of my objections to the above proposal to build on this land. 1. I object to green belt land being used for a large housing project in Burton when there are reasonable alternative sites that are NOT green belt that should be considered. (CN2) 2. I object to the loss of Burton Farm if this proposal goes ahead. This farm is an integral part of Burton village, and the country landscape it brings to the Burton Conservation area. (CN2) 3. I object to the loss of village status and village character that a large housing project will bring to Burton. 4. I object to the impact on Burton's road network that will undoubtedly be caused due to the increase in traffic. The road network into Christchurch is already very busy, with queues at peak times from Stony Lane roundabout. (KS10) 5. I object to the plan for the allotment site relocation to Burton. The proposal is for a very large area and this will also increase the traffic flow into the village. (CN1)					315	
656699	Mrs L Rogers		CSPS3401	Policy CN 2							I am writing to object to the planning grounds on the above for the following reasons: CN2 This is greenbelt land, other sites can be used CN2 + Burton Farm contributes to the conservation area – also jobs will be CN1 lost CS2 The roads cannot take the extra traffic ie Stony Lane roundabout is a nightmare morning and evening KS10 More traffic will be an unwelcome result in this quiet village					315	
656803	Mr A M Atkins		CSPS3355	Policy CN 2							CS2 and KS10 present serious traffic problems, particularly for Footners Lane which has a 20mph restriction which is hardly ever observed.					315	
656807	Andrew O'Connor		CSPS3352	Policy CN 2							I wish to register my strongest possible objection to any house building development that uses Green Belt					315	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											land. I think any Council that even contemplates doing this, is showing their complete contempt for the existing residents of Christchurch. It should be a prime objective of any Council to protect Green Belt land under its control and to resist the temptation to cede to the overtures and pressures of property developers. Aside from the Green Belt issues, what possible rationale can the Council use to justify a massive building programme, when the property market is stagnated and is likely to remain so for years to come. I thought the inessential extension of the Christchurch Library, demonstrated the insular and confused thinking of the Council in the middle of this economic downturn. Councillors should be keeping their efforts focused on the substantial problems that already exist in Christchurch and not creating new ones.					
656834	Mr Ivor Griffiths		CSPS3349	Policy CN 2	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	Removal of the green belt status from this land makes a mockery of purpose of Green Belt as a buffer. This nibbling away will probably only stop when town and village finally meet. The loss of farming lands close to Burton Farm could possibly lead to its eventual closure. The houses would be too remote from the village centre amenities.	Suggest: Land to north and west of village centre to be considered for extra housing. Closer to school, shop, churches etc. The removal of green belt status in this area would not have the same effect as proposed site.			315	
662385	E Ceen		CSPS3288	Policy CN 2							I am writing in protest of the planned development in Burton. Christchurch cannot cope with the amount of traffic as it is at the moment, without more to add to the already congested areas. Does the Council want to take away the village, and just join it to Christchurch. I am sure Burton School and Burton Surgery are already stretched as it is. And taking away farmland and greenbelt is not the answer to the government's planned building affordable homes.				315	
656191	Ms Rebecca Battle		CSPS3608	Policy CN 2		No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	CHRISTCHURCH AND EAST DORSET CORE STRATEGY POLICY CN2 - Land South of Burton Village This plan is flawed, not positively prepared, and not sound because it is not fully justified, effective nor consistent with national or local policies in several areas. Green Belt Building here would lose the Green Belt which provides separation from Christchurch and Somerford. The draft does not look at alternative, more suitable areas for example Grange Road, Somerford Road and the Stony Lane South/Purewell junction. The village already has a post office and shop and is largely served by the nearby shopping centre in Christchurch				315	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>and at Sainsburys so does not need more commercial property either. There are other plans too CN1 for building on Green Belt at Roeshot. This proposal is also wrong in relation to Green Belt policy but must make it unnecessary to also build in Burton? This is as well as the huge gravel extraction plans all in the same area. The new proposals involve the end of a working farm which hardly seems fair. This will really change this part of the village a farming one to a housing sprawl.</p> <p>Conservation Area The proposed building is in the Burton Conservation Area which was set up to keep the character of the village. The proposals would make that policy redundant.</p> <p>Flood Area The area has always flooded and has many surface and underground streams. Building on flood areas is not good policy. The proposal is does not take account of future rises in sea levels in the area.</p> <p>Infrastructure There is very little evidence that these have been properly accounted for. Local roads are already built up and local transport poor. Access to Christchurch and beyond is difficult for young people, the elderly and those who need to rely on public transport for school or work. Promises of improvement are unrealistic as this has shown to be not commercially profitable enough for local service providers. There is no thought to the old smelly sewage treatment plant which doesn't seem able to cope now without 1000 more homes in the area.</p>					
656198	Mrs P J Dunn		CSPS3612	Policy CN 2							<p>CHRISTCHURCH AND EAST DORSET CORE STRATEGY POLICY CN2 - Land South of Burton Village This proposal fails the test of being required to be positively prepared as it did not appear in the earlier stages of consultation, seems to have been included solely at the request of the landowner and fails to take account of the needs of the people of Christchurch. I do not believe that this part of the document is sound because it is not fully justified, effective nor consistent with national or local policies in relation to: Preservation of the Green Belt; Current policy in relation to an established Conservation area Building on flood plain Infrastructure of Burton Village and surrounds; nor Meeting the needs of Christchurch residents Preservation of the Green Belt Building in this part of Burton would result in the loss of</p>				315	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>Green Belt land identified as necessary to preserve the nature of the village and to provide a from urban Christchurch and Somerford developments. This draft document does not show consideration of alternative, more suitable area which would not impact Green Belt. For example Grange Road which although not suitable for a permanent travellers' site must remain suitable for permanent housing. This site cannot be needed for commercial property available and Christchurch has rejected commercial development in abandoned and available brown field sites (eg Somerford Road and Beagle Aircraft sites). It must be time to change the use of these sites and make them available for housing. Only the major supermarkets seem interested in development in the town and the Council has already concluded these are already at saturation point. There is no evidence that Burton needs any more commercial property since there is ample available locally at affordable rates. The village has a post office and shop. This links with proposal CN1 for substantial loss of Green Belt to provide for the Christchurch Urban Extension at Roeshot (which is also flawed in relation to Green Belt policy). The draft fails to make the case for additional homes in Burton if building is to go ahead on a huge scale elsewhere on the same landowner's Green Belt holding. This adds to the huge damage in the same location to the Green Belt on both sides of the Hampshire/Dorset boundary by massive gravel extraction plans. The proposals in Burton involve the total eradication of a working farm resulting in the loss of livelihoods and will change the nature of this part of the village and the character of Burton as a whole.</p> <p>Conservation Area The proposed development is in the Burton Conservation Area set up to retain the features of a rural community. Christchurch whilst responding to modern needs must not lose sight of its heritage. The status was set up to prevent further creep from damaging the rural and historic features of the village.</p> <p>Flood Area The area proposed for building, like much of that area of Christchurch and Burton, is already subject to low lying water at times as well as significant surface and underground streams. There is always water lying at the top of Martins Hill Lane due to an underground spring which is a hazard in winter. Building on flood areas is supposedly against government policy and widespread rain and floods elsewhere this year should have demonstrated the folly of building in such areas increasing flood risk to all. Nor do the draft proposals show that they allow for the implications for</p>					

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>Christchurch of predicted rises in sea levels.</p> <p>Infrastructure Issues</p> <p>There is little evidence that these have been properly planned for. Traffic congestion at some times of day already results in delays in Burton on Stony Lane without any additional traffic along this route.</p> <p>Additional cares from new housing would use Martins Hill Lane causing risk near the recreation ground and where there are a couple of quite dangerous bends.</p> <p>Traffic congestion in Christchurch, primarily on the A35 and surrounding routes, extends beyond the Fountain Roundabout through Bargates, Fairmile Road and to the Blackwater junction. The proposed mitigation plan does not make it clear how this will be resolved.</p> <p>Like much of outlying Christchurch, public transport in Burton is poor. The current hourly bus Christchurch and Bournemouth is only operating after Wilts and Dorset summarily withdrew the M2 service and local intervention encouraged the heavily subsidized Yellow Bus 21. It though struggles to survive and is unreliable. The plan does not show how it has taken account of the increased demand for water and sewage. The sewage works date from the early 1960s and the area smells very bad in warm weather and at holiday times. If this cannot cope we will see yet more raw sewage put out to sea which has already been reported as a problem in recent days. This will harm the quality of water off our beaches and damage the Borough's Blue Flag status.</p>					
656202	Ruth Siemaszko		CSPS3613	Policy CN 2							<p>CHRISTCHURCH AND EAST DORSET CORE STRATEGY</p> <p>POLICY CN2 - Land South of Burton Village</p> <p>This proposal would seem to fail the test of being required to be positively prepared as it did not appear in any of the earlier stages of consultation, seems to have been included solely at the request of the landowner, lacks evidence supporting its case, and fails to take account of the broader needs of the people of Christchurch.</p> <p>I do not believe that this part of the document is sound because it is not fully justified, effective nor consistent with national or local policies in relation to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Preservation of the Green Belt; Current policy in relation to an established Conservation area; Building on a known flood area; Infrastructure of Burton Village and surrounds; nor Meeting the needs of Christchurch residents. <p>These proposals do not properly address their interaction with the published policies in Green Belt and Burton Conservation Area document.</p>				315	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>Preservation of the Green Belt The proposed site is within an area of identified Green Belt. The proposals fail to show why the planners have opted for sacrificing Green Belt which should, according to National Policy be the exception not the rule, over development of non-Green Belt land. Building here would mean losing an area of Green Belt which local policy has specified is necessary to prevent planning creep, preserve the nature of the village as a rural/farming community and provide a distinct separation from the built-up urban Christchurch development. Burton as such an area appears on historic maps as a separate entity. The draft document fails to demonstrate adequate consideration of alternative, more suitable building sites not currently within the Green Belt. For example until recently there were proposals to provide a permanent travellers' site in Grange Road on the Somerford/Mudeford boundary. Following local objection this site was removed but must remain viable for a more suitable housing provision. It is disingenuous to argue that this site is now needed for commercial development when there remains much unused and vacant commercial property in the Borough. Similarly Christchurch have consistently rejected proposals for commercial development in abandoned and available brown field sites in the Borough (eg Somerford Road and the Beagle site) surely housing would be a better use for these sites. The only proposals for such commercial ventures seem to be the major supermarkets which it has been decided are already at saturation point in the town. The proposal also included vague reference to the inclusion of commercial facilities within the new development. However there is no evidence provided of any demonstrated need nor demand for this. Christchurch is already blighted by unused and vacant commercial property and office space which is currently available at very advantageous rates due to the wide availability of it. The village already has a post office and shop and is largely served by the nearby shopping centre in Christchurch, Somerford Road and Sainsburys. There is already within the plan a proposal (CN1) for substantial loss of Green Belt to provide for the Christchurch Urban Extension at Roeshot. Whilst this proposal is similarly flawed in relation to Green Belt policy it cannot be argued that if this were to go ahead a further 45 homes (as alleged in the draft or 135 if local reports are to be believed) are justified in Burton. This is all in addition to significant damage to the Green Belt to be caused on both sides of the Hampshire/Dorset boundary by massive gravel extraction plans. The proposals in CN1 and 2 involve</p>					

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>the total eradication of what is currently a functioning farm. This means that the whole nature of this part of the village will change from a farming/rural environment to larger urban development thus losing the character of this part of the village. In doing so the planners risk turning an ancient Christchurch village into the sort of sprawling urban nothingness which has been created elsewhere in Dorset, for example Verwood. There is no evidence that account has been taken of ecological impact and wildlife conservation eg bats, owls, breeding buzzards and nesting lapwings.</p> <p>Conservation Area The proposed development site is within the Burton Conservation Area which was set up primarily to retain the features of a rural community. The proposals would fundamentally eradicate this area. I know that the landowner who has a vested interest in seeing such development proceed would argue that Medlar Close, Alder Close and Gordon Way which already breach these principles are hardly examples of conservation. However, the status was, as I understand it, set up to prevent further creep from damaging the rural features of the village. The conservation area plan sites characteristics including unlisted buildings, working farm with cow herd crossing, sense of rural community and views of open working agricultural landscape which these proposals undermine.</p> <p>Flood Area The area proposed for building is already subject to significant surface and underground streams as indeed is all of Burton to some extent or another. Those streams already cause issues within the village. Indeed there is permanently water lying in Martins Hill Lane due to an underground spring which provides a significant hazard during the winter months. It is known that building on flood areas is not only flawed in respect of the flood plain but the creation of additional demand for water and sewage and drainage from the new properties whilst reducing the surface for natural drainage exacerbates flood risk. Properties in Gordon Way have experienced significant subsidence issues resulting in the need for a major building works and underpinning resulting from building on unsuitable land. The proposal is further flawed as it fails to show it has taken account of the likelihood of longer term rises in sea levels with the corresponding implications for flooding in the Christchurch and Christchurch harbour areas.</p> <p>Infrastructure Issues There is very little evidence that these have been properly accounted for. There is a vague suggestion</p>					

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>that roads will be improved along the A35 corridor and at the Stony Lane and Fountain Roundabouts. However traffic congestion at peak times of day means there are already significant delays on Stony Lane which it is difficult to see how these can be resolved. Pushing additional traffic along this route (let alone the additional lorries resulting from the gravel extraction proposals - estimated as some extra 50 lorries a day in and out and 30 lorries for recycling) can only exacerbate this. Furthermore additional cars from the new housing would need to use Martins Hill Lane. The Meyrick representatives have already been suggesting at public meetings that access should be via Alder Close and not Salisbury Road since the junction of Salisbury Road, Summer Lane and Martins Hill is notoriously difficult. Were this to be the case more cars would be coming onto Martins Hill Lane close to the recreation ground and near to a dangerous bend. In general traffic congestion in Christchurch primarily on the A35 and surrounding routes does not end at The Fountain Roundabout. There are major issues though Bargates, Fairmile Road and to the Blackwater junction. It is difficult to see how the proposed mitigation plan addresses these areas. Plans for pedestrian and cycle access through Alder and Medlar Closes would be detrimental to these areas reducing security and safety. Public transport in the village is poor. At best there is 1 bus an hour to Christchurch and Bournemouth supplemented on some days with a service between Ringwood and Christchurch. That bus is heavily subsidized, struggles to survive and is unreliable. School provision in the borough is unable to cope with current needs. In particular primary school provision in the village is provided by the local church school which is oversubscribed and has had a troubled history only just, after several years, coming out of special measures. There is little evidence to show that proper account has been taken of the impact of any of the proposed further development on water and sewage facilities in the town. The sewage treatment plant opened in the early 1960s is already extremely smelly in times of warm weather and during peak holiday periods. It is not clear that they have indicated they have sufficient capacity to expand without the risk of needing to put more sewage out to sea thus jeopardizing the quality of water off our beaches. Recent report draw attention to the fact that effluent is being discharged into the sea as local treatment plants cannot cope. The impact on our environment, water quality on our beaches, and shoreline could have sufficient impact not only on local</p>					

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	
											<p>residents but also the tourism industry on which the town relies heavily. Burton itself is a socially deprived area and is, I understand, in the bottom decile of social deprivation in Dorset. The village has over time taken a large share of the responsibility to allow additional building on green belt and farm land in order to meet the housing needs of the Borough. The plan does not show how further development in the village meets either the needs of existing residents nor of the wider population of Christchurch. There is already available low cost/affordable housing available north of the village.</p>						
656204	Zygmunt Siemaszko		CSPS3607	Policy CN 2							<p>CHRISTCHURCH AND EAST DORSET CORE STRATEGY POLICY CN2 - Land South of Burton Village These proposals fail the test of being required to be positively prepared as they did not appear in any of the earlier stages of consultation. They seem to have been included solely at the request of the landowner and do not reflect the broader needs of the people of Christchurch. I do not believe that this part of the document is sound because it is not fully justified, effective nor consistent with national or local policies. My major concerns are around: Preservation of the Green Belt; Current policy in relation to an established Conservation area; Building on a known flood area; Infrastructure of Burton Village and surrounds; nor Suitability of the plans for the needs of Christchurch residents. Preservation of the Green Belt Building on land to the South of Burton will mean further loss of Green Belt. This Green Belt is necessary to keep the nature of the village as a rural/farming community and to provide a distinct separation from Christchurch. Burton is shown on historic maps as a separate entity. The plans fail to show why this particular landowner's Green Belt is more suitable than other areas such as land behind the Manor Arms which has previously been proposed for housing for local people. It has become apparent that the Meyrick Estate have had detailed and persistent discussions with council officials over many years - they tell us since 2004. And yet this is the first that such proposals have hit the public - one wonders why? The draft document fails to demonstrate adequate consideration of alternative, more suitable non-Green Belt sites (for example, the area in Grange</p>					315	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>Road on the Somerford/Mudeford boundary, which was proposed for a permanent travellers' site. Following local objection this site was rejected but should still be considered for housing provision. This site cannot be needed for industrial/commercial development when there is plenty of unused and vacant commercial property in the Borough. Christchurch has consistently rejected proposals for commercial development in abandoned and available brown field sites in the Borough (eg Somerford Road and the Beagle site). The Somerford Road site has been largely vacant and an eyesore for several years and would be better used for housing than continuing to be left deserted. The only proposals for commercial development come from the major supermarkets which it has been decided are already at saturation point in the town. The local Chamber of Trade being fiercely opposed to any multi-chain development of supermarkets or hotels locally. The proposal for Burton also includes commercial facilities within the new development but makes no case for this. Christchurch is already awash with unused and vacant commercial property and office space. The village already has a well-regarded post office and shop and is largely served by the nearby shopping centre in Christchurch and at Sainsburys. It has two churches with halls providing a sense of community. When taken with separate policies in plan CN1 which would lead to extensive substantial loss of Green Belt to provide for the Christchurch Urban Extension at Roeshot and proposals for major gravel extraction (all on land belonging to the Meyrick Estate) the overall effect on this area of Christchurch would be devastating to the Green Belt. Whilst CN1 is similarly flawed in relation to Green Belt policy it cannot be argued that if it were to go ahead a minimum of a further 45 homes are justified in Burton. The proposals involve the total loss of a traditional working farm. This means that the whole nature of this part of the village will change from a farming/rural environment to a larger urban development. In doing so the planners will turn an old Christchurch village into a large housing mass with no heart – much like they achieved in Verwood.</p> <p>Conservation Area The proposed development site is within the Burton Conservation Area. This was created to protect the features of a traditional farming and rural community. The proposals would so fundamentally undermine that policy as to render it redundant. The landowner who has a vested interest in seeing such development proceed, and planners may believe that Medlar Close, Alder close and Gordon Way are already undermine</p>					

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>that principle by their very existence but the status was granted specifically to prevent further damage to the rural features of the village. To now allow this landowner to breach this policy for commercial gain is hardly fair to others in the area that have had more modest proposals for development or alteration of their property refused or modified.</p> <p>Flood Area The whole of this area is subject to flood, water logging and significant surface and underground streams as indeed is all of this part of the village. Those streams already cause problems, for example, the stagnant ditch on the recreation ground and the water which lies in Martins Hill Lane apparently due to an underground spring. Building on flood areas is to be avoided as it provides a poor base for quality building (eg subsidence to bungalows in Gordon Way). It also increases risk to those people living in the new houses while the extra hard surfaces they create leads to drainage problems in the non-built up area. The additional demands for water, sewage and drainage from the new properties make all this worse. These problems can only get worse if predictions of longer term rises in sea levels materialize increasing flood risk for the whole of the Christchurch and Christchurch harbour areas.</p> <p>Infrastructure Issues There is a suggestion that roads will be improved along the A35 corridor (including Staple Cross) and at the Stony Lane and Fountain roundabouts. There are already long delays at certain times each day when people are travelling to/from work/school on Stony Lane. Yet more traffic along this route from more houses can only make this worse (let alone the additional lorries resulting from the gravel extraction proposals - estimated as some extra 50 lorries a day in and out and 30 lorries for recycling). Cars from the new housing would need to use Martins Hill Lane. (The Meyrick representatives have already told us that they think access should be via Alder Close and not Salisbury Road since the junction of Salisbury Road, Summer Lane and Martins Hill is notoriously difficult. Were this to be the case more cars would be coming onto Martins Hill Lane close to the recreation ground and near to a dangerous bend.) Martins Hill Lane is already used as a cut through for cars seeking to avoid the bypass and village and as a narrow road taking buses has several awkward points. It is difficult to see how the proposed mitigation plan addresses the substantial traffic problems through Christchurch to the A338.</p> <p>Public transport in the village is poor and glibly</p>					

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>suggesting it will be improved is foolish as it has been shown that it is simply commercially not attractive enough. The village (and Yellow Buses) struggle to maintain the one bus an hour to Christchurch and Bournemouth.</p> <p>Plans to put footpaths, cycle paths and alleys linking the new development with the village via Alder Close and Medlar Close will create more problems with young people hanging around at night, reduce security and damage the quiet nature of these roads. School provision for the village is at capacity. The Borough as a whole is at stretch-point and is unable to cope with anticipated needs. The village primary school a small church school is oversubscribed and has had a troubled history partly arising from the difficult social needs of the residents in that part of the village. It has taken very great efforts for the school to only just, after several years, come out of special measures. It now needs a period of stabilization and support to ensure it can build on that.</p> <p>There is little evidence to show that proper account has been taken of the impact of any of the proposed further development on water and sewage facilities in the town. The sewage treatment plant opened in the early 1960s is already extremely smelly in times of warm weather and during peak holiday periods. Local paper reports show that Mudeford Avon Beach has had sewage discharged there several times this year already. Further major building without corresponding investment in the Sewage Plants must further risk putting more sewage out to sea and jeopardizing the quality of water off our beaches and ultimately our blue Flag status so important to local tourism.</p>					
656207	Paul Siemaszko		CSPS3606	Policy CN 2							<p>CHRISTCHURCH AND EAST DORSET CORE STRATEGY POLICY CN2 – LAND TO THE SOUTH OF BURTON VILLAGE</p> <p>This part of the document is not sound because it is not justified. Nor is it consistent with national or local policies in relation to the Green Belt, it would damage an established Conservation area and involves building on a known flood plain.</p> <p>Preservation of the Green Belt</p> <p>The site is currently part of the Green Belt. The proposals treat as accepted the principle of building on Green Belt without acknowledging that this should only be undertaken in exceptional circumstances when other options have been exhausted. These proposals do not explain why this should be the case here. The intended building would end the tradition of the village as a rural/farming community and lose its separation</p>				315	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>from the main town of Christchurch. There are other areas which could and should be considered more fully fist. For example disused garages in Barrack Road, the site previously agreed for development in South Stony Lane, and Grange Road, brown field sites in the Borough such as Somerford Road and the Beagle site. The plan already includes (CN1) for substantial loss of Green Belt at Roeshot Hill so doesn't explain the need for a further 45 (as alleged in the draft or far more if the landowner can secure it) in Burton. Together with damage to the Green Belt arising from the Hampshire/Dorset boundary gravel extraction plans the total are of Green Belt loss to the area will be vast. The proposals involve the loss of Waters Farm and the jobs of those working there. This will be a real loss to the village.</p> <p>Conservation Area The proposed site is in the Burton Conservation Area set up primarily to keep this a rural/farming community. The proposals would make such status pointless.</p> <p>Flood Plain The whole of this area is wet suffers flooding and water retention eg there is always water lying in Martins Hill Lane due to an underground spring which is particularly dangerous in winter.</p> <p>Infrastructure Issues Traffic from and through Burton at peak times of day creates long queues on Stony Lane making it difficult for those getting to work, school and college. More cars in this area from the new housing will make these problems worse. Local lanes and roads would be busier especially Martins Hill Lane where there are already danger points around the recreation/scout ground and dangerous bends. Public transport in the village is poor. Although at one time the M2 provided a good service to Poole via Bournemouth there is now the yellow 21 with on a good day one bus an hour to Christchurch and Bournemouth – when it runs! When at college I relied heavily on the bus service from Burton to Poole and simply could not have continued my studies were I in the village now with its poor bus links. The plan says little about provision of utilities in particular water and sewage facilities. The existing sewage treatment plant smells disgusting in the summer. The Bournemouth Echo only this week had a story about sewage in the sea off our beaches. Hardly something we want to be known for!</p>					
656215	Mrs Sheila A Turner		CSPS3600	Policy CN 2							The Burton Conservation Area Management Plan was adopted by Christchurch Borough Council on 21 February 2007. This stated that Burton was a				315	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>designated conservation in the Borough of Christchurch.</p> <p>Planning Policy CN2 - Land South of Burton Village</p> <p>This is not justified because:</p> <p>Point 1 It proposes a residential development of 45 properties on GREEN BELT land</p> <p>National Policy Framework states that Green Belt can only be altered in exceptional circumstances. The function of the Green Belt is to ensure settlements are separate. Any development here will result in Burton being joined up with Christchurch. Burton is still a village at the moment and not a part of Christchurch, having its own Civil Authority. It is still rural and any permitted development would be invite further development applications on this land in the future.</p> <p>This would cause the destruction of a working farm in a rural area thereby creating unemployment.</p> <p>Point 2 A minimum of 50% of all housing will be affordable on this development.</p> <p>As Burton currently has a large number of affordable type housing in the village, reducing the Green Belt to accommodate further affordable housing is unacceptable. This type of housing could be situated anywhere in the borough of Christchurch.</p> <p>Point 4 Developments will make appropriate contributions to transport improvements.</p> <p>Most of the houses in the development will have 2 cars.</p> <p>Roads in Burton are too narrow and congested to accommodate increased traffic volumes. Salisbury Road in particular is currently used as a cut through to the by-pass by traffic constantly exceeding the speeding limit.</p> <p>Any increase in traffic would be extremely dangerous. The Stony Lane Roundabout is currently extremely congested and prone to accidents. This would not be able to cope with increased traffic nor would Fountains Roundabout. The increased volume of traffic will also result in major jams both in Barrack Road and Bargates.</p> <p>The expected use of Public Transport is exaggerated. The current bus service has been cut yet again as the bus companies have deemed the service to be uneconomical.</p> <p>Planning Policy CN2 is not justified as</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is impossible to demonstrate the displacement of flood risk • The proposed development destroys the reasons for the original justification of the Conservation Area in this part of Salisbury Road. In the past the Christchurch Planning Authority has diligently maintained the conservation area. The proposal would destroy the 					

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	
											<p>characteristics set out in the Salisbury Conservation Area Plan for this part of the area i.e.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Burton farm has a number of unlisted buildings which contribute to the conservation area 2. The farm adds a genuine sense of a rural community 3. This is a working farm which has a crossing on the Salisbury Road to enable the cows to reach the milking parlour 4. The agricultural landscape would disappear 5. Most importantly this is a conservation area <p>Planning Policy CN2 was not shown in the two previous stages of the consultation and was not deemed necessary until the late intervention of the landowner.</p>						
656227	Mrs Josephine M Wheldon		CSPS3599	Policy CN 2							<p>Pre-Submission Core Strategy: Reference CN2 - Land South of Burton Village</p> <p>I object to the above. I do not consider it meets the tests of soundness because it is not 'Justified' nor is it 'Consistent with national policy'. Reasons are given below:-</p> <p>This land should remain Green Belt: It does not qualify for exception as there are alternatives within CN1 (Roeshot Hill) and there are brownfield sites available. There is little of this type of land left. It is valuable and should be conserved. There is an abundance of wildlife in the area, and the proposed building of houses would take away or destroy much of it. We should value wildlife and protect it.</p> <p>Risk of Flooding: The land is low-lying and very wet, with springs and streams there. I believe it would not be consistent with national policies to build there. It has flooded in the past, and it is near the river and parts where flooding occurs after a lot of rain. I think there would be a risk of flooding to houses built there, and I am very concerned as to the possibility of increased flooding risks to other existing properties in the area, including my own.</p> <p>Burton's status as a village: This seems like the thin end of the wedge – after building as proposed, it would be a small next step to build in the adjoining field to the south of it, effectively closing the gap between Burton and the main town of Christchurch. This would mean Burton would no longer be a village – just an extension of Christchurch town. This is not wanted, not justified and not necessary when other alternatives are available as already stated above.</p> <p>Loss of Burton Farm: The proposed development area is presently used as grazing area for the dairy herd, and with the proposal to place 220 or more allotments on the opposite side of Salisbury Road (CN1) taking</p>					315	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											away a further large grazing area, it would mean closure of the farm. I disagree with forcing a running business to shut down, especially in the case of a long established farm carrying livestock. Sewerage disposal and unhealthy air: The smell from Burton sewerage depot is often bad – especially in hot weather and when seasonal increase from visitors occurs. To place houses near to that seems unhealthy, and would be unpleasant for residents. It would obviously also put more pressure on the depot.					
656680	Mr N J Power		CSPS3505	Policy CN 2							I object to the proposed policy for development on the basis that it does not sufficiently meet the tests of soundness. Development on green belt land is not permitted without exceptional reason. I don't believe there are exceptional reasons and these have not been justified when good alternative brown sites exist. The village character and conservation status will be negatively affected by the proposed development. Burton is a rural community and does not fit in an urban extension plan. Therefore this is also not justified and not consistent with National Planning Policy Framework. Appropriate contributions to transport improvements. - I cannot see sufficient evidence that the proposed transport improvements are based on robust and credible data. The Stony Lane roundabout and approaches cannot be improved by simple widening. The traffic management is appalling and would be made worse by the increase in vehicle numbers as a result of development. The increased use of Martins Hill Lane and Salisbury Road brings additional safety concerns to a narrow thoroughfare which as you know is not lit at night. The absence of street lighting is a key differentiator for Burton Village and underpins the rural nature of the community. The increased use of public transport is not a viable mitigation since it cannot be proven, is very difficult to measure and is constantly under threat of service reduction to save costs. Burton – Salisbury Road conservation area. - Not consistent with National Policy on landscape quality and village conservation. The loss of pasture land for the cows at Burton Farm can only serve to destroy the viability of the farm and if it were to close as a result, the character of the village would be irrevocably damaged. This cannot be justified, is not an effective plan for our community and threatens the green lung which exists to separate Burton Village from the Christchurch and Somerford conurbation.				315	
656689	Mrs		CSPS3503	Policy							Re CN2 Proposed development of land south of				315	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	
	Elizabeth Surman			CN 2							<p>Burton</p> <p>I wish to submit 4 objections to the above proposal.</p> <p>1. This land is both Green Belt and in the Burton Conservation area. There does not appear to be any justifiable reason to build on Green Belt land when other sites are available that are NOT Green Belt.</p> <p>2. This land regularly floods. It is not sound policy to build on land that floods.</p> <p>3. Burton is a village with small village roads that are not suitable for extra traffic. A large number of children walk or cycle to school along the Salisbury Road. Extra traffic would make this dangerous for the children.</p> <p>4. Development of this area would mean the loss of Burton Farm which is an essential part of the village. This would also result in the loss of jobs.</p>						
656701	Jacky Silvey			CSPS3502	Policy CN 2						<p>I am totally abhorrent and absolutely object to the proposal of building houses on the land south of Burton village. I have lived adjacent to these fields for 33 years and cannot see the soundness of building there especially as there are other sites more appropriate. The 40/50 affordable houses proposed to be built here would be better accommodated within those being built on Roe Shot Hill and without such a great impact on the environment and structure within the village. It would no longer be a village but become a town!</p> <p>The land proposed for building on, both for affordable houses and for Proposed Policy CN1, allotments, is Farwell Farm. This family farm is an integral part of our village and the last working farm in Burton, by building houses on this green belt and on other parts for allotments and gravel pits is not only making people unemployed but also taking away the farmers' livelihood. The structure of the village will be altered entirely. This farm has been an integral part of village life and is very important to the community.</p> <p>This land is green belt and should remain so. It is prone to flooding and any the water would have to channel elsewhere resulting in displaced flooding. The road structure to accommodate the increase in traffic caused by more housing, allotments and gravel pits cannot be obtainable. The impact on Salisbury road would be dire as it very busy and fast at this present time. It is impossible to get onto Stony lane roundabout already, yet alone the impact of any extra traffic would incur. The country roads just would not be able to withstand the extra traffic.</p> <p>I would urge you to rethink your proposals of building houses in Burton and consider that Roe Shot Hill could easily absorb and extra 40/45 houses. Burton is still providing extra housing as Christchurch Council are</p>					315	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	
											allowing more properties to be built on sites that have previously only had one or two dwellings on them but now have six. As is the case in Whitehayes Road when two bungalows were demolished and had six houses built on the plot. There are many other cases of this in the village. I would urge you to reconsider any planning proposals that will now alter the village dynamics and structure of Burton.						
656704	Ms Nicole Keenan		CSPS3429	Policy CN 2											315		
656708	Mrs Ann Goodchild		CSPS3446	Policy CN 2							I should like to record my strongest objections to the development detailed above. 1. This land is green belt. I feel this should not be eroded and am angered that it can be used and destroyed for purposes of housing. Green belt and lands are reducing I feel this belt in Burton should be preserved. There are many other sites that are NOT green belt – please use one of them 2. There is a farm which is central to our village life. This should not be destroyed. The farm is also an employer and getting rid of it will result in loss of jobs 3. The proposed site is in Burton’s conservation area. This area will therefore be damaged and many houses will mean many more pedestrians and car drives. This will harm further the area. 4. The roads in and around the village are not designed to take any more traffic; they will become congested and dangerous. 5. The increase in population will therefore require more schools, shops, doctors, pharmacy, childcare, leisure areas restaurants to name but a few. We do not currently have the facilities to support such an increase. 6. The increase in individuals would mean a less safe village, it may encourage loitering of adolescents and an increase in crime as there is no facilities for teenagers and youngsters. 7. Any/all new residents would presumably wish to travel into Christchurch/Bournemouth – we do not have adequate roads and bus services to enable this. 8. The proposals do not give any natural walkways into the village centre. Are we to understand therefore that everyone will use cars as it is too far to walk? – Further damage to roads and danger to children and elderly and pedestrians. 9. The proposed site is a known flood risk area and adjacent to. If building is undertaken there the waters will be displaced to endanger existing properties. 10. If the allotment sites are moved as proposed the massive increase in persons using it will add further					315	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>traffic and thoroughfare problems, causing additional wear and tear on roads, congestion, anger and danger.</p> <p>I feel the proposal is rushed; we were not informed until Stage 3.</p> <p>There are other more appropriate sites.</p>					
656712	Mr Graham Woodman		CSPS3500	Policy CN 2							<p>I write to object and draw attention to the proposal of building a great number of houses on land to the south of Alder and Medlar Closes in the village of Burton. It is essential these proposals should be thought through extremely carefully with particular regard to the consequences should such plan receive approval. In the first instance the loss of Green belt will be enormous and have such long term effect - lost for ever to present and future generations and this also applies to our local allotments being so convenient to the village where they are currently situated. This will severely damage the Burton Conservation area. This would also apply with regard to Burton Farm. There have been considerable increases in development in the village in recent years with increased housing and it follows a massive increase in vehicular traffic to an already congested road structure. Forty Five new houses will no doubt generate a huge increase of vehicles. Using the accepted average of two vehicles per household it suggests 90 more to add to that congestion and increased usage of highways into and exiting the village area thus adding to the ever increasing blockage at Stony Lane roundabout giving access to the Christchurch Bypass and in turn to the Town area of Christchurch which already has its own traffic problems.</p> <p>Do not forget the increase in the village centre itself. The road outside the village shop and the Church is so often obstructed by vehicles without further addition that would follow with such an increase in the area of the proposed development. In addition there is the risk to emergency services vehicles accessibility.</p> <p>I sincerely hope the views expressed in this letter will help to oppose the proposals.</p> <p>I remain a resident of some years standing in this village.</p>				315	
656719	Mrs Margaret Woodman		CSPS3501	Policy CN 2							<p>I have read the letter written to you by my husband Graham woodman concerning the Christchurch Local Plan - Housing and Allotments in Burton, and concur with all he has written.</p> <p>Also, I would refer you to the following which has been used in another planning application refusal recently in this area. You may find that this proposed village development plan may also be the subject of these</p>				315	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	
											<p>objections and therefore would have to be refused on these particular grounds.</p> <p>If the proposal is within 5KM of an SSI and if that SSI is part of the Dorset Heaths SAC it may follow the application should have regard to Regulations 48 and 49 of the Habitat Regulations 1994 and carry out an appropriate assessment in accordance with advice set out in Circular 06/2205 to ensure no harm would be caused to the Special Protected area and Site Heathland.</p> <p>The Council should have also regard to the WADDENZEE Judgement ECJ Case C127/02 and ensure the proposal is not contrary to the Environmental Policies A.B.C. & D. of the Bournemouth Dorset and Poole Structure Plan as well as the recommendations of the Berne Convention Standing Committee on Urban development adjacent to the Dorset Heathland and Policy ENV11 of the Borough of Christchurch Local Plan 2001.</p> <p>Also the South East Dorset Transport Contributions Scheme 2 requiring development to make a proportionate financial contribution towards the implementation of schemes designed to alleviate problems caused by the cumulative and cross border impacts of new developments on transport developments and services.</p> <p>The applicants should also show the development would not exacerbate transport problems in South East Dorset and not contravene the National Planning Policy framework CIL Regulation 122 Saved Implementation Policy E of the Christchurch Local Plan March 2001 and Policy KS11 of the emerging Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy.</p>						
656721	Mr D.K Allan		CSPS3455	Policy CN 2							<p>I object strongly against the above proposals on the Planning Grounds as items listed below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This is a Green Belt area 2. It is a Flood Plain area – flood risk already at a high due, not least to the lack of maintenance of the existing water courses in the village and surrounding areas. With this in mind we need less development not more 3. It is a Conservation area which will be severely damaged by such a large development and relocation of allotments 4. Burton Farm, mentioned in the Conservation Area Appraisal makes a valuable contribution to the conservation area, this will be lost along with the consequential loss of jobs 5. The infrastructure of the village/its road network cannot support the extra traffic which will be generated by this scheme proposal 					315	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>6. It must be assumed that most of the new residents would wish to travel to Bournemouth or Christchurch, - Stony Lane roundabout is already at capacity</p> <p>7. The present village structure and community would start to be destroyed and thence become another sprawling satellite part of Christchurch – already undermined by previous ill-considered planning efforts which have eroded our ‘green and pleasant land’. In conclusion, the Core Strategy Proposals will destroy the safe and rural village existence – the ‘thin edge of the wedge’. All people living in Burton do so for the love of its rural environment and its Parish atmosphere. Building on the Green Belt and locating an allotment hub in Burton village will destroy our village atmosphere.</p>					
656723	Mrs Pauline Allan		CSPS3458	Policy CN 2							<p>Re: Local Plan, Core Strategy Proposals for Burton Stated below are my objections, on Planning Grounds, to the Local Plan for the Borough until 2026:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposed building of 45 new houses south of Alder and Medlar Close is an encroachment on the Burton Conservation Area. 2. The proposed area is within the Flood Plain thus creating flood risk especially to an area already known for flooding regularly as the ditches are unable to cope. 3. Burton already has problems with traffic accessing to and from the village either via Stony Lane or Salisbury Road - this situation will be greatly exacerbated. With the proposed development of numerous dwellings alongside Ambury Lane and the Roeshot Hill area, traffic in either direction on the Christchurch by-pass will be permanently gridlocked. 4. Burton Farm, has been a focal point of Burton for over 100 years, farmed by absolute stalwarts of the village who create local employment; the farm is in the Conservation area. 5. Burton is essentially a village with a real village atmosphere which is why many of us chose to live here rather than in Christchurch town – it is essential that it remains that way. 				315	
656725	Mr and Mrs Tinkler		CSPS3461	Policy CN 2							<p>HOUSING AND ALLOTMENTS IN BURTON</p> <p>I wish to object to the planning proposals most strongly for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Loss of valuable Green Belt land, surely you have alternative sites available for development that are not in the Green Belt. 2. The roads through our village cannot support the huge amount of extra traffic that will be generated and as for the Stony Lane roundabout, that is already an absolute nightmare! Goodness knows what it will be like in the tourist season and what a marvellous welcome to our beautiful Christchurch where time is 				315	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											pleasant..well, they will certainly have plenty of time sitting in the traffic to digest that little gem. 3. The proposed site is in the Burton Conservation area which will be severely damaged by such a large development, and what about Burton Farm? The loss of this will surely mean loss of valuable jobs. If these plans are approved, Burton will eventually lose its village identity and become part of the Christchurch/Highcliffe conurbation, like a mini Bournemouth and what a planning concrete joy that is!					
656728	Helen Slater		CSPS3463	Policy CN 2							I object to the use of farm land for housing and development. It will cause traffic chaos and will ruin our rural village.				315	
656732	Ms Celia Burch		CSPS3498	Policy CN 2							I am writing to object strongly to the Planning Proposals for 45 (maybe possibly a lot more) new houses in the land south of Alder and Medlar Closes, and also the relocation of allotments. I have lived in various parts of Burton since 1982, and purchased 9 Alder Close two and a half years ago, because of its quiet cul-de-sac location and lovely views of the fields with cattle and horses. Planning policy CN2 NOT JUSTIFIED – The proposed site lies within the Burton Conservation area, and this would be severely damaged. The area is Green Belt, which is direct contravention of national policy - it is not justified or consistent with this. There is no exceptional reason here to reduce Green Belt. There are alternative sites which are not in the Green Belt that are available. Burton already has a substantial amount of affordable housing, therefore reduction of Green Belt to accommodate this is not acceptable. This could be just the start, as it opens up corridors for future development. Burton is a VILLAGE and that it how it should stay - not eventually joining up with Somerford/Christchurch. Burton Farm, which is an integral part of our village, will be lost, with the consequential loss of jobs, as a direct result of CN1 and CN2. The village's roads cannot take any extra traffic, it is already bad enough trying to get out of Burton at the Stony Lane roundabout and slip road onto A35. Not many people will walk or cycle, this is unrealistic. With regard to flooding, which is a risk around this area, it is not possible to demonstrate and so is not deliverable. CN1 – moving of allotments and further housing. These should be in a suitable accessible location for a range of transport – this is contradictory and therefore undeliverable. In conclusion, my property would lose value if the end of Alder Close were opened up for access, either by car or just as a pathway. Youths would undoubtedly				315	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											gather in any alley/footpath. This would ruin the peaceful and picturesque Close that I live in making it harder to sell should I want to move because of the development proceeding. Burton is a lovely quiet and peaceful village – let us keep it this way! I urge the Planners to think again regarding these developments. They are not wanted or needed in this part of our village. Please look again at other much more suitable sites within the Borough.					
656745	Barbara and Gary Foord		CSPS3466	Policy CN 2							I have a plot at Roeshot Hill allotments. Like other plot holders I grow gooseberry bushes and strawberries and all kinds of vegetables. If anyone needs help they receive it. It is a social thing where experienced plot holders will advise you when to plant crops and when to harvest. This is an institute which would be broken up with a loss of friendships. The housing quota could be located elsewhere. I say no to housing were the allotment would be.				315	
656767	Mrs M Lucas		CSPS3591	Policy CN 2							I am very concerned that the building developments beings proposed for the area in the south of Burton on farm land will reduce the Green Belt without being a strong enough reason. The Green Belt is an important area which helps maintain Burton's own identity. I would not want to see Burton merged into Christchurch. I also think that any developments here would have a serious and unwanted effect on the Salisbury Road Conservation Area.				315	
656789	Mr G R Chester		CSPS3597	Policy CN 2							HOUSING & ALLOTMENTS IN BURTON CN2 & CN1 – LOCAL PLAN I object to the above proposals on the grounds that the land in question is valuable green belt land separating Burton from Christchurch Town. Alternative sites not in the green belt are available. It is obvious that the proposal is being driven by the landowner and is no doubt tied up with possible proposed gravel excavation and possible future housing on land adjoining the A35 Roeshot Hill. The roads in Burton are not adequate now and the movement of 70 or 80 vehicles from CN2 together with a large unknown quantity of vehicles from CN1 are going to bring further chaos to the roads within the village & Stony Lane roundabout. In addition I do not want to see the loss of Burton Farm which is within Burton Conservation Area together with the loss of associated jobs. Let's make sure that future generations grow up appreciating agriculture which in time will be vital for food production.				315	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											I am lucky enough to have been born in Christchurch some 70 years ago, let's make sure that all parts of the borough do remain a place where time is pleasant, it is in your hands.					
656794	Pam Higginson		CSPS3517	Policy CN 2							<p>It has come to my knowledge that there are several housing planning applications by Christchurch Council in process all around where I live.</p> <p>It is nigh impossible to find out any details via the web, and it is only through 'word-of-mouth' or some person I know having received information that I have found out about this.</p> <p>Why is it that all these applications are not made known to all Christchurch residents in an easily accessible form?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Roeshot Hill housing 2) Burton Farm (Farwells) 3) Transfer of Roeshot Hill allotments 4) Business/retail outlets on south of Somerford Rd 5) Gravel extraction to north of railway line Burton Common area <p>My objections to ALL OF THESE mainly concern the unnecessary destruction of 'green belt', and the excessive traffic all this housing/allotments/gravel extraction will bring to the already busy A35 and Stony Lane.</p> <p>Apart from destroying green belt, the building of houses south of the railway line to the bypass, and from Salisbury Rd, Burton right up to Roeshot Hill is unbelievable! Who, in their right minds, would want to buy a house right next to a railway line anyway!! Combined with the building on fields in the area of Burton Farm, all this will totally destroy the rural feel of the area. Green belt should REMAIN GREEN BELT - otherwise it makes a mockery of the classification?!</p> <p>The increase in cars/lorries from all these plans will cause an excessive increase in traffic - particularly out onto the A35, Salisbury Rd and Stony Lane, where congestion already occurs.</p> <p>More retail/superstores are NOT needed in this area. Additional housing should be built on these Brownfield sites. If a site off Grange Rd can be allocated for building for gypsies!! Then it should now be used to building homes for those residents in need locally.</p> <p>2035 new homes is excessive, considering the number of properties that are already up for sale around the area. This area is well-known for attracting second-home/holiday home buyers, so who would monitor that these 'affordable' houses will only be bought by local young people who are in need? Or that the prices will stay affordable?</p> <p>Please accept this letter of objection.</p>				315	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	
656798	Mr Peter Collins		CSPS3564	Policy CN 2							<p>I would like to take this opportunity to register my complete objection to various items within the above document.</p> <p>As someone who was born in the village of Burton in 1957 I have seen many changes to the appearance of the village but feel enough is enough if the village is to retain its rural charm and character</p> <p>This proposed development was not included in the original strategy document and has been added at the eleventh hour and can therefore not have been positively prepared.</p> <p>Planning Policy CN2. Land South of Burton Village.</p> <p>This policy is not justified on numerous counts:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This land is greenbelt and should remain so. 2. The greenbelt is in place to prevent settlements merging into huge conurbations. This portion of land is an important part of the greenbelt which separates Christchurch and Burton. To allow this to be developed is the thin end of the wedge and before long this whole section of land could be lost to further development. 3. Burton is a rural village and not a suburb of Christchurch and has no need for an urban extension. 4. The allowance of this proposal together with the allotments in policy CN1 will almost certainly see the demise of the farm with the associated loss of jobs. 5. The planned development will cause vastly increased traffic movements in Salisbury Road and Martins Hill Lane and even further congestion at the Stony Lane and Fountain roundabouts. 6. Part of this site is subject to flooding. 7. This proposed development comes within the Salisbury Road conservation area. The following is a statement from the Salisbury Road conservation area document 5.50.1. "Infilling or other further intensification of the housing within Burton would continue to erode the basic village character of the settlement to the general detriment of the existing residential amenity". 					315	
656812	Mr A B Du Puy		CSPS3567	Policy CN 2							<p>I am writing to express my concerns regarding the proposed building 45 houses on the land south of Alder and Medlar Closes.</p> <p>I would express my objections on the following Planning Grounds:</p> <p>CN2:</p> <p>There will be a loss of valuable Green Belt land when there are alternative sites available that are not in Green Belt designated area.</p> <p>The proposed site is in the Burton Conservation Area which will be severely damaged by such a large development which will necessitate relocation of allotments (CN1 proposal).</p>					315	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>CS2: The infrastructure of the village and its road network cannot support the extra traffic that will be generated by this proposed development.</p> <p>KS 10: This development will considerably increase the amount of traffic using the Stony Lane which is already a nightmare at times due to the restricted access onto the roundabout. You can often wait up to fifteen minutes to get onto the roundabout. The timescale will escalate if this development goes ahead. I trust that the above objections will be taken into consideration in relation to this proposed development.</p>					
656857	Mr Stephen Perry		CSPS3514	Policy CN 2			No	No	No	No	<p>1. Green Belt The National Planning Policy Framework includes rigorous protection for Green Belt land. It makes it perfectly clear that any development of Green Belt land cannot be permitted unless in exceptional circumstances. This proposal therefore directly contravenes national policy. It does not merit exception status when reasonable alternatives exist within CN1, other less sensitive sites around the village and brownfield sites are available – eg Somerford Rd. Somerford Road already has a mix of industrial, retail and residential land use and would be eminently suited to residential infill given the existing infrastructure. I note that the Beagle Aircraft site is also available. The crucial nature of this green belt – acting as it does as a vital green wedge or buffer zone separating the village from the town of Christchurch – is particularly important. It is therefore deeply troubling that the exact opposite is being proposed - it is now seen by both the landowner and the council as an opportunity to open up a green corridor for future development – 135 houses have already been openly talked about by a council employee at the Saxon Square meeting. Another direct quote from the representative at the Burton Scout Hut meeting on 12/5/2012 - "rural exception would be 10-15 dwellings typically". Policy CN2 is therefore not sound. It is not justified as "the most appropriate strategy when considered against the reasonable alternatives and it is clearly not consistent with National Policy."</p> <p>2. Conservation Area and Village Status, Scale and Character I understand that much of the relevant detail of the Salisbury Road Conservation Area was adopted by Christchurch Borough Council as recently as 21st February 2007. Quoting directly from the document; "The character area comprises part of a working farm and its various outbuildings, yards and enclosures. Its</p>	Policy CN2 should be withdrawn from the strategy.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	Because I wish to further substantiate my response and to seek transparency in this process.	315	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>wider setting also forms an important part of the character area." Also, "Views are a particularly important part of this section of the conservation area. The farm group is seen in the context of a very open working agricultural landscape and this in turn forms a crucial part of the setting of the conservation area and the buildings within this character area." That farm buildings remain in their original uses is specifically mentioned in the conservation area documentation. This land and the buildings in the Burton Farm Group make an important contribution to character of area, providing a genuine sense of rural community. As a direct result of CN1 and CN2 – proposed allotments and housing the future of the farm is directly jeopardised as is the character of village and this aspect of Conservation Area. I note that the Allotments (in CN1) should be in "suitable accessible location".... "which can be accessed by a range of transport." This is quite simply not the case.</p> <p>Astonishingly, this proposal is not only at odds with National Policy regarding Conservation Areas but it also contravenes and contradicts the council's own stated policy in Core Strategy Policy LN4 p177 – "the development is small scale and reflects the setting, form and character of the settlement and the surrounding landscape." Again P22 – "control small scale works which might damage the character of Conservation Areas".</p> <p>To set about destroying "a crucial part of the setting of the conservation area" designated as recently as 2007 is breathtaking.</p> <p>Policy CN2 is therefore not sound. It is not positively prepared in that it not only contravenes existing Conservation Area policy but, incredibly, it contradicts other policy statements within the same document. Equally it cannot be justified – "founded on a robust and credible evidence base" – when policy statements within the same document are contradictory and incompatible.</p> <p>It is not effective – deliverable – because of those contradictions and, yet again, it is inconsistent with National Policy. Development can and should occur in areas where impact/damage is less.</p> <p>3. Flood Risk</p> <p>It is common knowledge that to build on land at risk of flood is not consistent with National Policy but Christchurch Council are once again at odds not only with Central Government but – again – with their own stated policies.</p> <p>The Environment Agency makes the flood risk in the area of CN2 clear. As does "Advice for developers – Strategic Flood Risk Assessment for planning</p>					

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>purposes“ on www.dorsetforyou.com/sfra/christchurch. In a House of Commons Standard Note (SN/SC/4100) published as recently as 9th May 2012 it states; “Concerns over flooding have increased in recent years. Under the Labour Government planning guidance was revised more than once to discourage building on areas at risk of flooding” and “Local plans should take account of climate change over the longer term.” “Inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding should be avoided by directing development away from areas of at highest risk, but where development is necessary (my italics – how can it be necessary when over 800 houses are being proposed on land that does not have the flood risk?) making it safe without increasing flood risk elsewhere.” This is key, but needs to viewed in the context of further contradictions within the Core Strategy document – Core Strategy Policy ME6 (p162) – “demonstrate that flood risk does not increase as a result of development” This is simply not possible to demonstrate – so not deliverable, so not sound. Displaced flooding in Alder and Medlar Close as a direct result of this proposed development is impossible to calculate or demonstrate. The impact on the water course running directly through this area cannot be shown. Thus the proposal is again unsound and not justified since it is not founded on a robust and credible evidence base.</p> <p>The Sequential Test, referred to in the above House of Commons document makes it clear that the aim of the test “is to steer new development to areas with the lowest probability of flooding.” This test cannot have been applied rendering the proposal unsound since the document is not positively prepared and, once again, national policy and guidance are ignored. The effects of climate change are highlighted in UKCP09 – http://ukclimateprojections.defra.gov.uk - the Defra website. It is specifically designed to assist in “taking decisions or making investments with long-lifetimes, such as construction”. Defra is, of course the UK government department responsible for policy and regulations on the environment, food and rural affairs. I quote directly from the above website...</p> <p>“High-plus-plus (H++) scenario. This might be used for contingency planning and to help users thinking about the limits to adaptation. We think it very unlikely that the upper limit of this scenario will occur during the 21st century but cannot yet rule it out completely given past climate proxy observations and current model limitations. In summary, our H++ scenario range for time-mean sea level rise around the UK is 93 cm to approximately 1.9 m. Beyond our qualitative statement</p>					

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>that the top of this range is very unlikely to occur in the 21st century we make no attempt here to assign a precise probability to this event. Improvements in models and continued monitoring may, in the future, help us to estimate the likelihood of this type of event or rule it out completely.” It then goes on to state; “If a global carbon emissions deal is not reached very soon there is great potential for even the high emissions scenario to be a significant underestimate.”</p> <p>Further research by Devon County Council states; “It was found that the present day 50 year return period storm surge can be expected to increase sea level above the astronomical tide by between 0.6 and 0.9 m in the South West depending upon exact location. In 2095 the same event can be expected to raise sea levels by up to 1.2 m over the present day high tide.”</p> <p>This relates to storm surges over and above sea level rises attributable to global warming”</p> <p>On P20 of the Core Strategy document the council pledge to “adapt to emerging demands of climate change through clear strategies to reduce risk of flooding”. Possible sea-level rises of 1-2m plus storm surges of over 1m extend flood risk zone beyond current flood plain. Therefore the proposal is again clearly unsound since – demonstrably – national policy is contravened, as is further government advice.</p> <p>4. Transport Infrastructure</p> <p>Once again CN2 is directly contravened within the council’s Core Strategy document. On P21 it states that “development should be located in most accessible locations”. Given the nature of the local roads this is clearly not possible to achieve. “Safe access and egress” on Salisbury Road is not feasible whilst any use of Medlar and Alder Close would be wholly inappropriate – as would access and egress on Martin’s Hill Lane close to a signposted dangerous bend and clearly within the potential flood zone.</p> <p>Additionally, “Appropriate contributions to mitigate its impact on the transport network” are proposed. The lanes and village roads of Burton are inadequate for this increase in traffic and impossible to improve. The proposal is therefore not sound since it is not deliverable. It is not justified because a robust and credible evidence base does not exist.</p> <p>5. Additional points</p> <p>Policy CN2 does not appear in the two previous stages of consultation – it was not deemed necessary until late intervention of the landowner, Meyrick Estates. This alliance between landowner and planning authority renders the proposal unsound since it was not positively prepared.</p> <p>Since the publication of the Core Strategy and before</p>					

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>the end of the consultation period, Meyrick Estates have returned to the council and offered land for 135 houses on this site. This was openly stated by Mr Trueick, the Strategic Planning Officer, in the Saxon Square “consultation” on the grounds that a proposed development elsewhere in the Strategy was meeting some opposition. Such maneuvering during the consultation period demonstrates that the proposal is unsound – it is not objectively assessed and is not positively prepared. Furthermore it is not justifiable, not most appropriate strategy, not based on robust and credible evidence base due to late its ‘bolting on’ to original strategy and subsequent modification during what is supposed to be a transparent process.</p> <p>6. Conclusion This proposal fails ALL FOUR tests of soundness by any objective analysis.</p> <p>1. It is not Positively Prepared. “The plan should be prepared based on a strategy which seeks to meet objectively assessed development and infrastructure requirements”. CN2 has quite clearly not been subject to such rigour, riddled as it is with so many contradictions and unsubstantiable assertions. Worst still is the cosy alliance between council and landowner whereby the Strategic Planning Officer openly reveals an offer made by the landowner to increase the number of houses to be built BEFORE THE CONSULTATION PROCESS HAS ENDED, CLEARLY ON THE BASIS OF INFORMATION SUPPLIED TO THE LANDOWNER BY THE COUNCIL. At this point the plan must be rejected as this collusion undermines the entire process, proving that it is not positively prepared.</p> <p>2. It is not Justified. “The plan should be the most appropriate strategy, when considered against the reasonable alternatives, based on proportionate evidence.” Throughout this response I have repeatedly demonstrated that it is NOT the most appropriate strategy when so many perfectly reasonable alternatives exist.</p> <p>3. It is not Effective. “The plan should be deliverable over its period”. It is clearly NOT deliverable when viewed against the flood risk, the available infrastructure, and the total contradiction with the council’s own existing policies, be they previously written - in the case of the Conservation Area - or those written into the very same Core Strategy Pre-Submission document.</p> <p>4. It is not consistent with National Policy. Again, by any reasonable objective analysis, the plan not only fails to be in accordance with a range of national policies – Green Belt, Conservation Area, flood risk</p>					

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											and climate change – but signally fails to follow the guidelines and advice subsequently offered by central government. In conclusion, this proposal is contradictory, poorly prepared and mired in a process that is demonstrably not transparent. It is the moral obligation of Christchurch Council to withdraw this proposal now from the Core Strategy before it is submitted for independent examination. It is completely beyond my comprehension that any neutral, objective inspection of this plan could reach any other conclusion.					
657167	Mr David Wheldon		CSPS3489	Policy CN 2		No	No	No	No	No	The proposal CN2 land south of Burton village. This plan is not sound because it will be built on 'Green Belt', 'Flood Plain' and is subject to flooding. There is abundant wildlife. Traffic would be seriously increased. The problem with very bad smells from the sewerage works. Rising sea levels will affect the site and make more floodland. To move the sewerage works would be much more costly. This plan has not been thought out and is "unjustified				315	
662967	Mr Ronald Brailey		CSPS3554	Policy CN 2	No	No	No	No	No	No	Contravenes national policy and goes against your own appraisal document adopted in February 2007 "Survival of farms and farm buildings as a reminder of the strong agricultural origins of the settlement", "The open rural agricultural landscape setting" plus nine other similar items that the new development will destroy. Also the added traffic either at Stony Lane or over the Avon Causeway used by a lot of residents. Plus the doctors' surgery is fully stretched as are the schools.		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		315	
663076	Mrs S Richards		CSPS3616	Policy CN 2							CN2 Green Belt Status I am opposed to changing any Green Belt status in the village of Burton. It would be the thin end of the wedge. Once one area is changed, that area would be cited in future applications, and we would end up with houses south of Stony Lane and north to the Church and beyond. Green Belt is in place to protect the countryside from urban sprawl such as the proposed development of 45, or possibly 135, houses on farmland south of Burton. Green Belt is also there to prevent the merging of towns and villages such as Burton and Christchurch. I refer to the Broadway Malyan Master Plan of 2010 re North Christchurch Urban Extension commissioned by Christchurch Borough Council, which states that there should be no further development of Green Belt land south of Burton, as it would cause coalescence of Burton with Christchurch. This was a decision made on land behind Burton Farmhouse, but in my view the				315	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>statement applies in this case also.</p> <p>If Green Belt land is deemed OK to change into housing and commercial use, then perhaps commercial land in Somerford and elsewhere could be changed to accommodate housing. In Grange Road, Somerford, Christchurch Council was prepared to allow a residential travellers' site on what is now commercial land. In that case, that could be an alternative site for housing needs.</p> <p>Housing Development</p> <p>With regard to the proposed housing estates, I question the need for so many new houses in this area, Christchurch having the highest proportion of elderly in the country. I question whether there are enough places in local schools, and whether other services such as doctors can cater for the new influx. Surely at some point, a line has to be drawn. If the houses are not there, people cannot come here to live. Regarding the 45 houses south of Burton, I question the decision to build houses on land which regularly floods. Once the houses are there, will the excess water, having nowhere to go, possibly be forced back out to Martins Hill Lane which already experiences ongoing trouble with surface water and flooding. I presume that dog walkers won't mind walking their dogs on the heathlands mitigation land when it is flooded.</p> <p>Living adjacent to the proposed site, I object to pedestrian access coming through Medlar and Alder Closes, on the grounds of noise (to and from the Oak Inn) and compromising of privacy and security, and would similarly oppose any entry or exit road coming through. The roads are narrow with cars parked either side and also at the ends.</p> <p>Commercial Units</p> <p>I oppose the incorporation of commercial units into the old barns on Burton Farm and question the need for them. There are already plans in place for commercial units in Staple Cross Farm buildings, which I also do not approve of. There are office buildings and lots in Somerford and Christchurch which have been vacant for years. Burton is not the place for commercial units, and in this instance it could mean the loss of another grazing field for car parking. All this in a Conservation area.</p> <p>Loss of Farmland</p> <p>It is obvious that with farmland being converted to houses, allotments and gravel extraction, the far will no longer be viable as a dairy farm, and it is understood that the present tenants could be at the end of their tenancy. I question why a dairy and beef farm is to be lost when the UK already imports, as I understand it,</p>					

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>nearly one third of the UK's dairy product requirements. Isn't it better for the UK to produce its own food wherever possible. I know it is not for me to say what a landlord does with his own land, but I am presuming that Christchurch Council would prefer the land to be covered in solar panels producing electricity, a business interest of this landlord, rather than food for the nation. Burton has already lost Staple Cross Farm recently, so once Burton Farm land goes, and the remaining fields are not productive, Burton's rural village status goes, and housing will proliferate.</p> <p>Conservation area I oppose the entry/exit of the housing/commercial units site being near the junction of Salisbury Road and Martins Hill Lane as this is already a difficult junction being on a bend. It is also in a Conservation Area which would be compromised. The Conservation Area has views in both directions included in the Conservation Area Plan of 2007. These views would be compromised by both the housing development and the relocation of allotments.</p> <p>Traffic (CN1 and CN2) The traffic generated around Burton by both schemes would have a great and detrimental effect on the locality. The 45 (possibly 135) houses could potentially generate double that number of cars or more, with children being ferried to schools in Burton, Somerford or Christchurch. In the case of the allotments, not everyone travels by bicycle or walks, so the number of users' cars, possibly more so at the weekends, could be enormous, on country roads not built for such traffic. Salisbury Road could have backlogs of traffic waiting to go out onto the fast-moving by-pass, including cars coming from the Burton end of the Roeshot Hill housing development. This could be a recipe for accidents. The impact on Stony Lane out to the by-pass roundabout, already with problems of tailbacks, would be huge. Not to mention the onward effect of all this traffic on the Fountain roundabout.</p>					
663344	Mr and Mrs J A Lord		CSPS3644	Policy CN 2							<p>We are writing to register our objections to the proposed plans you have for the development of Burton on the outskirts of Christchurch. In line with many Burton residents we object to the proposals because of the following: Loss of Green Belt land. Loss of Burton farm which is an integral part of the village. Increase in traffic. We have lived on Martins Hill Lane for almost 30 years and during that time have noticed the significant increase in the volume of traffic and the speed that the cars travel along the road. In our time here our front wall has ben demolished three times by cars losing control on the bend. In our view</p>				315	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											it's only a matter of time before someone is seriously injured or killed, we have written to the council before asking for traffic calming measures to be introduced but this was rejected. The additional traffic is only going to make the situation worse. The increase in housing will change the character of the village. Increased time in travelling to Christchurch due to increased volumes of traffic trying to get on to the Stoney Lane Roundabout.					
663358	Judith M Ward		CSPS3648	Policy CN 2							<p>I object to the above mentioned proposals for the following reasons:-</p> <p>It is wrong to build homes on green belt land when there are alternative sites that could be used and is a direct contravention of national policy. CN2 has not been in the previous stages of consultation and I believe it is only in now, due to the intervention of the landowner.</p> <p>This development is in the Salisbury Road Conversation Area, the character of which will be changed by the housing and the relocation of the allotments from Roeshot Hill. It is also taking land from Burton Farm, a working farm, which makes a valuable contribution to the Conversation Area, this will be lost together with jobs.</p> <p>Allotments should be sites in the most accessible locations, Salisbury Road and the lanes of Burton are inadequate and not possible to improve. The amount of traffic generated by this housing and allotments will be huge, access to Stoney Lane and Christchurch bypass is already difficult at certain periods of the day and the volume of extra traffic generated would be impossible, causing more back-up in Barrack Road and Fairmile Road.</p> <p>I have lived in Christchurch all of my life and in this lovely area for the past forty six years and I urge you most strongly to reject these proposals and not spoil the character of the village of Burton.</p>				315	
359571	Mr Renny Henderson	Royal Society for the Protection of Birds	CSPS3717	Policy CN 2							<p>This policy relates to the allocation of land for 45 dwellings south of Burton.</p> <p>We object to policy CN2.</p> <p>Paragraph 6.61 identifies the site is located adjacent to the Avon Valley SPA/Ramsar site and within close proximity of the River Avon SAC and the Dorset heathland European sites. The development will provide "on site Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace" in order to minimise its impact on the European sites. Paragraph 6.62 also states that development will need to avoid adverse impacts on off-site areas used by qualifying species of the above terrestrial sites.</p> <p>Policy CN2 states:</p>		Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	<p>we would like to confirm that we wish to reserve the right to appear at the Examination into the Core Strategy, on the grounds the Core Strategy raises significant issues relating to the protection of internationally important wildlife sites (as highlighted in the HRA) and that there remains uncertainty over the delivery of appropriate and effective mitigation</p>	315	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>“the development will contribute to the Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace provided for the North Christchurch Urban Extension, and will provide linkages to this new greenspace”.</p> <p>This appears contradictory to the statement that on-site SANG will be provided, and we would welcome clarification. We object to the policy on the basis of the uncertainty over SANG within policy CN1, which we assume to be delivering the mitigation for the 45 dwellings proposed in policy CN2.</p>			measures.		
521508	Ms Lisa Jackson	Jackson Planning Ltd	CSPS3643	Policy CN 2	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	<p>Although the allocation is supported by MEM Ltd the policy as currently drafted in relation to Burton is not sound as it is not justified by evidence. The current allocation of 45 units does not reflect the housing need within the Borough and in particular does not reflect available housing land supply to meet the Borough need within the first five years of the plan. MEM Ltd believes the capacity of land south of Burton is greater than indicated in the pre-submission draft, and will make a positive contribution to the land supply from 2013/14.</p> <p>At 50% affordable housing requirement the scheme is not viable to make a competitive return for a willing developer as required by NPPF paragraph 173 . There is no justification or evidence for a 50% requirement based on the SHMA. The SHMA (paragraph 6.13) is clear that a 50% affordable requirement may not be supported by the current market. The SHMA refers to viability tested scenarios at 40% affordable housing across sites in Dorset and indicates in some cases up to 50% (greenfield sites). This evidence is not provided in the SHMA and is not be relevant to the new neighbourhood sites in Christchurch.</p> <p>The scheme at Burton has been tested for viability and deliverability by experts. The results of this testing show that the site can provide a maximum of 40% rather than 50% affordable housing. Fixed costs for infrastructure, utilities, flood mitigation, SANG & CIL/s106 in combination with the low revenues from affordable housing units only allow an acceptable developer profit margin at 40% affordable. Criteria used to develop this viability are standard industry costs and margins. This confidential and commercially sensitive information but this can be provided to the Council on request.</p> <p>Please note this representation is substantiated by additional evidence in a supporting statement submitted with the representations by MEM Ltd.</p>	<p>The policy should be altered on the second bullet point to say: 'Approximately 90 dwellings will be delivered on the allocated site in accordance with a site specific flood risk assessment. Development will be phased over 4 years with commencement in 2013/14. A maximum of 40% of all housing will affordable consistent with policy LN3.' The fifth bullet point should be altered to read : 'The development will provide suitable SANG to meet the requirements of Policy ME3 A full suite of technical reports on the site at Burton including: community consultation, flooding, green belt, transport, landscape and visual impact assessment, phase 1 ecology, heritage impacts, SANG/ heathland mitigation has been submitted in support of the site. The technical evidence provided with this submission shows that the site is available and deliverable within the first five years of the plan.</p>	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	MEM Ltd believe they can demonstrate to the Inspector why the allocation at Burton should reflect the greater potential this site can deliver, and why the form of development should change to support local objections and technical evidence on visual impact. The position is supported by extensive evidencesubmitted in support of this representation that the Inspector may wish to examine including a report of comprehensive community engagement undertaken to date.	315	2261601_0_1.pdf 2261602_0_1.pdf 2261603_0_1.pdf 2261605_0_1.pdf 2261606_0_1.pdf 2261607_0_1.pdf 2261608_0_1.pdf 2267120_0_1.pdf
360668	Mr Daniel Burgess		CSPS3682	Policy CN 2							My objections to the building of additional housing in Burton are:				315	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>1. I object to the planning building 45 houses at the rear of Medlar and Alder Close in Burton. These houses have only just become a part of the local plan as they were not on the previous two stages of the consultation.</p> <p>1a. This tract of land is part of Burton Farm. It is a viable, working beef, dairy and agricultural far which provides jobs for several employees and housing for their families as well as the Farwell family who have farmed here for over 135 years and planned to continue doing so. To use this piece of land, together with a much larger area in Summers Lane for the resiting of the allotments, also part of the farm, would almost certainly be detrimental to the continued running of the farm due to loss of grazing.</p> <p>2. I object because Salisbury Road is in the Conservation Area and within the green belt. To use green belt land for building, unless in exceptional circumstances, is a contravention of national policy. It does not merit exceptional circumstances as there are reasonable alternatives including brown field within Christchurch. It is Christchurch that says it requires more housing not Burton Village. Christchurch have plans, within the same document, for over 800 houses on Roeshot and thus taking away the current allotment site and moving it into Summers Lane.</p> <p>3. I object because we want to stay a village and to build 45 houses on this piece of land is the thin edge of the wedge into using more green belt which keeps us part from Christchurch.</p> <p>4. I object because there is a danger of increasing the risk of flooding. There are areas of Burton, clearly shown on maps, already in danger of flooding and thus additional development could cause displaced flooding particularly with the additional demands of climate change.</p> <p>5. I object because additional development of 45 houses would almost certainly impact on Salisbury Road and Martins Hill Lane and therefore on the dual carriageway and Stony Lane roundabout as I assume that the residents of these houses would need to find/go to employment probably in Christchurch/Bournemouth or other local areas. These roads are at capacity now as Salisbury Road is almost certainly a rat run for vehicles from Ringwood. Also the public transport in Burton is only one an hour and even</p>					

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											less at weekends and holidays and as we have had to fight to keep this level of transport I cannot see that Yellow Buses would increase them. We want to continue to be a rural Village and not an urban part of Christchurch and to lose Burton Farm and the views would alter the character of the area. I moved to the Village just because it is a village and is in the country with fields around us.					
490815	Mrs Trish Jamieson	Burton Parish Council	CSPS3671	Policy CN 2	No			Yes	Yes	Yes	<p>Burton Village is felt by those who live there to be a very special community. Despite the spurt of housing growth in the 1960s and 1970s the new development was confined to the area between Salisbury Road and Stony Lane and Burton's essential character as a rural village has been maintained. This is recognised by the establishment of the Burton Conservation Area, which protects the core of the old village and its essential features. The Parish Council, elected in May 2011, in commenting on these proposals has as its aim the preservation and enhancement of the character of the village and the lives of its residents by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> _ Preventing development inimical to the village _ Supporting and promoting appropriate developments <p>To this end the Council supports the need for a new Local Plan and Core Strategy and acknowledges that without the new plan there is a considerable danger that developers will be able to seek to pursue development proposals which might not be in the best interests of the Village.</p> <p>The Parish Council also accepts that the new Core Strategy offers opportunities to protect services and facilities in the village, and to develop new ones - for example, to pursue extensions to public transport, to protect local shops and facilities, and to secure improvements to private transport.</p> <p>Aware of the difficulties facing young couples with roots in the village finding housing, the Council welcomes the commitment to allowing a development of 100% affordable housing and will seek the adoption of a Rural Exception policy for Burton. For these reasons the Council welcomes many of the new policies and proposals, but it has to be noted that it has serious concerns over proposed Policy CN2.</p> <p>The Council objects very strongly to proposed Policy CN2.</p> <p>Objections in Principle Paragraph 182 of the National Planning Policy Framework states:</p>				315	2262990_0_1.pdf

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>A local planning authority should submit a plan ... which it considers is "sound" – namely that it is: ... Justified . the plan should be the most appropriate strategy, when considered against the reasonable alternatives, based on proportionate evidence; ... Consistent with national policy . the plan should enable the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in the Framework.</p> <p>The Council does not believe that proposed Policy CN2 meets these criteria.</p> <p>A. Justification</p> <p>The Council is extremely disturbed by the way in which this Policy was brought forward.</p> <p>The Council notes that there was no suggestion at either the "Issues and options" stage or the "Preferred Options" stage of the need in principle to provide such a development in the village and notes therefore that this policy has not been exposed to the intense public scrutiny expected by the 2004 Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act.</p> <p>The Council notes that neither itself, its Officers nor the elected Borough Councillors for the village were consulted at any time in the preparation of this policy. The Council takes particular issue with the attempt to justify the inclusion of this development at paragraph 6.58 of the draft Core Strategy by stating:</p> <p>The need for affordable housing in Burton Village has been identified in the Burton local housing needs survey (2006).</p> <p>This survey in fact identified that the need in Burton was for a Local Exceptions Policy to enable the provision of a small number of 100% affordable homes solely to meet the need of local residents. Policy CN2 does not do this and instead presents the policy in terms not simply of meeting the housing needs of Burton but of contributing to providing market and affordable housing for the Borough as a whole.</p> <p>While the Council is well aware of the needs of the parish the Council does not accept that the general waiting list is completely valid. The Council notes the success of the Bournemouth Borough Council in reducing its waiting list by some 5000 and urges a stringent examination of</p>					

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>Christchurch’s waiting list.</p> <p>Paragraph 150 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that “Local Plans are the key to delivering sustainable development that reflects the vision and aspirations of local communities Policy CN2 has not, unlike other policies, been tested in any way against the “vision and aspiration” of the community of Burton.</p> <p>The Council therefore expresses its doubts that Policy CN2 can be described as “Justified” in that there are serious flaws in its preparation and presentation to the community which it is supposed to serve.</p> <p>B. Conformity to the National Planning Policy Framework</p> <p>1. Damage to the Green Belt</p> <p>Paragraphs 79 and 80 of the National Planning Policy Framework state:</p> <p>79. The Government attaches great importance to Green Belts.</p> <p>The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence.</p> <p>80. Green Belt serves five purposes: ... to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another; to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment;</p> <p>The Council does not believe that sufficient reasons have been advanced to justify releasing the portion of the Green Belt proposed under policy CN2. The Council believes that in principle there is no proven need for this type of development in terms of housing need in Burton (as opposed to a very limited development, suggested by the Parish Council’s Housing Survey, as would be the case under a local exceptions policy) and even if there were such a proven need the site proposed is not acceptable.</p> <p>When the proposed development at “Roeshot Hill” is taken into account the Council notes that the “green wedge” referred to in Paragraph 80 separating Burton from Christchurch will be reduced to little more than a quarter of a mile. The Council does not believe this to be sufficient and believes that pressure from landowners and developers will result in the further erosion of the “Green Wedge” in the same way as the settlements of Friars Cliff and</p>					

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>Highcliffe have become linked with the growth of Hoburne,</p> <p>2. Flood Risk Paragraph 99 of the National Planning Policy Framework states: Local Plans should take account of climate change over the longer term, including factors such as flood risk ... New development should be planned to avoid increased vulnerability to the range of impacts arising from climate change. Proposed new Accepting for the purposes of this paper the validity of the concept of climate change, the Environment Agency's Flood Risk Map indicates that the area proposed for development includes a flood risk area. This site should not have been brought forward if alternative sites are available.</p> <p>2. Impact on the Conservation Area Paragraph 137 of the National Planning Policy Framework states: Local planning authorities should look for opportunities for new development within Conservation Areas ... to enhance or better reveal their significance. Unfortunately proposed Policy CN2 reverses this aim. The Borough Council's Burton Conservation Area Appraisal places stress on the importance of Burton Farm and the views into the village to the north. It states: The survival of such a high number of traditional farm buildings in their original uses is a relatively rare sight in this part of Dorset and this group provide a valuable record of the local farm vernacular. The proposed development would destroy, or at the very least absorb, the farm and would block the views which the Conservation Area Appraisal finds so important. Thus the "opportunities for new development" as envisaged by proposed policy CN2, far from enhancing or better revealing the significance of the Area, will destroy or obscure those very features in the southern part of Burton which the 2007 Appraisal seeks to protect.</p> <p>4. Transport Paragraph 32 of the National Planning Policy Framework states:</p>					

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>Development should only be prevented or refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts of development are severe.</p> <p>In the light of this statement it is possible to query whether areas which would indeed generate severe cumulative effects in transport terms should be designated for development.</p> <p>Development as outlined in the area designated in proposed policy CN2 would, the Council believes, indeed have a severe impact on traffic flows in and around the village.</p> <p>The previous Government had set out a completely unrealistic view of car use, requiring authorities to plan for a maximum of one car per dwelling. Experience in developments constructed since 1997 according to this principle has shown that the policy of the predecessor government, that a minimum of two cars per dwelling were to be expected, provides a more accurate response to the reality of the situation. Thus it might be argued that 45 homes will generate 90 extra cars based in the village.</p> <p>Again, it is unrealistic not to expect these cars to be used. The target group of these homes is likely to be at the younger end of the family age spectrum, and therefore it is to be assumed that both adult family members will be seeking employment. Given the present unemployment rate of some 8% (1) this allows an estimate of 82 people in employment. In April 2012 there were some 1.4 million part-time workers out of a total employed work force of 29 million (2), a percentage rate of approximately 5%. Thus of the 82 workers above it can be assumed that 78 will seek to leave the village every day. It has to be assumed that many of these will find work at the principal employment site in Christchurch, the Airport, to which public transport links are non-existent. Other workers may find employment in Christchurch itself, Bournemouth or Poole. Public transport links here are better but it is worth noting that the only regular bus service from the village in this direction, though popular, is not commercially viable and special "worker" buses were abandoned by the bus company. Others, particularly in the skilled professional group, can be expected to have to travel further to find appropriate employment, and indeed many residents of the conurbation travel to</p>					

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>Southampton - and not by train or bus. There are only two principal exits from the village, the Stony Lane junction and the Salisbury Road junction, which only points eastwards, away from Christchurch and the airport. There is another exit to the north, with an unclassified road leading towards the airport over a narrow bridge.</p> <p>The Council therefore feels that the great majority of these journeys will be through the Stony Lane junction, which already suffers from very long delays. The Council notes that the "improvements" envisaged in Policy KS4 are not necessarily due to be implemented until the end of the plan period and are in any event dependent on developer contributions which may not be forthcoming.</p> <p>Further, the Council notes that it is likely that the housing development will generate the need for numerous trips to the village school, located at the other end of the village over a mile away. While the Council notes the assumption that children will walk to school the Council notes that in the real world parents prefer to drive their children to school, as is evidenced by the severe congestion apparent at the beginning and end of the day not only at the Burton primary school but at the local RC primary school in Somerford.</p> <p>The Council also notes the assumption that the provision of good walking and cycling links to the village centre will encourage residents to use the centre by these methods. Again, evidence suggests that the great majority of patrons of the village shop, many from closer locations than the new development, prefer to travel by car.</p> <p>The Parish Council notes that in its response to the consultation on the now abolished Regional Spatial Strategy the Borough Council stated that Christchurch needed new infrastructure investment before, not after, the acceptance of new housing. The Parish Council supports this view.</p> <p>For these reasons therefore the Council believes that Policy CN2 does not conform to national planning policy in terms of transport.</p> <p>C. Alternatives</p> <p>Although the Council challenges the need for development of this type in Burton in principle, it notes that even if the need for an extra 45 homes is accepted as being established there are</p>					

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>better sites available. The Council notes that the development at Roeshot Hill is designated for some 850 homes, and the Council also notes that in the "Preferred Options" stage the site was said to be able to accommodate up to 1,500 homes. The Council notes also the reduction in the "Preferred Option" from 900 to 850 and suggests that restoring this figure, an increase in site density of less than 5%, would not materially harm the character proposed for the Roeshot Hill development. It notes that of course Burton residents would be able to apply for the 35% affordable housing envisaged for this site and feels that given the geographical proximity of the western arm of the development it would would neither be illogical nor impossible to designate 45 of the homes in this arm as being the replacement for the land south of Martins Hill Lane.</p> <p>SUMMARY Burton Parish Council welcomes much of the Core Strategy. However the Council is compelled to reiterate that it has to oppose the inclusion of proposed Policy CN2 on the grounds that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It cannot be justified in terms of the National Planning Policy Framework • the consultation on this has not properly involved the local community and its representatives and there has been insufficient time for thorough critical examination of the policy • The Policy is based on assumptions (the Housing Waiting List) which the Council believes to be seriously flawed • It does not conform to the National Planning Policy Framework, in that the proposed development <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contravenes Paragraphs 79 and 80 of the Framework in that it would damage the Green Belt without sufficient justification • Contravenes Paragraph 99 of the Framework in that the area proposed for development is located in an area of land at flood risk when an alternative site for delivery of the homes to be required is available (Paragraph 99) • Contravenes Paragraph 137 of the Framework in that it would not assist in preserving or displaying the assets of the Burton Conservation Area when an alternative site for delivery of the the homes said to 					

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	
											be required is available • Contravenes Paragraph 32 of the Framework in that it would place an unacceptable burden in transport terms on the infrastructure of the village.						
496918	Mrs Anne Burgess		CSPS3680	Policy CN 2							Christchurch Local Plan I would like to state my views and objections regarding housing and allotments in Burton as stated in Policy CN2. 1. I object to this because Burton does not need any more houses and the building 45 houses behind Alder Close and Medlar Close was not mentioned in the previous two stages of the Local Plan. It is an add on at the last minute. Christchurch may need more housing but with the plans, also in this document, to build bet part of a thousand houses on Roeshot I cannot see the need for this additional block. 2. I object because the piece of land planned to be used to build these houses on is in a conservation area and is part of the Green Belt. To build on the Green Belt is in direct contravention of government policy particularly as Christchurch has brown field sites nearby available. To build here is the thin edge of the wedge and would open the flood gates for more development probably reducing the green wedge between Christchurch and Burton. We want to stay a rural community not an urban part of Christchurch. 3. I object to taking this land for housing and also the bigger tract for the allotments because it would almost certainly impact on the farm. This is a working dairy, beef and agricultural farm. It provides jobs for several employees and housing for their families as well as the Farwell family who have successfully run the farm for well over 135 years and have always planned to continue doing so. 4. My objections also cover the roads and lanes around the village. Have the Council considered the impact of the additional vehicles on the roads around Burton and factored in widening the roads ? The roads to the planned allotment area are lanes not roads and are not wide enough to take any extra cars. Salisbury Road and Martins Hill Lane do not have the space to make them bigger nor does Summers Lane. There are already problems accessing the dual carriageway which takes people to Christchurch and Bournemouth. Children going to school in Burton have great difficulty crossing Salisbury Road as it is already a rat run for cars and lorries (some very large especially the gravel lorries) for traffic coming from Ringwood. 5. What about public transport ? The village has					315	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>already had to fight to keep the buses running through and thankfully Yellow Buses seem to have made it work albeit only 1 bus an hour and even less at the weekends.</p> <p>We want to stay a village and keep the character of the village. We do not want nor need these 45 houses and the additional vehicles that they would incur.</p>					
654831	Mrs Kate Huckle		CSPS3673	Policy CN 2	No	No	No	No	No	No	<p>The document proposes building on Green Belt land National Planning Policy Framework states that green belt can only be altered in exceptional circumstances; no such circumstances have been identified, there are other sites available on Somerford Road and Stony Lane South that would be more suitable for development in relation to traffic impact, local facilities and would lessen the environmental impact which are not green belt land.</p> <p>The additional traffic that would be introduced into the village would cause further congestion to Stony Lane Roundabout, the A35 from Christchurch down to Sainsburys, the slip road from Burton onto the dual carriageway is currently a hazard forcing further traffic to exit the village from here would increase the risk of accidents. The new development would seem to encourage people to use Martins Hill Lane as a route to Christchurch, this road cannot sustain increased traffic flow and cannot be widened or improved to cope with the additional capacity. Public transport is not an alternative in the village as the bus service is not adequate to cope with more residents.</p> <p>With the suggestion that 50% of the homes built would be affordable housing this would suggest a significant increase in the school places required, with the local schools already beyond capacity this has not been addressed within the document.</p> <p>There is a current flood risk identified in the area and building a further estate would increase the local risk to Martins Hill Lane, Salisbury Road, Alder Close and Medlar Close. I believe this actually contravenes part of the Core Strategy in itself and is non consistent with National Policy.</p> <p>Currently the village health service is stretched and introducing the suggested number of new residents would further increase waiting times and put an increased strain on the service again this has not been address in the document.</p> <p>It seems that the land earmarked is a sizeable plot for 45 homes and would suggest that this is the first stage of development and would open up opportunities for further development of the land and other sites in the area. It would significantly change the nature of the village.</p>	<p>I do not believe that the document can be made sound when there are alternative locations that already meet all of the necessary criteria. The document should be applied to another site.</p>	<p>No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination</p>		315	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>The environmental impact on the village in relation to increased noise and traffic is unacceptable.</p> <p>For completeness and in case there is a problem with the attachment, as I believe responses can also be submitted in writing I outline my response to Policy CN2 below.</p> <p>I do not believe the document is either sound or legally compliant as it suggests building on Green Belt land when there are other suitable sites in the area available which are not Green Belt, i.e. various sites along Somerford Road and also Stony Lane South. I believe it is National Policy to only allow such a change of Green Belt land where there are exceptional circumstances there are no such exceptional circumstances in this case.</p> <p>The impact of the additional traffic through the village of Burton is not sustainable and there is no scope for improving or widening the village roads. It would seem to increase the risk of accidents at the A35 slip road from Salisbury Road and indeed increase the already heavy traffic to Stony Lane Roundabout from Winkton / Burton direction.</p> <p>The additional strain on the health centre in the village would not be acceptable and would significantly increase waiting times for appointments for the current residents. Furthermore the document clearly doesn't meet the test of soundness so far as it makes no provision for the additional school places required when the area is already over capacity.</p> <p>There is already an identified flood risk in the area and building on the land would increase the risk for most local residents.</p>					
663352	Mr Gary Collins		CSPS3727	Policy CN 2							<p>I lived in the village for 24 years and when I married and moved to West Moors where I live at present with my wife, and two children.</p> <p>Due to work demands for both my wife and I we had decided to look to moving to Burton in order that we are near my mother, and father for child care reasons. On hearing of the above proposals we are putting our move on hold the reasons as follows:</p> <p>CN1 & 2 Polices will cause:</p> <p>FALLING HOUSE PRICES TRAFFIC CONGESTION BEYOND BELIEF THE DEMISE OF THE VILLAGE</p> <p>Burton is a village approx 3 kilometres form Christchurch Town Centre and according to the 'CONSERVATION APPRAISAL & MANAGEMENT PLAN' adopted by Christchurch Council in February 2007 – is within a conservation area designated on 30th Jan 1986 – amended 15th June 1995 – and adapted as above in Feb. 2007 – points mentioned</p>				315	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>were: OPEN RURAL ASPECT THE SURVIVAL OF FARMS AND BUILDINGS The proposed plans seem to go against all of the above. Also the land in question is categorised as GREEN BELT, which would eventually cause the loss of the only working, farm in the village, unemployment for the formworks and will interfere with the whole Village Status, Character and Scale. Our village is a rural area so in no way does it require an URBAN DEVELOPMENT. The above report ends under the heading of CONCLUSION as follows:- ‘The semi informal spatial qualities of Burton Green enclosed by high quality historic buildings, the hamlet of Martins Hill Lane with its small intimate scale and the Valuable Survival of Burton Farm: a working Farm of historic farm buildings and farmhouse all contribute to the high quality historic environment and the distinct sense of peace in Burton’ all the above would and could be destroyed. CN2 – HOUSES OBJECTION: FLOOD RISK & TRAFFIC CONGESTION The houses are planned for a piece of land which again is part of the above farm, the fields in question are low grade grazing, as the bottom half floods on a regular basis and contradicts Core Strategy P20 which states land should adapt to emerging demands of climate change through clear strategies to reduce risk of flooding, and Core Strategy policy ME6 says planning should demonstrate that flood risk does not increase as a result of development, not build on land that is highlighted as to be at risk. As national policy talks of possible sea-level increase of 1 to meters in height and possible storm surges that could extend flood risk zone far beyond the currant flood plain. The make up of the 45 properties within the proposed development is to include 50% low cost housing, the site is 150 meters closer to the existing sewer works in Stony Lane were on a bad day the aroma can be somewhat ripe. I fail to believe that private buyers would wish to purchase properties on a potential flood risk area, near a sewer farm and railway line, in a traffic congested area, thus the majority or all the properties could be offered as low cost housing, giving those residents little option but to live within the above described conditions. This is morally wrong. The access to the site will be on Salisbury Road near the crossroads of Summers Lane and Martins Hill Lane, through what has been described as a mix of low grade industrial units, thus making use of existing and part disused farm buildings, The plan talks also of</p>					

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>800 plus houses at Roeshot Hill why could these few houses at Burton be added to the proposed Roeshot Hill development doing away with this excessive over development of this south end of this village. Social housing should be built near the main town not away on the edge of a village with limited and at times no bus service.</p> <p>CN1 ALLOTMENTS--- OBJECTION: TRAFFIC CONJESTION UNSUITABLE FOR VILLAGE</p> <p>The proposed CN1 plan is to site 400/500 allotments on land at Summers Lane, at the rear of the only working farm in the village, this forms part of the Burton Conversation Area Plan as adopted by Christchurch Council in February 2007. This site will remove a large part of arable land used for e feed and grazing of a large beef/dairy heard.</p> <p>The plan CN1 and Core Strategy P21 talks of Allotments that should be in a suitable accessible location, Summers Lane is a single track road from Hawthorn Road to Salisbury Road crossroads with Martins Hill Lane, where, it will as per the allotment own report have a possible usage of 50 plus cars a day, based on 10% visiting the site but this estimate could be way out. The traffic is a major problem as said above these roads are single track, and more over the access and exit route to Christchurch would be via Martins Hill Lane that at the moment has seen a significant increase in traffic especially since the traffic calming came into force in Salisbury Road. I cannot see how any proposed road improvement could be carried out on this road unless houses were demolished. Improving public transport will have no consequence as people with an Allotment normally use their own transport and have trailers. I cannot see any benefit for the villagers of Burton.</p> <p>CN1 & 2 ROADS SALISBURY ROAD Main spine road running through village SUMMERS LANE Side road at the cross roads with Martins Hill Lane opposite, this is single track road leading to Hawthorn Road. MARTINS HILL LANE Side road at the crossroads and again opposite SUMMERS LANE, any access to the proposed site would enter and excess near this crossroads on Salisbury Road and either go down Salisbury Road to the BY-PASS, or down Martins Hill Lane to Stony Lane where at peak times the traffic queues back beyond the turn to Martins Hill Lane the traffic chaos that the proposed that 45 houses and allotment traffic would bring beggars belief that</p>					

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											someone has came up with this plan. ROAD IMPROVEMENTS					
663376	Mr John Whiffen		CSPS3687	Policy CN 2		No		Yes	Yes		<p>Core Strategy: Pullout from Christchurch Courier, Spring 2012</p> <p>As with the Pullout from 2010, response to this document would have been so much easier to make had there been the opportunity to use tick-boxes. Perhaps they would have saved your colleagues much time instead of having to comprehend written answers. It has taken me much time to read and, therefore, to respond.</p> <p>Is it the fact, as it appears to be, that the entire business of the local development strategy in general and the core strategy in particular results from predictions of national, and, from that, local growth in population?</p> <p>Page 1</p> <p>What was the percentage of rate-payers who responded to produce the “excellent results”? If the responses really did “inform this stage”, how are you able to continue with plans to build on the allotments at Roeshot Hill when so many people do not want that to happen? It appears that the “consultation – responses”, evidence, surely, have NOT been used in drafting this stage. Had those responses from allotment-holders alone been included, you would not be showing planned roads on the land used now as allotments!</p> <p>Page 2</p> <p>1. Is not “Green Belt” intended as a protection against jut such intrusion? 850 dwellings will, quite likely but as a guess, house an average of three people. Over a thousand more cars in Christchurch, perhaps, but much ensuing congestion a certainty, especially into and from the roundabout at Sainsbury’s. All those people would need additional facilities (doctors, dentists, shops, another petrol-station, perhaps, restaurant/pub – what else?) which would take more land adding to the sense of increasing density.</p> <p>2. Affordable by/to whom? Such an unquantifiable expression is meaningless as evidence, surely. Who are to be the intended purchasers?</p> <p>3. You have identified space “south of the railway line”. Presumably such land is already available and you are planning to cover at least some if it with “retail/community facilities”. For whom? The additional housing/population will be occupying it, your plan appears to show.</p> <p>4. “Will be relocated”? Have you absorbed at all the representations from RHAA and individuals? Not much</p>				315	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>point in “consulting”, it seems. LEAVE THE ALLOTMENTS where they are and build your new houses north of the railway line. Would you like years of your work in your hobby to be buried – literally?</p> <p>6. I agree. Who wouldn't?</p> <p>7. Does this mean that the developer will be paying for some of the improvements?</p> <p>CN1 You ask if the policy meets the tests of soundness.</p> <p>It is not justified because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The number of British people is declining • It is unreasonable to build over or on excellent, friable, manured, allotments, tilled for decades, and to require allotment-holders to start again on a green field, losing year of effort • Efforts are being made to reduce the transportation of food and increase local production: the planned (no longer merely possible) move will work against both. (The Queen's new Jubilee Fund will, in part, be advancing the idea of growing locally.) • “evidence” of population-growth is merely prediction and seems not to take account of emigration, • The possible repatriation of immigrants from the EU when Britain leaves the EU and the reduction in longevity likely to arise from continued over-eating, lack of exercise, congestion and the stress of ever-increasing over-crowding <p>It is not appropriate because reasonable alternatives are to build houses north of the railway, providing there the transportation and other facilities now shown south of it and, thus, to leave the allotments as they are (and the decades-long efforts input into them by plot-holders), enabling the continuing production of food locally, and close to those who produce it.</p> <p>It is not effective in that open space in the borough will be lost permanently, as will excellent arable land (the allotments), and density of population, crowding and congestion will increase, all to the detriment of the interests of present rate-payers (who elected the council to administer those interests, not to damage them).</p> <p>What, precisely, does “deliverable” mean here? It usually means “capable of being delivered” but that would be far too vague for a document about policy, such as this, surely. “Flexible” or flexibility seems to be a contradiction when dealing with policy, or at least to be introducing uncertainty, especially for rate-payers and their interests. “Monitored”? Any project can be monitored. It sounds good to feed to rate-payers but it means merely comparing actuality to estimates/plans periodically.</p> <p>“Framework Masterplan”. Where is any alternative to</p>					

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>building on the allotments offered? Why is there not an alternative plan for building north of the railway? Your decision seems to have been made. Your plan shows dwellings likely to be blighted both by consequential increased noise from increased use of local roads and the railway and built close to either (or both). Time will not be pleasant for them nor for existing residents in that immediate area. That aspect seems not to have been considered. Have you considered cancelling altogether plans for further building?</p> <p>Page 3: Land south of Burton village</p> <p>1. Why are you utilising for housing ANY land in the "Green Belt", an area which the population understands as sacrosanct?</p> <p>2. The problem of defining "affordable" recurs and raises the same questions: by whom?, for whom? And in whose opinion?</p> <p>3. Does your statement mean that those whom you intend should undertake the development will make a financial contribution to improving "community facilities" (undefined)? If not, what?</p> <p>4. Does this mean that the developer will be paying for some of the improvements?</p> <p>Tests of soundness</p> <p>NO. The development cannot be justified as it is (also) based on prediction not evidence. Houses should not be built unless demand exists and is evident (as the Spanish have found in large measure) and not speculatively.</p> <p>Page 3: land east of Marsh Lane</p> <p>My comments are as for the other two areas.</p>					
653227	Mrs Wendy Bailey		CSPS3876	Policy CN 2	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	<p>There is too much development planned for too small an area. We do not have the roads or network to cope with the amount of development that is planned. For example, CN2, 45 houses may not sound very many, but this could involve 2 or more cars per household trying to get on to an already overcrowded road. This is bad enough in the winter, but in the holiday season the traffic and population increases significantly with the enormous amount of holiday accommodation in the area.</p> <p>KS3 The same applies here. There is far too much development planned for a small area. Christchurch does not have the capacity or facilities to cope with this development that is planned. It's time someone thought about the existing population and their needs. Where are all these people coming from to live in the new houses? Christchurch is too small a community to cope and it will be destroyed by the plans.</p>	I think the document should be destroyed	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		315	
656629	John	Roeshot Hill	CSPS3834	Policy							We appreciate that the strategy within the Document		Yes, I wish		315	2267876_0_1.pdf

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
	Campbell	Allotment Association		CN 2							<p>relates to a wide geographic area and the rationalisation of demands from a wide range of competing interests. Whilst the interests and concerns of Christchurch allotment gardeners may seem almost incidental in such context, they are by no means so. We have examined the Document from three perspectives: (1) proposals affecting Christchurch; (2) allotment provision in Christchurch and (3) the impact on the rural environment of Christchurch. We have found that a number of the issues that concern us touch upon fundamental principles contained in the document.</p> <p>HOUSING POLICY - Christchurch The Document draws upon a number of assessments of housing supply and predicted demand to conclude that urban infill will be insufficient to meet future housing needs. After briefly reviewing the physical constraints on building elsewhere in Christchurch, it is proposed to adjust the Green Belt area at Roeshot Hill, Burton and Marsh Lane to accommodate housing developments.</p> <p>1. We consider these proposals to be unjustified in that:</p> <p>1.1 They rest on the assumption that 'housing trumps environment' in a Borough which is characterised by its urban, rural and coastal mix, which makes 'life pleasant' for its inhabitants and which attracts a large volume of visitors and vacationers. Our view is that the assumption in the document is merely a subjective assessment, and that it fails to grasp the inconvenient truth that Christchurch cannot accommodate all who may wish to live in the Borough whilst maintaining its present character.</p> <p>1.2 The proposals for housing at Burton fail to explain how an additional 45 dwellings will serve the 'specific needs' of the village. On the contrary, the effect of the proposal would be negative by turning Burton from a village into a conurbation.</p> <p>1.3 The Document contemplates the development of 'exception sites' in order to meet the need for affordable housing in the area. This weakens the case for provision of new market homes at the expense of the rural environment.</p> <p>2. The proposals are ineffective in that:</p> <p>2.1 They would adversely affect the Green Belt by releasing some of the 'best and most versatile agricultural land' at Roeshot Hill and substituting unspecified land of lesser value.</p> <p>2.2 They do not ensure the reduction of local demand for new market homes in the absence of a residential qualification (such as applied elsewhere in Dorset) and/or other measures to ensure that local residents</p>		to participate at the oral examination			

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>have the ability and opportunity to absorb new housing as it becomes available. The document admits the attractions of Christchurch as a retirement location, and the phenomenon of 'supply stimulating demand' could well result in migrants from other areas of the country exacerbating rather than reducing the demands on local resources without reducing local housing needs.</p> <p>3. The proposals are non-compliant with section 110 Localism Act 2011 Christchurch shares a housing market area and travel to work area with Bournemouth and Poole, New Forest Council and adjacent local authorities in Hampshire. It is mostly a matter of preference rather than strategic issues that determine where people live. If it is the case that Christchurch cannot accommodate more than 2060 additional homes without impacting on its rural villages and Green Belt, the question arises as to whether there has been a reasonable allocation of resources to absorb regional housing needs. Despite some reference to joint working with neighbouring Dorset authorities (but not Hampshire) there is no evidence of any specific arrangement whereby unmet requirements in Christchurch might be met by neighbouring authorities, particularly by Bournemouth, which is by far the largest authority. We feel that it is reasonable to conclude that the Christchurch Borough Council and East Dorset District Council have failed to fully exhaust the duty to co-operate with adjoining local authorities within the spirit of section 110.</p> <p>4. The proposals are non-compliant in respect of Sustainability The Sustainability Assessment is not on consultation and is only referred to in paragraph 1.21. By not have the SA open for consultation in the same way as the Core Strategy the Council are failing to complete stage D of the Sustainability Assessment effectively and thus the Core Strategy is unsound. This could be subject to Judicial Review.</p>					
656731	Mrs Joan M Luck		CSPS3854	Policy CN 2							<p>There will be a loss of valuable Green belt when alternative sites not in the Green Belt are available. WHY? The proposed site is in the Burton Conservation Area which will be severely damaged by such a large development and relocation (Allotments relocation proposal is CN1) WHY? Burton Farm, mentioned in the Conservation Area Appraisal as making a valuable contribution to Conservation Area will be lost with the consequential loss of jobs WHY?</p>				315	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											The infrastructure of the village - its road network - cannot support the extra traffic which will be generated. Object on planning grounds:- How many of the 45 houses do you plan to be low - cost affordable houses for the young people of our village? thus ensuring a continuity of energy in our village. The wealthy, older in-comers would not care about the village, and it would die.					
656864	Mr Alan Hiriart		CSPS3847	Policy CN 2	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	It seem that my garden and surrounding area around Burton is a Conservation Area, when it suits Christchurch and East Dorset planning, but not when it comes to build 45+ properties. I feel proud to live in a Green Belt area yet you want to kick me and national planning in the bo***ks.		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		315	
663555	Mrs Trish Jamieson		CSPS3693	Policy CN 2							Policy CN1 Christchurch Urban Extension There are many reasons why I cannot support the proposed urban extension at Roeshot Hill. a) There would be a big loss of valuable Green Belt when I am sure that there are other sites not in the Green Belt available. b) You state that "the Urban Extension will act as an attractive gateway to the north of the borough". I believe that visitors to our lovely town would much prefer to see green space rather than a great sprawl of new modern houses. c) The A35 is the main route into Christchurch from the east and Roeshot Hill becomes extremely busy particularly during the main holiday periods. This traffic then becomes snarled up right along the route through Sainsbury's roundabout, Stony Lane roundabout and right into the town centre along the A35. d) Traffic problems will be exacerbated by the number of cars in the new development. It is usual now for there to be more than one car per household and I believe that one and a half per household would be a modest estimate. People from these properties would have to travel to work places, schools, etc. e) Access points on Lyndhurst Road will also lead to difficulties which will be made much worse with the extra lorries going to and from the planned gravel extraction site at the top of Roeshot Hill. I believe the number will be some 50 movements in and out of the site per hour. f) Junction improvements along the A35 are expected to come forward between 2014-2019 whilst the proposed development would commence in 2014/15. How will the roads cope with extra traffic from road improvements and extra traffic from the start of the development? g) Moving the Roeshot Hill Allotments to land north of				315	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>the railway line is being opposed by a large number of allotment holders. The proposed new site will again cause considerable traffic congestion. A large number of allotment holders have held their plots for a number of years and worked them to obtain good results. A new site would need a number of years in order to get to the same level.</p> <p>h) The infrastructure, schools, shops, medical services and roads need to be in place well before the start of any possible urban extension. The school situation in Christchurch is critical and must be addressed before any large development takes place.</p> <p>i) In addition to the above I am opposed to the proposed development in Policy CN2, land south of Burton Village. This will mean a loss of agricultural land and livelihood with a loss of valuable green belt that will infringe on the Burton Conservation Area.</p>					
663581	Chris Gerrard		CSPS3698	Policy CN 2							<p>I have recently learnt that there is an intent by Christchurch Council to build 45 new houses on the land south of Alder and medlar Closes in Burton. I strongly object to this proposal for the following reasons on the following planning grounds:</p> <p>1. CN2 - the loss of any further Green Belt areas in or around Burton is unacceptable - there will now be no green field break between Burton and Christchurch, particularly bearing in mind the planned major housing expansion south of the railway line. What is the point of having Green Belt corridors, only to then destroy them, when there is still non-Green Belt land available in the Christchurch area (for example CN1 Roeshot Hill and brownfield sites such as Somerford Road) ?</p> <p>2. CN2 - What is the purpose of having a Conservation Area and then building even more houses on it - surely the housing density within the Burton Conservation area is already maxed out. This is not consistent with National Policy</p> <p>3. CN2 - the loss of Burton Farm would be a tragedy, being the only local family-owned, working, mixed farm left in the area, giving an insight for all, but especially the youngsters of how a modern farm runs in harmony with the local community - indeed my son, among others, has spent their Twynham School 6th form enrichment afternoons working on this farm as a precursor to entering into agriculture and veterinary science.</p> <p>4. CS2 The local infrastructure is already on overload, as any one who travels along Stoney Lane (or tries to) at peak times during the mornings and afternoons will already know. Any increase in traffic density will result in even longer queues at the roundabout.</p> <p>Please reconsider your future plans for Burton.</p>				315	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	
663598	David Hoad		CSPS3702	Policy CN 2							<p>I refer to the Local Plan and in particular the proposal to build 45 new houses on the land south of Alder Close and Medlar Close. I wish to register my objection on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) There will be a loss of valuable Green Belt when alternative sites not in the Green Belt are available ii) The proposed site is in the Burton Conservation Area which will be severely damaged by such a large development and relocation of allotments iii) The infrastructure of the village and in particular its road network cannot support the extra traffic which will be generated iv) The extra traffic generated will place even more congestion at the Burton junction of Stony Lane roundabout with even longer traffic queues v) The proposed development gives no natural links to the hub of the village. It is beyond normal walking distance and it will be unrealistic for people to walk. This will mean more unsustainable vehicle movements on minor village roads vi) The development is within the Avon Valley floodplain with its inherent high water table. The recent flooding at similar areas on the South Coast has led to severe criticism on the justification to allow new builds to take place in such areas. This proposal is contrary to modern thinking and should not be permitted 					315	
663637	George Brown		CSPS3720	Policy CN 2							<p>I would like to bring these comments to your attention. My wife and I live next to the land currently earmarked as being potentially available for housing development in the future. I have lived there since 1968 which probably gives us the longest tenure in terms of neighbouring housing. The property is a weekend home that we regularly travel to from London where we both live and work.</p> <p>I want to point out that that the main concern regarding building on this land should be that there is a substantial risk of water damage. I believe that the land is unsuitable for building. The water table in the area is very high and my garden at the front as well as the back floods several times a year. So far it has not reached inside the house but it has undermined the garage to the point where I have had had the foundations underpinned. The garage walls though are cracking because of the washing away of the foundations.</p> <p>There is a stream that runs by my back garden right through the proposed site which Burton Parish Council has pressed house owners to clear. The stream does not drain all the land it passes through so it remains very slow moving and renders the land around it unsuitable for building. The problem with water is that</p>					315	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											although you can drain land in effect if the land is close to water sources then what you are dealing with is displacing water to somewhere else. And if you displace water in such a way that it affects my house then I shall happily take legal action, having nothing to lose because after all I think that the plot that I live on currently is only marginally suitable.					
663657	Lynn and Stuart Paterson		CSPS3725	Policy CN 2							We would like to forward our objection to houses being built on Green Belt land south of Alder and Medlar Close and the relocation of allotments to Burton. Once this land is used for housing we feel that in time other green belt land will also be used and that will be the end of the Village status. Since we moved to Burton more than 30 years ago the village has grown so much. We already have a housing estate in the village and therefore we do not believe another one will be beneficial. To lose Burton Farm would be devastating to the people that work and live there and also the village community. The extra traffic that would be generated by the extra housing and relocation of the allotments would put tremendous strain on our country lanes in and around Burton.				315	
664138	Mr & Mrs M Heller		CSPS3775	Policy CN 2							GREEN BELT. We wish to lodge our objection to any development of the Green Belt around Burton. The village atmosphere will be destroyed if the area is built up any further. Also, the area already suffers from a high water table. The development of land, with extra roads/drives etc as well as buildings, will only have an adverse affect on the water table and could result in more flooding. We live on Stony Lane adjoining the meadows/flood plain of the Avon river, and this could well have a severe detrimental affect in the future. The cost of our insurance doubled last year, and it is becoming almost impossible to afford, on account of our postcode registering as a flood alert area. Heaven knows what would happen if we were actually flooded. What is the point of having a Green Belt if it can be developed with housing? ALLOTMENTS. We have no objection to the plan for allotments. The more fruit and vegetables grown for home consumption the better, it is so much healthier for families both from the consumption point of view, as well as the fresh air and family environment that it engenders. I assume that the Burton residents will have first right over the allocation of allotments before anyone from outside the area is offered space.				315	
664144	Mr and Mrs Peirce		CSPS3779	Policy CN 2							We would like to make an objection to the proposed 45 houses to be built on Burton Farm, Burton. This would have a huge detrimental effect on Burton Village life, far too much extra traffic, additional children in the				315	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											Village school classes, loss of green land and farm area. Please DO NOT pass this proposed development.					
664195	Mrs S Newbury		CSPS3791	Policy CN 2							Regarding Development at Alders Close/Medler Close on the proposed 135 Dwellings. I have lived in Burton for 40 years and having seen it grow and the traffic that comes with it I believe this is too many houses. At the moment its horrendous trying to get out to Stony Lane roundabout. If you tried you would know that the traffic at certain times reaches as far as Footners Lane.				315	
664208	Mr Farwell		CSPS3793	Policy CN 2							<p>Objection to Houses</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Houses West of Salisbury Road, residential & affordable. 120 so we are told at the moment 2. Who are the people taking them emigrants 3. Where is the work none in this area 4. Transport. Few buses 5. Car parking. Unable to park in lanes and roads now 6. Farming land lost & farm buildings 7. Removal of green belt 8. Roads not suitable 9. Main road not good enough 10. Doctors unable to book now for own ? 2 to 3 weeks 11. Schools won't cope 12. No good roads to hospitals 13. Village life has gone this will be a town 14. Nothing is thought properly 15. Flood Plain <p>Objections to Allotments & Open Space</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Object to allotments on good agricultural land 2. Parking 3. Noise with turn offs 4. This will be unsightly approach to Burton 5. Object open space – open space in Burton now is only used for drugs & drink young children cannot go out to play <p>This is the last open space being farmed now, until Avon in Burton.</p>				315	
664262	P Mitchell		CSPS3802	Policy CN 2							<p>I wonder if Christchurch council is in its right mind to give into pressure to build on Green Belt land at Burton ???</p> <p>The roads in Burton and surroundings are at breaking point and chaos reigns at Stony Lane roundabout from 7am in the morning. Burton Primary School is not up to Ofsted standards, the Grange Academy will not be able to cope. There's no decent street lighting, pavements aren't good either. What about a bigger doctors' surgery and more</p>				315	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											practice nurses. Transport:- 1 bus an hour??? Reasons are many more, you need to know.					
664615	Pauline Allen		CSPS3829	Policy CN 2							Stated below are my objections, on Planning Grounds, to the Local Plan for the Borough until 2026: 1. The proposed building of 45 new houses south of Alder and Medlar Close is an encroachment on the Burton Conservation Area. 2. The proposed area is within the Flood Plain thus creating flood risk especially to an area already known for flooding regularly as the ditches are unable to cope. 3. Burton already has problems with traffic accessing to and from the village either via Stony Lane or Salisbury Road - this situation will be greatly exacerbated. With the proposed development of numerous dwellings alongside Ambury Lane and the Roeshot Hill area, traffic in either direction on the Christchurch by-pass will be permanently gridlocked. 4. Burton Farm, has been a focal point of Burton for over 100 years, farmed by absolute stalwarts of the village who create local employment; the farm is in the Conservation area. 5. Burton is essentially a village with a real village atmosphere which is why many of us chose to live here rather than in Christchurch town – it is essential that it remains that way.				315	
664978	Mr Brian Epton		CSPS3861	Policy CN 2							I wish to register my objections tot he proposed relocation of Roeshot Hill allotments. I have worked my plot for over four years now and found it to be much more than just an allotment. It is a very happy community of young and old, rich and poor who share their knowledge and expertise. Many of the older plot holders have been there years from the very start and would find having to start again very difficult if not impossible. There is in the proposed redevelopment, allocation of land to re site the allotments in an area that is waterlogged most of the autunm and winter. I know this to be a fact as our family is born and bred in Christchurch and we walk this area often. Why cannot this land be used for housing and the allotments left where they are? This would be possible as the development of water logged land off Burton Rd and Purewell was sucessful. Finally the over all proposed development, in my opinion, is far too large and the proposed site would create an infrastructure and traffic nightmare.				315	
665027	Mr Malcolm Panton		CSPS3866	Policy CN 2							I wish to register my objections to the proposal to build 45 new houses in the land south of Alder and Medlar Closes at Burton.				315	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	
											<p>I object on the following grounds: CN1/CN2 - The loss of Green Belt Land is completely unacceptable. Green Belt land should not be built on and should remain protected. The Burton Conservation Area again raises the same question - what is the point of conserving an area to then hand it over to developers when the council decide they want to without regard to those who actually live in the vicinity? The loss of the Conservation Area is totally unacceptable.</p> <p>CN2 - There will be a large increase in traffic and all forms of pollution which will threaten to destroy what little character remains of the area. More infrastructure will be needed. We already have plenty of problems with young people causing trouble in the area - the last thing we need is more of the same.</p> <p>We do not want this development in our village.</p> <p>I am also unhappy that this proposal has not been widely published by the local or county councils. I only find out about it when a flyer produced by local residents is put through my door.</p> <p>Are those who are supposed to represent the local people frightened their real plans will be revealed?</p>						
665050	Mrs Rosemary Panton		CSPS3868	Policy CN 2							<p>I wish to register my objections to the proposal to build 45 new houses in the land south of Alder and Medlar Closes at Burton.</p> <p>I object on the following grounds: CN1/CN2 - The loss of Green Belt Land is completely unacceptable and represents a lazy choice by the Council. What is the point of Green Belt Land if it is merely a way to keep it from being built on until you decide otherwise? Green Belt land should not be built on and should remain protected. The Burton Conservation Area again raises the same question - what is the point of conserving an area to then hand it over to developers ? The loss of the Conservation Area is totally unacceptable.</p> <p>There will be a large increase in traffic, rubbish pollution, noise pollution and population within the village, all of which will threaten to destroy what little character remains of the area. More infrastructure will be needed. We already have plenty of problems with young people causing trouble in the area - the last thing we need is more of the same.</p> <p>The Council must stop this wholesale destruction and damage to what little green space is left. These houses are not needed in Burton, they are not needed in Christchurch - by building more houses you simply encourage more people to come which creates even more problems. We do not want this development in our village.</p>					315	
666205	Mr & Mrs H Mackenzie-		CSPS3950	Policy CN 2							<p>We have become aware of the proposed development in Burton by Meyrick Estates / Bodorgan Estates. I</p>					315	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
	Cook										<p>phrase it that way as there seems to have been a number of meetings in the village, called by meyrick / Bodorgan, inviting certain residents to be presented with the plan. However, so far we have not been given any notice or invitation to such meetings and only learn of them after the event.</p> <p>The plan appears to be for 45 or maybe now 100+ houses to be built on Meyrick's land between Martins Hill road and the railway. In addition, the farms (Burton Farm and Waters farm) would be closed down, the tenant farmers evicted, and the farm buildings used for the basis of light industrial / commercial development. These proposals give rise to concern for various reasons, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * The development would be on Green Belt. Burton is separated from Christchurch and has a character as a village. The loss of Green Belt separating the two is to be deplored. *Burton has a Conservation Area which includes the farms. The development violates the conservation area and disregards the employment at the farms and the families that have run them for decades. *The increase in population that would come with the development, with typically 2 vehicles per property, will further overload the road accesses to the A35 at Salisbury Road and Stony Lane. <p>Approach from the East to the 45 properties in Burton will involve Stony Lane roundabout. Whether approaching from E or W from this roundabout, either to Staple Cross junction or Stony Lane, Martins Hill Rd and Salisbury Rd.</p> <p>This will increase traffic on the roundabout, already difficult at many times, and in these village roads. The Staple Cross junction is also going to be an exit to the bypass for all the new development. This is only a slip access and will need consideration.</p> <p>As for Meyrick's further proposal, it looks as if we will have to wait for him to make application to CBC. I have now had the opportunity to study the pre-draft submission and also the response by our parish council. I find that I concur totally with the latter and would like to be noted as such.</p>					
668475	Miss Stephanie Manley		CSPS3955	Policy CN 2							<p>I am 14 years old and I must say that I am disgusted with your plans to ruin our homes, let alone our village. You may think that because I am a teenager, I don't care about these things, but I do, so I strongly advise you continue to read to see what I have to say on behalf of the young generation that live in Burton. I am a student that attends the Grange school in Somerford, that means I have to walk home past the farm everyday. If you plan to destroy this calm area</p>				315	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	
											<p>and turn it into a building site deathtrap, then I'm sorry, but who do you think you are? Crossing these roads now are just as dangerous, I am not the only person who thinks so. Many parents agree with me aswell. They walk to sechool and back home too, with their young children who attend Burton school. If you go ahead with these plans then you're putting an even higher risk into our lives.</p> <p>Why are you still wanting to go ahead with this ridiculous, destroying and horrid plan when all of Burton don't agree with it either.</p> <p>Burton is full of beautiful countryside which you are going to promptly ruin with an idea that nobody agrees with. Why are you willing to put yourself under fire from the strong opinionated public that is Burton?</p> <p>My final argument is why on earth are you planting so much money into this stupid plan. Our money could be used for something so much better, for example a youth centre for us youth. We'll have somewhere to go with our friends instead of being labelled by your lot, assuming we're up to no good.</p> <p>You want to build 45 homes (possibly more) in a small area. An area which people may not have heard of. In this case, who is going to live here if it's a small area where there's nothing to do. Nothing to entertain us. Spend OUR money on something we actually appreciate!</p> <p>Don't go against our opinions! This is where we live. Maybe we should build a dirty great big wreck in front of your doorstep! We will win this battle against your outrageous plans!</p>						
668492	Miss Heidi Manley		CSPS3956	Policy CN 2							<p>I am writing about the proposal of new houses and allotments. I do not think this is a good idea. Burton is a small quiet village, and building new houses will not only mean that you will be taking most of its natural beauty, but also this is a village not a town. Adding more houses increases the amount of people therefore cars. Burton needs to stay a village, if I wanted to live in a town, with plenty of people and traffic I would have done.</p> <p>Furthermore, I think this proposal is ridiculous, such as my point with more traffic, also means that there would be more than Burton could handle, meaning that getting out of Burton would take longer at the Stony Lane Roundabout.</p> <p>Also when the construction of this is going on, what about the safety of children walking to and from the Grange school, or even younger children walking from Burton school to Somerford. Plenty of them cycle and walk, that road alone is dangerous from several sets of traffic already, putting more houses therefore cars will</p>					315	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											only make this worse. I'm 17 years old, and yes I would like a house in Burton when I'm older, but not at the expense of Green Belt! Please take this letter into consideration, because I aswell as others feel very strongly about this.					
668532	Mrs Janet Manely		CSPS3957	Policy CN 2							I have lived in Burton for 28 years, I love living in a village, not a town, which is what you are turning this into. We do not need anymore houses, taking away more green belt, the area you are proposing tends to flood anyway, the traffic is bad enough now at the Stony Lane roundabout, without more cars adding to it. Salisbury Road is also a dangeroud road, so your plan for allotments to be put there, 300 I believe, more cars then, being parked along the roads, children coming or going to school, having to walk in the road. The children take their life in their hands now, with the cars that go down that road anyway. The farm should stay, it is part and parcel of the village life, leave the green belt alone, leave the village alone, we do not want it turning into a town. Listen to us, think about it, what if it was on your doorstep.				315	
668653	Mrs Shirley Allcock		CSPS3961	Policy CN 2							I wish to protest at Planning Policy CN2 - land south of Burton Village. The proposed siting of 45 proposerties would be on "green belt" land when there are alternatives on brownfield sites, and reduction of the "green belt" can only be altered in exceptional circumstances according to National Planning Policy framework. Burton already has affordable housing and your proposals are not justified or consistent with national policy.				315	
668707	Ken Savage		CSPS3963	Policy CN 2							I have lived in Burton for 37 years and in Gordon Way 33 years. I back onto very bogie and marshy fields as I often flood in the garden. Over the years 3 of my floors have sunk 4", as the bungalow was built on top of spring, which runs under my bungalow, because there was no subsidence on the outside walls I had to pay it myself which cost me £12000. If they build on this land new residents should be warned what could happen in the future. I am very sad that we will loose the farm also the impact it will have on our school, health centre and extra traffic on our roads.				315	
668723	Mrs G P Jones		CSPS3964	Policy CN 2							I would like to object to your plans to build homes on a Burton Conservation area. Which will mean more traffic in the area, and also disturbance of allotments which mean so much to people working them. It will spoil the whole area. It is no good having a green belt, if at the drop of a hat				315	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											someone decides to build on it without good reason. Burton is surrounded by open fields and lovely countryside, please dont spoil it. Having been brought up in Burton, I find the whole idea devastating.					
668794	Mrs J Siezenberg		CSPS3967	Policy CN 2							<p>Re: Proposed building plan development South of Alder and Medlar Closes.</p> <p>Please find below my reasons for opposing the above planned development.</p> <p>The reason I moved here to Burton was to get away from town living. I never thought that Green Belt land would be used for such a misplaced development. The loss of Burton Farm and the allotments will be sorely felt by all residents of Burton. So much for supporting our farms and buying local produce. Also the loss of allotments used by many people not just for growing but as a way socialising will be a bitter blow.</p> <p>There are more suitable sites available at the moment which would be a much better option. They already have the right infrastructure in situ. I am talking about the three sites which are being fought over by Morrisons and other supermarkets. These three sites are a much better option for such a large venture.</p> <p>I am at a total loss as to why when there is only one shop in Burton, one bus an hour and a surgery that you are even considering such a proposal. There is one primary school which I am sure is full to capacity. I would imagine by the number of dwellings that we are talking around 150 residents. They are too far away for Burton village so I presume they will have to drive into Christchurch - more emissions - more traffic on the A35 and it's already congested roundabouts.</p> <p>Will these new homes be for key workers from Christchurch and its local areas or from across the various boroughs? Are they family homes or single dwellings?</p> <p>I presume that you will have to build some new shops, a doctor's surgery and increase the buses to cope with this influx of new residents. Will all of these things still make a viable option considering the cuts in council spending required.</p> <p>I know that affordable housing is required but this is not in my opinion a good site.</p> <p>I would like to be informed of any meetings or viewings of plans.</p>				315	
669833	C A Surman		CSPS3971	Policy CN 2							<p>Re – policy CN2 – Burton Village</p> <p>I vigorously object to these plans as follows</p> <p>1) This proposal is in direct contravention of National Policy regarding the conservation of Green Belt areas – proposal not necessary or desirable.</p> <p>2) a) In no way do these proposals merit exceptional</p>				315	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>status when reasonable sites are available.</p> <p>b) Now proposed supermarket sites have been rejected – any homes required can be built on Somerford Road and the Beagle site on Stony Lane South. Existing brownfield site and suitably located to add to footfall to Christchurch centre and aid regeneration of sadly declining shopping area.</p> <p>3) Original plans for 35 or so homes – now seems to have grown to circa 130 – due to unlikely build in/around Marsh Lane and confirmed by a Mr S Trueick whilst at the 'Road Show' in Saxon Square.</p> <p>4) This area of South Burton also represents an area of green belt that distances Burton Village from Christchurch Town and should be kept as a buffer rather than representing the initial stage of integration – none of which is consistent with national policy. Plans contravene Core Strategy LN4 page 177 Plans contravene Core Strategy P22 Both sentences are not effective or consistent with National Policy hence not deliverable and incompatible with preset policies.</p> <p>Re - Core Strategy Policy ME6, p162 to demonstrate flood risk does not increase as a result of development - impossible to prove - so not deliverable. Your own website on Strategic Flood Risk Assessment shows risk should you choose to disregard your own data displaced flooding yet again impossible to calculate.</p> <p>Re - Transport Infrastructure With addition of circa 130 homes and circa 300 allotments increase in traffic on Salisbury Road and Martins Hill Lane would in no way be compatible with the safe passage of pedestrians in particular youngsters to and from school. Lanes and village roads in the immediate area will not allow safe access and egress and these are impossible to improve - hence not deliverable and planning office has no robust and credible evidence to the opposite. Finally the late addition of circa 80 homes since core strategy publication smacks of coercion with the landowners and is unsound through not being objectively assessed and is against your own framework and is in no way justifiable or based on any robust or credible evidence to the contrary due to the late 'bolting on' of said plans.</p>					
359614	Mr & Mrs McCammon		CSPS147	Policy CN 3							Most will be affordable housing whilst others will be buy to let with 50%+ affordable, unlikely to attract private owner/occupier buyers.				317	
359615	Mr Burridge		CSPS98	Policy CN 3							The concept of Green Belt is a joke if it can be summarily changed. Appropriate contributions toward transport improvement - a bland phrase to justify more				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											traffic.					
360149	Mr John Urguhart		CSPS85	Policy CN 3							No - the destruction on heathland has gone far enough - there is so little left! There must be no more building on heathland.				317	
360166	Mr TC Nicholson		CSPS102	Policy CN 3							This proposal appears to be sound development where traffic will filter into Fairmile Road; could also benefit should the A35 bypass be rerouted to the A338.				317	
589997	Mrs Clarke		CSPS79	Policy CN 3			No				No, Green Belt land. No justification. No infrastructure in place. If you are going to do an extension strategic allocation you should also put in place infrastructure at the same time. CN1, CN2 and CN3 cannot be effective if you cannot supply at the same time schools, doctors, hospitals and social services.				317	
647876	Mr Christopher Whitcher		CSPS104	Policy CN 3							Concerned about increase traffic along Fairmile Road.				317	
647898	Mr Derek Beasley		CSPS111	Policy CN 3							Ok for flooding?				317	
648240	Mr Roger Haxby		CSPS151	Policy CN 3							<p>Objection 1: PPG2 Green Belts states there are five purposes of including land in Green Belts:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas; 2. To prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another; 3. To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment; 4. To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and 5. To assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. <p>The development encroaching on Green Belt land does not meet the first reason – since it leads to an unrestricted sprawl, the third reason, since the proposal encroaches on the countryside, and the fourth reason, since the historical riverside / countryside setting characteristic of Christchurch and surrounding villages is not being preserved. The policy does not meet the test of soundness because it is not consistent with national policy.</p> <p>Objection 2: Para 1.7 of PPG2 says “The purposes of including land in Green Belts are of paramount importance to their continued protection, and should take precedence over the land use objectives.” The policy does not meet the test of soundness because the Green Belt purposes are not given precedence over land use objectives, and so it is not consistent with national policy.</p> <p>Objection 3: Also the development seems “Unjustified”</p>				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											because it is very close to a major flood plain, and so is not founded on a robust and credible evidence base.					
648788	Mr R Hewetson		CSPS160	Policy CN 3							What is meant by affordable? Where will the money come from?				317	
648805	Mr John Cuming		CSPS164	Policy CN 3							Does this mean that open space and alternative natural green space will be located in that area that is part of the heathland exclusion zone outlined in the plan?				317	
360085	Mrs J Houson		CSPS312	Policy CN 3							No! I firmly believe any green belt use for housing is near sighted and bodes ill for the future of our area and ultimately for our planet. Every day I see trees cut down, undergrowth cleared and more development with the devastation of nature in the process. When will "those in charge" realise every bird nest, every mouse hole means the balance of nature is being squeezed into smaller and smaller spaces and ultimately it will disappear! I have seen in the 8 years I have lived here birds in my garden reduce from blue tits, wrens, chaffinch etc to only crows, magpies and starlings - ok build houses but not greenbelt!!				317	
648918	Mrs M Ramsden-Fisher		CSPS197	Policy CN 3							No. Already too much development for existing facilities.				317	
648964	Mrs Sue Bruce-Burgess		CSPS206	Policy CN 3							100% affordable.				317	
649915	Miss Sara Newman		CSPS274	Policy CN 3							No. It is not justified when there are alternative areas that can be developed. Marsh Lane is very much an area occupied by elderly people. Such a proposition ruins the lives of these people who have purchased properties because of the peace and quiet. It is not fair for "affordable housing" residents to then enjoy the views. It will totally spoil the area and many peoples' lives. Dear Councillor I note that the planning strategy for Christchurch Borough includes the building of 90 homes on Land East of Marsh Lane (Policy CN3). I recognise that a consultation is taking place but in addition to this I would like to point out the following planning problems:- The land East of Marsh Lane is Green Belt land and on a flood plain. Building 90 new homes will make additional demands on water supply. The proposed development is close to the Avon Valley and Dorset Heathland Special Protection areas and Ramsar site. The large influx of people to the 90 new homes is likely to have a detrimental effect on wildlife				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>and there is uncertainty as to whether potential damage to the sensitive areas can be adequately mitigated.</p> <p>Access to the site for vehicles will cause planning difficulties because the heathland and the bungalows already East of Marsh Lane with their gardens etc form a barrier.</p> <p>There will be significant increase in traffic noise. This will have an adverse impact on quality of life in the adjoining area between the Fairmile Road and Marsh Lane. This is a quiet area that so far has remained undisturbed by noise. Planning should seek to preserve tranquillity, not introduce noise.</p> <p>90 new homes will result in substantial additional traffic on Fairmile Road (B3073), a very busy highway, already severely congested at certain times.</p> <p>Christchurch has the worst traffic congestion in Dorset. Planning should aim to ease this, not add to it.</p> <p>90 new homes will require new infrastructure and also more services. There is already huge pressure on schools, medical services, policing, social services etc. With services currently strained, it is difficult to envisage future provision being adequate.</p> <p>Developments are also planned at Parley Cross and Roeshot Hill. These developments, together with the building East of Marsh Lane, will have a huge impact on the B3073 and other roads. This will not only affect residents, it will also damage tourism.</p> <p>Restricting building development to brownfield sites will at least not add any more to urban sprawl and will help to ensure that Christchurch remains a place where time is pleasant. We cannot go on building indefinitely.</p> <p>I would ask you, please, to address the planning irregularities outlined above by deleting Policy CN3, Land East of Marsh Lane, from the Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy. No new homes should be built in this location.</p>					
649982	Mr and Mrs Edward and Marion Slade		CSPS277	Policy CN 3							<p>Same objection as for CN2 above. More housing in an already very built-up area = more amenities needed = more congestion and traffic build-up, and more overcrowding.</p> <p>A good site for new housing would have been the waste ground adjacent to BAE systems by the Runway - that has been used for ugly industrial buildings and warehouses which still have not been let!</p>				317	
649998	Mr John Grainger		CSPS281	Policy CN 3							<p>Are these dwellings going to be built on a potential flood plain? The percentage of affordable housing is to be commended but will there be sufficient space for the increased car parking demands, open spaces for children and playground areas?</p>				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											Can the local health and education facilities cope with the increased demands from these proposals? There is a large amount of property for sale in this area that could cope with this demand.					
650390	Mr and Ms T and E J Lodge and Cox		CSPS315	Policy CN 3							We are concerned that this area in part of the flood plain? Otherwise see comments in CN1.				317	
650474	Mr Stuart Mondon		CSPS327	Policy CN 3	No	No	No	No	No	No	<p>Object to this Policy.</p> <p>This land is classified as Green Belt for a reason. If seems ludicrous that this Policy can be amended to suit a numbers gain for new housing, what is the point of having a Green Belt policy in the first place.</p> <p>The density proposed for the housing appears much higher than the existing surrounding developments. This will lead to a development totally out of character with its surroundings. The majority of the housing fronting this proposed site is of a bungalow type. This development will lead to an increase of traffic to Fairmile Road which is already over burdened during peak times.</p> <p>Not sure how access is to be achieved without ploughing through existing plots/houses.</p> <p>The 50% affordable housing requirement will not stack up commercially. There is a reason why developers are not building in this area - its because of the requirement for 30/40% affordable housing.</p> <p>The following coNo – our objections are:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies) <p>mmments were submitted separately on an extract of the leaflet:-</p> <p>Dear Councillor</p> <p>I note that the planning strategy for Christchurch Borough includes the building of 90 homes on Land East of Marsh Lane (Policy CN3). I recognise that a consultation is taking place but in addition to this I would like to point out the following planning problems:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The land East of Marsh Lane is Green Belt land and on a flood plain. Building 90 new homes will make additional demands on water supply. The proposed development is close to the Avon Valley 		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>and Dorset Heathland Special Protection areas and Ramsar site. The large influx of people to the 90 new homes is likely to have a detrimental effect on wildlife and there is uncertainty as to whether potential damage to the sensitive areas can be adequately mitigated.</p> <p>Access to the site for vehicles will cause planning difficulties because the heathland and the bungalows already East of Marsh Lane with their gardens etc form a barrier.</p> <p>There will be significant increase in traffic noise. This will have an adverse impact on quality of life in the adjoining area between the Fairmile Road and Marsh Lane. This is a quiet area that so far has remained undisturbed by noise. Planning should seek to preserve tranquillity, not introduce noise.</p> <p>90 new homes will result in substantial additional traffic on Fairmile Road (B3073), a very busy highway, already severely congested at certain times.</p> <p>Christchurch has the worst traffic congestion in Dorset. Planning should aim to ease this, not add to it.</p> <p>90 new homes will require new infrastructure and also more services. There is already huge pressure on schools, medical services, policing, social services etc. With services currently strained, it is difficult to envisage future provision being adequate.</p> <p>Developments are also planned at Parley Cross and Roeshot Hill. These developments, together with the building East of Marsh Lane, will have a huge impact on the B3073 and other roads. This will not only affect residents, it will also damage tourism.</p> <p>Restricting building development to brownfield sites will at least not add any more to urban sprawl and will help to ensure that Christchurch remains a place where time is pleasant. We cannot go on building indefinitely.</p> <p>I would ask you, please, to address the planning irregularities outlined above by deleting Policy CN3, Land East of Marsh Lane, from the Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy. No new homes should be built in this location.</p>					
651267	Mr Gerald Bradley		CSPS410	Policy CN 3							<p>no - our objections are: loss of Green Belt strain on water / utilities inadequate vehicular access traffic congestion extra strain on services and infrastructure increased risk of flooding impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety</p>				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies).					
651353	Mrs Janice Targett		CSPS420	Policy CN 3							No				317	
651828	Mrs Anne Phyllis Kirby		CSPS432	Policy CN 3							No - our objections are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies).				317	
652759	Mrs M Berry		CSPS487	Policy CN 3							I note that the planning strategy for Christchurch Borough includes the building of 90 homes on land East of Marsh Lane (Policy CN3). I recognise that a consultation is taking place but in addition to this I would like to point out the following planning problems:- The land East of Marsh Lane is Green Belt land and on a flood plain. Building 90 new homes will make additional demands on water supply. The proposed development is close to the Avon Valley and Dorset Heathland Special Protection areas and Ramsar site. The large influx of people to the 90 new homes is likely to have a detrimental effect on wildlife and there is uncertainty as to whether potential damage to the sensitive areas can be adequately mitigated. Access to the site for vehicles will cause planning difficulties because the heathland and the bungalows already East of Marsh Lane with their gardens etc. form a barrier. There will be significant increase in traffic noise. This will have an adverse impact on quality of life in the adjoining area between the Fairmile Road and Marsh Lane. This is a quiet area that so far has remained undisturbed by noise. Planning should seek to preserve tranquillity, not introduce noise. 90 new homes will result in substantial additional traffic on Fairmile Road (B3073), a very busy highway, already frequently severely congested. Christchurch has the worst traffic congestion in Dorset. Planning should aim to ease this, not add to it. 90 new homes will require new infrastructure and also more services. There is already huge pressure on schools, medical services, policing, social services etc. With services currently strained, it is difficult to				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>envisage future provision being adequate. There are also planned developments at Parley Cross and Roeshot Hill. These, taken together with the Land East of Marsh Lane development, will have a cumulative effect on roads and other infrastructure that will both damage tourism and impact on residents. Restricting building development to brownfield sites will at least not add any more to urban sprawl and will help to ensure that Christchurch remains a place where time is pleasant. We cannot go on building indefinitely.</p> <p>I would ask you, please, to address the planning irregularities outlined above by deleting Policy CN3, Land East of Marsh Lane, from the Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy. No new homes should be built in this location.</p>					
652761	M V Adams		CSPS489	Policy CN 3							<p>I note that the planning strategy for Christchurch Borough includes the building of 90 homes on land East of Marsh Lane (Policy CN3). I recognise that a consultation is taking place but in addition to this I would like to point out the following planning problems:-</p> <p>The land East of Marsh Lane is Green Belt land and on a flood plain.</p> <p>Building 90 new homes will make additional demands on water supply.</p> <p>The proposed development is close to the Avon Valley and Dorset Heathland Special Protection areas and Ramsar site. The large influx of people to the 90 new homes is likely to have a detrimental effect on wildlife and there is uncertainty as to whether potential damage to the sensitive areas can be adequately mitigated.</p> <p>Access to the site for vehicles will cause planning difficulties because the heathland and the bungalows already East of Marsh Lane with their gardens etc. form a barrier.</p> <p>There will be significant increase in traffic noise. This will have an adverse impact on quality of life in the adjoining area between the Fairmile Road and Marsh Lane. This is a quiet area that so far has remained undisturbed by noise. Planning should seek to preserve tranquillity, not introduce noise.</p> <p>90 new homes will result in substantial additional traffic on Fairmile Road (B3073), a very busy highway, already frequently severely congested. Christchurch has the worst traffic congestion in Dorset. Planning should aim to ease this, not add to it.</p> <p>90 new homes will require new infrastructure and also more services. There is already huge pressure on schools, medical services, policing, social services etc.</p>				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>With services currently strained, it is difficult to envisage future provision being adequate. There are also planned developments at Parley Cross and Roeshot Hill. These, taken together with the Land East of Marsh Lane development, will have a cumulative effect on roads and other infrastructure that will both damage tourism and impact on residents. Restricting building development to brownfield sites will at least not add any more to urban sprawl and will help to ensure that Christchurch remains a place where time is pleasant. We cannot go on building indefinitely.</p> <p>I would ask you, please, to address the planning irregularities outlined above by deleting Policy CN3, Land East of Marsh Lane, from the Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy. No new homes should be built in this location.</p> <p>Also sent in an extract of a leaflet with the following comments:-</p> <p>No – our objections are:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies) 					
652766	Mrs Pamela Pratt		CSPS492	Policy CN 3							<p>I note that the planning strategy for Christchurch Borough includes the building of 90 homes on land East of Marsh Lane (Policy CN3). I recognise that a consultation is taking place but in addition to this I would like to point out the following planning problems:-</p> <p>The land East of Marsh Lane is Green Belt land and on a flood plain.</p> <p>Building 90 new homes will make additional demands on water supply.</p> <p>The proposed development is close to the Avon Valley and Dorset Heathland Special Protection areas and Ramsar site. The large influx of people to the 90 new homes is likely to have a detrimental effect on wildlife and there is uncertainty as to whether potential damage to the sensitive areas can be adequately mitigated.</p> <p>Access to the site for vehicles will cause planning difficulties because the heathland and the bungalows already East of Marsh Lane with their gardens etc. form a barrier.</p>				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>There will be significant increase in traffic noise. This will have an adverse impact on quality of life in the adjoining area between the Fairmile Road and Marsh Lane. This is a quiet area that so far has remained undisturbed by noise. Planning should seek to preserve tranquillity, not introduce noise.</p> <p>90 new homes will result in substantial additional traffic on Fairmile Road (B3073), a very busy highway, already frequently severely congested. Christchurch has the worst traffic congestion in Dorset. Planning should aim to ease this, not add to it.</p> <p>90 new homes will require new infrastructure and also more services. There is already huge pressure on schools, medical services, policing, social services etc. With services currently strained, it is difficult to envisage future provision being adequate.</p> <p>There are also planned developments at Parley Cross and Roeshot Hill. These, taken together with the Land East of Marsh Lane development, will have a cumulative effect on roads and other infrastructure that will both damage tourism and impact on residents. Restricting building development to brownfield sites will at least not add any more to urban sprawl and will help to ensure that Christchurch remains a place where time is pleasant. We cannot go on building indefinitely.</p> <p>I would ask you, please, to address the planning irregularities outlined above by deleting Policy CN3, Land East of Marsh Lane, from the Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy. No new homes should be built in this location.</p>					
652770	P Gibson		CSPS493	Policy CN 3							<p>I note that the planning strategy for Christchurch Borough includes the building of 90 homes on land East of Marsh Lane (Policy CN3). I recognise that a consultation is taking place but in addition to this I would like to point out the following planning problems:-</p> <p>The land East of Marsh Lane is Green Belt land and on a flood plain.</p> <p>Building 90 new homes will make additional demands on water supply.</p> <p>The proposed development is close to the Avon Valley and Dorset Heathland Special Protection areas and Ramsar site. The large influx of people to the 90 new homes is likely to have a detrimental effect on wildlife and there is uncertainty as to whether potential damage to the sensitive areas can be adequately mitigated.</p> <p>Access to the site for vehicles will cause planning difficulties because the heathland and the bungalows already East of Marsh Lane with their gardens etc.</p>				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>form a barrier.</p> <p>There will be significant increase in traffic noise. This will have an adverse impact on quality of life in the adjoining area between the Fairmile Road and Marsh Lane. This is a quiet area that so far has remained undisturbed by noise. Planning should seek to preserve tranquillity, not introduce noise.</p> <p>90 new homes will result in substantial additional traffic on Fairmile Road (B3073), a very busy highway, already frequently severely congested. Christchurch has the worst traffic congestion in Dorset. Planning should aim to ease this, not add to it.</p> <p>90 new homes will require new infrastructure and also more services. There is already huge pressure on schools, medical services, policing, social services etc. With services currently strained, it is difficult to envisage future provision being adequate.</p> <p>There are also planned developments at Parley Cross and Roeshot Hill. These, taken together with the Land East of Marsh Lane development, will have a cumulative effect on roads and other infrastructure that will both damage tourism and impact on residents. Restricting building development to brownfield sites will at least not add any more to urban sprawl and will help to ensure that Christchurch remains a place where time is pleasant. We cannot go on building indefinitely.</p> <p>I would ask you, please, to address the planning irregularities outlined above by deleting Policy CN3, Land East of Marsh Lane, from the Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy. No new homes should be built in this location.</p> <p>18.6.12 - Also submitted the following comments on extract of leaflet:-</p> <p>No – our objections are:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies) 					
652772	J P Page		CSPS494	Policy CN 3							<p>I note that the planning strategy for Christchurch Borough includes the building of 90 homes on land East of Marsh Lane (Policy CN3). I recognise that a consultation is taking place but in addition to this I would like to point out the following planning problems:-</p>				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>The land East of Marsh Lane is Green Belt land and on a flood plain. Building 90 new homes will make additional demands on water supply. The proposed development is close to the Avon Valley and Dorset Heathland Special Protection areas and Ramsar site. The large influx of people to the 90 new homes is likely to have a detrimental effect on wildlife and there is uncertainty as to whether potential damage to the sensitive areas can be adequately mitigated. Access to the site for vehicles will cause planning difficulties because the heathland and the bungalows already East of Marsh Lane with their gardens etc. form a barrier. There will be significant increase in traffic noise. This will have an adverse impact on quality of life in the adjoining area between the Fairmile Road and Marsh Lane. This is a quiet area that so far has remained undisturbed by noise. Planning should seek to preserve tranquillity, not introduce noise. 90 new homes will result in substantial additional traffic on Fairmile Road (B3073), a very busy highway, already frequently severely congested. Christchurch has the worst traffic congestion in Dorset. Planning should aim to ease this, not add to it. 90 new homes will require new infrastructure and also more services. There is already huge pressure on schools, medical services, policing, social services etc. With services currently strained, it is difficult to envisage future provision being adequate. There are also planned developments at Parley Cross and Roeshot Hill. These, taken together with the Land East of Marsh Lane development, will have a cumulative effect on roads and other infrastructure that will both damage tourism and impact on residents. Restricting building development to brownfield sites will at least not add any more to urban sprawl and will help to ensure that Christchurch remains a place where time is pleasant. We cannot go on building indefinitely. I would ask you, please, to address the planning irregularities outlined above by deleting Policy CN3, Land East of Marsh Lane, from the Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy. No new homes should be built in this location.</p>					
652774	K Willis		CSPS497	Policy CN 3							<p>I note that the planning strategy for Christchurch Borough includes the building of 90 homes on land East of Marsh Lane (Policy CN3). I recognise that a consultation is taking place but in addition to this I would like to point out the following planning</p>				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>problems:- The land East of Marsh Lane is Green Belt land and on a flood plain. Building 90 new homes will make additional demands on water supply. The proposed development is close to the Avon Valley and Dorset Heathland Special Protection areas and Ramsar site. The large influx of people to the 90 new homes is likely to have a detrimental effect on wildlife and there is uncertainty as to whether potential damage to the sensitive areas can be adequately mitigated. Access to the site for vehicles will cause planning difficulties because the heathland and the bungalows already East of Marsh Lane with their gardens etc. form a barrier. There will be significant increase in traffic noise. This will have an adverse impact on quality of life in the adjoining area between the Fairmile Road and Marsh Lane. This is a quiet area that so far has remained undisturbed by noise. Planning should seek to preserve tranquillity, not introduce noise. 90 new homes will result in substantial additional traffic on Fairmile Road (B3073), a very busy highway, already frequently severely congested. Christchurch has the worst traffic congestion in Dorset. Planning should aim to ease this, not add to it. 90 new homes will require new infrastructure and also more services. There is already huge pressure on schools, medical services, policing, social services etc. With services currently strained, it is difficult to envisage future provision being adequate. There are also planned developments at Parley Cross and Roeshot Hill. These, taken together with the Land East of Marsh Lane development, will have a cumulative effect on roads and other infrastructure that will both damage tourism and impact on residents. Restricting building development to brownfield sites will at least not add any more to urban sprawl and will help to ensure that Christchurch remains a place where time is pleasant. We cannot go on building indefinitely. I would ask you, please, to address the planning irregularities outlined above by deleting Policy CN3, Land East of Marsh Lane, from the Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy. No new homes should be built in this location.</p>					
518223	Mr Gary Lammers		CSPS728	Policy CN 3							Ok.				317	
652827	Mr S Richmond		CSPS513	Policy CN 3							No. our objections are: Loss of Green Belt				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (waterbeds / flies) Historical context - yet another disappearing from Christchurch - just look at the High Street!!					
652830	Mr and Mrs David and Sally Farquhar		CSPS515	Policy CN 3							No. our objections are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (waterbeds / flies)				317	
652830	Mr and Mrs David and Sally Farquhar		CSPS708	Policy CN 3							I note that the planning strategy for Christchurch Borough includes the building of 90 homes on Land East of Marsh Lane (Policy CN3). I recognise that a consultation is taking place but in addition to this I would like to point out the following planning problems:- The land East of Marsh Lane is Green Belt land. The land East of Marsh Lane is on a flood plain. Building 90 new homes will make additional demands on water supply. The proposed development is close to the Avon Valley and Dorset Heathland Special Protection areas and Ramsar site. The large influx of people to the 90 new homes is likely to have a detrimental effect on wildlife and there is uncertainty as to whether potential damage to the sensitive areas can be adequately mitigated. Access to the site for vehicles will cause planning difficulties because the heathland and the bungalows already East of Marsh Lane with their gardens form a barrier. There will be significant increase in traffic noise. This will have an adverse impact on quality of life in the adjoining area between the Fairmile Road and Marsh Lane. This is a quiet area that so far has remained undisturbed by noise. Planning should seek to preserve tranquillity, not introduce noise. 90 new homes will result in substantial additional traffic on Fairmile Road (B3073), a very busy highway,				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>already severely congested at certain times. Christchurch has the worst traffic congestion in Dorset. Planning should aim to ease this, not add to it. 90 new homes will require new infrastructure and also more services. There is already huge pressure on schools, medical services, policing, social services etc. With services currently strained, it is difficult to envisage future provision being adequate. Restricting building development to brownfield sites will at least not add any more to urban sprawl and will help to ensure that Christchurch remains a place where time is pleasant. We cannot go on building indefinitely.</p> <p>I would ask you, please, to address the planning irregularities outlined above by deleting Policy CN3, Land East of Marsh Lane from the Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy. No new homes should be built in this location.</p> <p>Dear Councillor</p> <p>I note that the planning strategy for Christchurch Borough includes the building of 90 homes on Land East of Marsh Lane (Policy CN3). I recognise that a consultation is taking place but in addition to this I would like to point out the following planning problems:-</p> <p>The land East of Marsh Lane is Green Belt land and on a flood plain.</p> <p>Building 90 new homes will make additional demands on water supply.</p> <p>The proposed development is close to the Avon Valley and Dorset Heathland Special Protection areas and Ramsar site. The large influx of people to the 90 new homes is likely to have a detrimental effect on wildlife and there is uncertainty as to whether potential damage to the sensitive areas can be adequately mitigated.</p> <p>Access to the site for vehicles will cause planning difficulties because the heathland and the bungalows already East of Marsh Lane with their gardens etc form a barrier.</p> <p>There will be significant increase in traffic noise. This will have an adverse impact on quality of life in the adjoining area between the Fairmile Road and Marsh Lane. This is a quiet area that so far has remained undisturbed by noise. Planning should seek to preserve tranquillity, not introduce noise.</p> <p>90 new homes will result in substantial additional traffic on Fairmile Road (B3073), a very busy highway, already severely congested at certain times. Christchurch has the worst traffic congestion in Dorset. Planning should aim to ease this, not add to it. 90 new homes will require new infrastructure and also</p>					

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>more services. There is already huge pressure on schools, medical services, policing, social services etc. With services currently strained, it is difficult to envisage future provision being adequate. Developments are also planned at Parley Cross and Roeshot Hill. These developments, together with the building East of Marsh Lane, will have a huge impact on the B3073 and other roads. This will not only affect residents, it will also damage tourism. Restricting building development to brownfield sites will at least not add any more to urban sprawl and will help to ensure that Christchurch remains a place where time is pleasant. We cannot go on building indefinitely. I would ask you, please, to address the planning irregularities outlined above by deleting Policy CN3, Land East of Marsh Lane, from the Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy. No new homes should be built in this location.</p>					
652832	Mrs Rita Hamilton		CSPS516	Policy CN 3							<p>No. our objections are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (waterbeds / flies)</p>				317	
652834	Linda and James Savage		CSPS518	Policy CN 3							<p>No. our objections are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (waterbeds / flies)</p>				317	
652836	Mrs Gillian Rogers		CSPS519	Policy CN 3							<p>No. our objections are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise</p>				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											Road safety Poor environment for new homes (waterbeds / flies)					
653587	Miss Nicky Prior		CSPS6574	Policy CN 3	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	<p>One of the many factors that defines Christchurch as extraordinary from other towns is its Green Belt, the purpose of which, in part, is to protect against urban sprawl. The Fairmile area is densely populated, but retains its "village" quality due to its open spaces. The area to the east of Marsh Lane is to be protected at all costs. It is home to amazing wildlife such as deer, cuckoos, otters, swans and owls, to name just a few. How can it even be considered that this can be put at risk by such a development?</p> <p>There are already approximately forty 2, 3 and 4 bedroom homes planned for Avon View in Bronte Avenue, plus plans for key homes for workers on the site of Christchurch Hospital. Another 90 homes is sheer madness, as the infrastructure is simply not there to sustain it. The area already struggles under the weight of traffic, there are not enough dentists, schools or healthcare facilities to support this massive influx of homes in an already crowded space. The noise pollution issue, lack of jobs, increase in traffic and increased risk of flooding will erode the quality of life for everyone in and around this proposed development.</p> <p>Furthermore, why is it deemed necessary at all, when the Council's own 2011 figures state that there are 190 empty homes in the area? How is it reasonable to consider building more "affordable housing" when there are unused properties lying empty? Why are the Council suggesting destroying greenbelt sites before considering better use of the enormous quantity of brown field sites in the region first?</p> <p>The following comments were also submitted by Nicky Prior on the circulated extract from the leaflet:-</p> <p>No – our objections are:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies) 	No development of Greenbelt sites at Marsh Lane, or indeed, anywhere in this remarkably beautiful and historic town.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		317	
653852	Mrs Susan Newman-Crane		CSPS650	Policy CN 3	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Marsh Lane would cease to have the appropriate and pleasing rural character it now provides; St Catherine's Hill heathland would be seriously threatened by housing in such proximity.	Remove this proposal.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
654026	Ms Bev Miller		CSPS627	Policy CN 3		No	No	No	No	No	Policy CN3 does not meet the tests of soundness, for reasons referred to in previous policies (CN1 and CN2) regarding this relentless assault on the Green Belt. It appears that since the tragic loss of Purewell Watermeadows to housing the only policy that Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy has is to destroy the last vestiges of the Borough's precious Green Belt and replace it with concrete and tarmac urban sprawl. NO NO NO TO MORE EROSION OF GREEN BELT		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		317	
653852	Mrs Susan Newman-Crane		CSPS693	Policy CN 3		No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Your statement: Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace will be provided within the site in accordance with the standards set out in Core Strategy Policy ME3. To avoid adverse impacts on off-site areas used by qualifying species of the Avon Valley Special Protection Area and Ramsar Site and Dorset Heathlands Special Protection Area appropriate survey work will be undertaken prior to development in order to allow suitable mitigation measures to be devised and implemented. This is utterly unacceptable, that you can suggest removing the legal protection given to rare species by these designations, and claim it is 'mitigation'. You simply cannot mitigate destruction of vital habitat - once it's gone, it's gone, and there are no guarantees an alternative site, mitigation you call it, would be a successful replacement habitat for creatures and flora which, from millions of years of evolution, have selected the site you are proposing to build on - not the mitigated site you will move them to. I cannot see what other mitigation measures you might consider, but nothing can negate the point that you are taking away a habitat. Nor is SANG acceptable: if land identified as SANG was available, it would also have SPA and RAMSAR designation already, so you are proposing to use land of less environmental value than the land being developed.	Remove this proposal and any idea of 'mitigation' in regard to any site which has been formally designated as being environmentally valuable. Protect these as you are obliged to and they were designated for the purpose of being protected.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		317	
654341	Ms Chris Keats		CSPS667	Policy CN 3							"Did you know that some 20% of the remaining heath land in the world is in Dorset? And around 30% of that is in South East Dorset, with half a million people living nearby. Heath lands not only provide beautiful open spaces, they are also home to some of Britain's rarest wildlife. Nearly all Dorset's heaths are classified at Sites of Special Scientific Interest." Written in Christchurch Council 'Courier' magazine, Spring 2012. It would not be 'Sound' in any way, shape or form, to destroy even one centimetre of the world's remaining heath land for homes. I object most strongly to this proposal for approx. 90				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>dwellings. Green belt land should be respected and left as green belt land.</p>					
654400	Mrs J Williams		CSPS675	Policy CN 3							<p>'No' Not before a Christchurch Relief Road is built. Putting another 90 houses off Marsh Lane means at least another 100+ cars using Fairmile Road. The road just cannot take it. I live on Fairmile Road, and at certain times of day traffic is at a standstill already. Until a proper relief road is built it would be a mistake to add even more congestion.</p>				317	
654521	Don Dawson		CSPS689	Policy CN 3							<p>I note that the planning strategy for Christchurch Borough includes the building of 90 homes on Land East of Marsh Lane (Policy CN3). I recognise that a consultation is taking place but in addition to this I would like to point out the following planning problems:- The land East of Marsh Lane is Green Belt land. The land East of Marsh Lane is on a flood plain. Building 90 new homes will make additional demands on water supply. The proposed development is close to the Avon Valley and Dorset Heathland Special Protection areas and Ramsar site. The large influx of people to the 90 new homes is likely to have a detrimental effect on wildlife and there is uncertainty as to whether potential damage to the sensitive areas can be adequately mitigated. Access to the site for vehicles will cause planning difficulties because the heathland and the bungalows already East of Marsh Lane with their gardens form a barrier. There will be significant increase in traffic noise. This will have an adverse impact on quality of life in the adjoining area between the Fairmile Road and Marsh Lane. This is a quiet area that so far has remained undisturbed by noise. Planning should seek to preserve tranquility, not introduce noise. 90 new homes will result in substantial additional traffic on Fairmile Road (B3073), a very busy highway, already severely congested at certain times. Christchurch has the worst traffic congestion in Dorset. Planning should aim to ease this, not add to it. 90 new homes will require new infrastructure and also more services. There is already huge pressure on schools, medical services, policing, social services etc. With services currently strained, it is difficult to envisage future provision being adequate. Restricting building development to brownfield sites will at least not add any more to urban sprawl and will help to ensure that Christchurch remains a place where time is pleasant. We cannot go on building</p>				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>indefinitely.</p> <p>I would ask you, please, to address the planning irregularities outlined above by deleting Policy CN3, Land East of Marsh Lane from the Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy. No new homes should be built in this location.</p> <p>Dear Councillor</p> <p>I note that the planning strategy for Christchurch Borough includes the building of 90 homes on Land East of Marsh Lane (Policy CN3). I recognise that a consultation is taking place but in addition to this I would like to point out the following planning problems:-</p> <p>The land East of Marsh Lane is Green Belt land and on a flood plain.</p> <p>Building 90 new homes will make additional demands on water supply.</p> <p>The proposed development is close to the Avon Valley and Dorset Heathland Special Protection areas and Ramsar site. The large influx of people to the 90 homes is likely to have a detrimental effect on wildlife and there is uncertainty as to whether potential damage to the sensitive areas can be adequately mitigated.</p> <p>Access to the site for vehicles will cause planning difficulties because the heathland and the bungalows already East of Marsh Lane with their gardens etc form a barrier.</p> <p>There will be significant increase in traffic noise. This will have an adverse impact on quality of life in the adjoining area between the Fairmile Road and Marsh Lane. This is a quiet area that so far has remained undisturbed by noise. Planning should seek to preserve tranquillity, not introduce noise.</p> <p>90 new homes will result in substantial additional traffic on Fairmile Road (B3073), a very busy highway, already severely congested at certain times.</p> <p>Christchurch has the worst traffic congestion in Dorset. Planning should aim to ease this, not add to it.</p> <p>90 new homes will require new infrastructure and also more services. There is already huge pressure on schools, medical services, policing, social services etc. With services currently strained, it is difficult to envisage future provision being adequate.</p> <p>Developments are also planned at Parley Cross and Roeshot Hill. These developments, together with the building East of Marsh Lane, will have a huge impact on the B3073 and other roads. This will not only affect residents, it will also damage tourism.</p> <p>Restricting building development to brownfield sites will at least not add any more to urban sprawl and will help to ensure that Christchurch remains a place</p>					

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	
											where time is pleasant. We cannot go on building indefinitely. I would ask you, please, to address the planning irregularities outlined above by deleting Policy CN3, Land East of Marsh Lane, from the Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy. No new homes should be built in this location.						
654566	Helen Wade		CSPS704	Policy CN 3							<p>I note that the planning strategy for Christchurch Borough includes the building of 90 homes on Land East of Marsh Lane (Policy CN3). I recognise that a consultation is taking place but in addition to this I would like to point out the following planning problems:-</p> <p>The land East of Marsh Lane is Green Belt land. The land East of Marsh Lane is on a flood plain. Building 90 new homes will make additional demands on water supply. The proposed development is close to the Avon Valley and Dorset Heathland Special Protection areas and Ramsar site. The large influx of people to the 90 new homes is likely to have a detrimental effect on wildlife and there is uncertainty as to whether potential damage to the sensitive areas can be adequately mitigated. Access to the site for vehicles will cause planning difficulties because the heathland and the bungalows already East of Marsh Lane with their gardens form a barrier. There will be significant increase in traffic noise. This will have an adverse impact on quality of life in the adjoining area between the Fairmile Road and Marsh Lane. This is a quiet area that so far has remained undisturbed by noise. Planning should seek to preserve tranquillity, not introduce noise. 90 new homes will result in substantial additional traffic on Fairmile Road (B3073), a very busy highway, already severely congested at certain times. Christchurch has the worst traffic congestion in Dorset. Planning should aim to ease this, not add to it. 90 new homes will require new infrastructure and also more services. There is already huge pressure on schools, medical services, policing, social services etc. With services currently strained, it is difficult to envisage future provision being adequate. Restricting building development to brownfield sites will at least not add any more to urban sprawl and will help to ensure that Christchurch remains a place where time is pleasant. We cannot go on building indefinitely. I would ask you, please, to address the planning irregularities outlined above by deleting Policy CN3,</p>					317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>Land East of Marsh Lane from the Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy. No new homes should be built in this location.</p> <p>Also submitted the following text on an extract of a leaflet:-</p> <p>No – our objections are:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies) <p>The following comments were provided on a Response Form:-</p> <p>I do not hold the document to be legally compliant or sound for reasons which I have set down on the 18 enclosed A4 sheets.</p> <p>My reasons under headings relating to issues raised in Policy CN3:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Green Belt Protection of sensitive habitats and species Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG) Transport Access from Marsh Lane <p>I have also included:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Services Flooding Water supply and sewerage Local opposition The Pre-Submission Consultation itself Green Belt <p>The land referred to in Policy CN3 is Green Belt land. The Green Belt boundary is to be 'amended' to allow 'limited residential development'. But Policy CN3 envisages the building of as many as 90 homes. This is not limited development. It is considerable development.</p> <p>The word 'amended' seems to have been chosen carefully to make light of the matter and to divert attention away from the fact that the Green Belt is being stolen, never to be returned. This appropriation of Green Belt is a very serious matter and completely unjustified. Our green areas are valuable in their own right and should be left for future generations. Once built on – that is it - the Green Belt is lost for ever. Building on the Policy CN3 area would be a totally irretrievable, inflexible act so the plan can hardly be deemed to be flexible. See The Future of Christchurch</p>					

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>leaflet 'Effective means that the Core Strategy must be ...flexible'.</p> <p>The National Planning Policy Framework is completely clear about building on Green Belt land - it should not happen. On Page 19 Paragraph 79 of the NPPF we read 'The Government attaches great importance to Green Belts. The fundamental aim of the Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their performance'. Policy CN3, far from being consistent with National Policy, goes directly against it. It is an unsustainable unjustified and ineffective plan. The reasons for maintaining the Green Belt are stated on Page 19 paragraph 80 of the National Policy Planning Framework.</p> <p>Green Belt serves five purposes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas • To prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another • To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment • To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns • To assist in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land <p>Christchurch already has urban sprawl - yet more is planned as the CN3 homes encroach ever further into countryside. Christchurch and Burton will be a step closer to merging and the special natural setting of Christchurch will be closer to being spoilt. CN3 is a most inappropriate, unjustified plan. It goes directly against National Policy and it will have all the undesirable consequences that the Green Belt was put in place expressly to safeguard against.</p> <p>If we encroach on Green Belt land now, this sets a precedent for future planners who will deem it permissible to take more and more Green Belt until Christchurch and the UK are concreted over. The need for homes is no valid reason to take the land in the CN3 policy. The Core Strategy Pre-Submission Document Page 19, under 'The Challenges We Need to Deal With' states we should plan for 'almost limitless housing demand, given the popularity of the area to live in'. It is patently absurd to believe that Christchurch can fulfil limitless demands for housing. We absolutely cannot plan for this - given constraints of sea, borough boundaries, flood plains etc. No borough could. At some point, unless we go in for skyscrapers, we are going to have to realise that Christchurch is full. It would be far better to come to</p>					

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>this realisation sooner rather than later and preserve our Green Belt land. Embarking on the impossible task of trying to satisfy limitless housing demands is fruitless and will ultimately be destructive.</p> <p>(B) Protection of Sensitive Habitats and Species The Policy CN3 area is close to the River Avon, an area of wet river valley grassland used as pasture for horses and cows. The Avon Valley is internationally important for wildlife, the river having an enormous variety of aquatic flora and fauna including some rare species. The entire river system is an internationally important Special Area of Conservation (SAC) – a European site.</p> <p>Natural England (over 400 m developer enquiry Jan 2007) states 'The Dorset heathlands are notified as SSSIs for the special interest of their heathland habitats and associated plant and animal species. The SSSIs are part of the Dorset Heathlands Special Protection Area (SPA) on account of rare or vulnerable heathland bird species and are also part of a Ramsar site on account of rare or vulnerable heathland wetlands and associated rare wetland species'.</p> <p>The area projected for development in Policy CN3 lies just 400m away from heathland. It is possible that the road to access the development will actually go through the heathland.</p> <p>There can be no doubt that the Policy CN3 area is hugely important from a conservation point of view, given its proximity to the European sites (SPA and SAC).</p> <p>Natural England (over 400 m developer enquiry Jan 2007) says 'There is considerable documented information showing that urban development in the area around lowland heathland has an adverse effect on the quality of heathland interest features underlying the designation of the European sites, Ramsar site and SSSIs'.</p> <p>The Core Strategy Document of 22 February 2012 has used a traffic light approach to show whether impacts on the European sites are likely or not. Amber is used for policies where effects may be significant but there is uncertainty. Policy CN3 is categorized as Amber. If effects may be significant, the policy should not be carried out; it is unsound. It is totally unjustified to put the environment at risk for the sake of some houses - for the sake of a limitless demand that is always going to be impossible to satisfy.</p> <p>The National Planning Policy Framework is considering biodiversity and conservation states (Page 27, Paragraph 118) 'if significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided (through locating on an alternative site with less harmful impacts),</p>					

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>adequately mitigated, or, as a last resort, compensated for, then planning permission should be refused'. Alternative brownfield sites for the CN3 houses could be found and I have argued on another sheet that the efficacy of mitigation measures such as Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace is as yet unproven. Policy CN3 is not consistent with National Policy which seeks to protect valuable environmental sites, not build on them.</p> <p>The whole of Paragraph 118 of the NPPF deals with conservation, the need to protect irreplaceable habitats and the need to protect wildlife sites. Then Paragraph 119 makes it clear that the presumption in favour of sustainable development (paragraph 14) does not apply where development requiring appropriate assessment under the Birds or Habitats Directives is being considered, planned or determined'. This means that covering the UK with houses is not necessarily always a first priority - there are other considerations too, such as birds and habitats.</p> <p>The Standing Committee of the Berne Convention has formally recommended to the UK Government 'to avoid any more development close to existing heathland'. This Committee said pressure on heathland should be avoided. Building in the CN3 area should not happen.</p> <p>Natural England's position on this is that building between 40 m and 5 km of heathland would have such a significant detrimental effect on it that mitigation measure would be needed. But would mitigation measure really be sufficient ?</p> <p>One of the measures is heathland management. This is rather vague and therefore unconvincing. Quite a lot might be done by way of protecting the CN3 surroundings - but on the other hand the developer contributions might not go very far in financing very much at all or the manager might not manage very well. Wardening is proposed but no warden can be on duty all the time so this will still leave plenty of opportunity for damage to occur. No warden can cover every part of his area and the warden appointed may do his job well - or not. Education as a measure is vague and nebulous and doesn't guarantee anything, partly because not everyone can be reached and not everyone is receptive. Sustainable Alternative Natural Greenspace is another proposed measure. This has been discussed above and on a separate sheet. It does not prevent people wandering further afield. It seems to me that these mitigation measures could so easily accomplish very little in the way of protecting heathland and wildlife. Far better to abandon the plan for 90 homes because this ensure there are far fewer</p>					

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>adverse effects to mitigate.</p> <p>Families who come to live in these 90 homes will have children of all ages who will have a wonderful time racing round Cowards Marsh, the river banks and St Catherine's Hill doing goodness knows what arson ? putting things in the river e.g. shopping trollies ? * This is the kind of thing that happens. To imagine all the children and teenagers will stay on a recreation ground specially made for them is highly naïve. The provision of playground and sports' facilities is not guarantee that pressure is kept off heathland. Interest in these will pall after the first week.</p> <p>There will be erosion and loss of habitat through trampling by adults, children and dogs alike. Dogs will disturb ground nesting birds. People in the 90 homes will keep cats which will be out and about taking birds. These cats will not discriminate between rare and common species. No amount of wardening or management will prevent this damage from household pets, especially cats.</p> <p>Other pressures on the heathland will include noise and vibration from construction works and from traffic, light and air pollution from traffic and light pollution from the development itself.</p> <p>*or worse ?</p> <p>The projected development (CN3) is far too large for such an important wildlife area. A small retirement home would be one thing - a housing development of 90 homes where there are likely to be large numbers of children is another.</p> <p>I doubt that the measures proposed so far would go even a small way towards mitigating environmental damage and therefore hold Policy CN3 to be unsustainable, unjustified and inconsistent with National Policy.</p> <p>After CN3 has been implemented, when the dwellings are in place but the birds have gone there will still be continued pressure for more and more development. Demand will be never ending, so there is the potential for most of the lovely natural environment of Christchurch to eventually disappear under concrete. We need to stop before it is too late, make better use of brownfield sites and leave the countryside for future generations to enjoy ... and the wild life to live in unthreatened.</p> <p>The National Planning Policy Framework confirms that brownfield sites should be used (Page 26 Paragraph 111). 'Planning policies and decisions should encourage the effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developed (brownfield land) ...'. It does not say build on Green Belt. This should be sacrosanct.</p>					

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>Finally, the significance of the area bordering on the land East of Marsh Lane cannot be overstressed. It is of international importance. The National Planning Policy Framework is very clear (Page 26 Paragraph 113) 'Distinctions should be made between the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites, so that protection is commensurate with their status and gives appropriate weight to their importance and the contributions that they make to wider ecological networks'. The conservation area in question should receive the highest possible level of safeguarding. Building so very close to it, on such a large scale is a completely unsound policy.</p> <p>(C) Protection of Sensitive Habitats and Species Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace SANG SANG will be provided as a mitigation measure. However, the efficacy of SANGs in adequately protecting wildlife and vegetation is as yet unproven. SANGs are a new idea - their effectiveness is currently not known. It is too early in the history of SANGs for the outcomes of monitoring them to be known. The Core Strategy document admits this (page 157). 'During the phasing of development the effectiveness of SANGs will be monitored and enhancements will be required if the SANGs are not functional according to the criteria set out in this policy'. If the SANG areas in Policy CN3 are found not to have been functioning properly it will possibly be too late - damage may have occurred in the area which the SANG was set up to protect.</p> <p>SANG will be set up to attract people away from the heathland but whether the SANG will in reality do this is highly uncertain. The CN3 development will have families with children and teenagers. The older children and teenagers will soon be bored with the SANG and will move on to St Catherine's Hill and other surrounding areas. They will also soon be on the banks of the River Avon - if not in it. The impact on wildlife could potentially be huge.</p> <p>Provision of the SANG will in itself attract more visitors to the area - a very undesirable consequence given its environmentally sensitive nature. And if the SANG has a car park this will attract yet more cars to the local area - something existing residents do not want.</p> <p>Plenty of space must be provided within the SANG for dogs off the lead. These are very hazardous to wildlife. When it comes to monitoring and managing the SANG, it will be the same old story - not enough money to do it. There will be too few staff, no wardens available, few volunteers etc. Fine words now, no action taken later. This is what happens. It says in the Core Strategy Pre-Submission document (page 152</p>					

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>paragraph 13.10 'Protection of habits and species will be undertaken through the Council's own work programmes, working with partners and the local community'. I am sceptical as to how this will turn out. If Christchurch library has to be run with a barely skeleton staff, what hope is there for the SANG ? As always there will turn out to be no cash, no time, no staff. This is one of the projects likely to get lost and have to take a back seat in the future because other demands on the Council's resources will be more important and more pressing.</p> <p>The implementation of Policy CN3 Land East of Marsh Lane will impact on environmentally sensitive areas and be detrimental to wildlife and heathland. The provision of SANG will not adequately mitigate this impact, for reasons given above. Policy CN3 is unsound, unsustainable and ineffective.</p> <p>The National Planning Policy Framework Page 27 Paragraph 118 states 'if significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided Adequately mitigated then planning permission should be refused'.</p> <p>Adequate mitigation will not be achieved by creating SANGs. Policy CN3 clearly goes against national policy. It should be deleted from the Core Strategy and not revived in future years.</p> <p>(D) Transport</p> <p>CN3 is a totally unsound plan from the point of view of transport - an ill-prepared scheme, not positively prepared one. Building 90 new homes East of Marsh Lane could well result in 180 extra cars - or even more and as far as roads are concerned infrastructure in Christchurch is already abysmally inadequate. Christchurch residents, business people and tourists suffer appallingly, on a daily basis, from the huge volumes of traffic. The B3073, Fairmile Road is frequently moving very slowly or even at a standstill. This happens in the morning and evening rush hours, at the end of afternoon school, when there are roadworks and also in the summer when there is additional tourist traffic.</p> <p>At certain times of the day vehicle drivers from the area east of Fairmile Road already find that turning into the Fairmile Road is very difficult. It is always dangerous. What will it be like in future if CN3 goes ahead - with all the extra cars ? Suffolk Avenue, Walcott Avenue, Flambard Avenue and Bronte Avenue all lead into the Fairmile Road (B3073) but access is extremely difficult, especially for drivers turning right. These are very dangerous junctions especially when traffic on Fairmile Road is moving faster. The extra cars from the CN3 area will make the situation even</p>					

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>more worrying than it is at present. CN3 is not a sound, effective or positive plan.</p> <p>Roadside pollution on the B3073 must already be quite high, affecting the health of pedestrians (especially children walking to and from local school), cyclists and residents. What will be done to address that ? Extra care will make it worse.</p> <p>Implementation of the CN3 policy will have a significant effect on the B3073 and other traffic in Christchurch but when CN1 and CN2 housing developments as well as BA2 airport development are taken into account too - the traffic situation will be horrendous. There will be a huge cumulative effect. This means that CN3 is not a sound, positively prepared plan.</p> <p>There have been several building developments in the CN3 area in relatively recent times. These have played a part in adding to traffic congestion. We absolutely do not need more congestion - so CN3 is unsound. The homes in the Royal Close are near Christchurch Hospital are fairly new as are the homes on Rimbury Way, Calkin Close, Deverel Close and the homes near Christchurch Station on Fairmile Road. There will be a development on Bronte Avenue where the Avon View Residential Home used to be and one on Clarendon Road where the pub was. The Fairmile Road area has been built on and built on causing an appalling traffic situation. Yet more building is completely unsound and unjustified on traffic congestion grounds alone. Christchurch's main highways are already most unpleasant and dangerous.</p> <p>The state of roads here makes people short tempered which can result in impatient, dangerous driving. This in turn affects the more elderly drivers who find road conditions here extremely frightening. There are so many older people in Christchurch - we should be assisting them, not making their lives more difficult.</p> <p>The measures planned for the B3073 from Parley Cross to Blackwater and the improvements to the Fountains Roundabout cannot alter the traffic situation on Fairmile Road to any appreciable degree. Indeed, traffic coming more quickly through Parley will clog up Fairmile Road and Bargates even more as it joins up with local traffic.</p> <p>Similarly, in the CN3 area the measures that could be taken by a developer to limit impact on the transport network are likely to be extremely limited. What could the developer possibly do ? He could not arrange for Fairmile Road and Bargates to be widened and it is on these roads that the situation is especially bad. They are a traffic nightmare. No amount of enlarging roundabouts is going to do anything very much either.</p>					

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>The only sound measure from a traffic point of view is to call a halt to building in the Fairmile Road are. Building 90 homes will result in so many more cars that the project is completely unsound, ineffective and unjustified.</p> <p>The Core Strategy Vision says that the Christchurch area will be easier to get around but I have not yet managed to find any concrete examples of anything planned for the Fairmile Road area close to the projected CN3 area, East of Marsh Lane. I suspect there is not a lot that can be done. And if it can, why isn't it being done now ?</p> <p>(E) Access from Marsh Lane I have heard three differing ideas regarding access to the CN3 area.</p> <p>One of these is that the exact point of access is unknown.</p> <p>Another idea is that an access road will go through one of the green areas between the gardens of the bungalows already to the East of Marsh Lane. That would certainly not be in the best interest of residents of the bungalows and they certainly would not want a road between their bungalows. The local government website www.communities.gov.uk says that 'Decisions should be driven by people and governments locally'. Yet another idea I have heard is that access would be from Suffolk Avenue. But this would mean that a road is built within the 400 metre buffer boundary around the heathland. Significant effects on wildlife would happen including loss of habitat and there would be noise and air pollution. Some beautiful trees (oak) would probably have to go - further loss of habitat. Putting the road - which will be fairly busy - through heathland is not a good idea. It is unsound.</p> <p>Furthermore, if the road leading to the CN3 site is at the point where Suffolk Avenue joins Marsh Lane, that is already highly dangerous as it is on a bad bend. An accident is just waiting to happen there as things are now, without the added danger of much increased traffic.</p> <p>Suffolk Avenue at present, with its long line of cars parked on the right hand side (going in the Fairmile direction) is practically a one way street. Cars have to wait almost at the Fairmile Road junction for any vehicles proceeding towards Fairmile Road. At present this is manageable and drivers are patient and courteous while waiting. A whole lot more traffic coming from the Policy CN3 site and the situation would be chaotic.</p> <p>To sum up - there are going to be problems with an access road and a large majority of people do not want another road in the area. This is yet another reason</p>					

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>why Policy CN3 is unsound and inappropriate.</p> <p>(F) Services Christchurch already suffers from lack of services. Why are we bringing more people here when services are strained already ?</p> <p>When the homes in the CN3 area, Land East of Marsh Lane, are built they will not only got to people on the Council's waiting list, they will also attract new people to come and live here. It is possible they may attract more retired and elderly people. Is this what Christchurch needs when medical services, mental health services, provision for the elderly, social services, policing, library services and schools are finding it difficult to cope as it is ? Even the main post office on Church Street strains to keep up. Queues here are frequently very long and very slow moving. I understand that the idea is to attract younger people who will possibly take caring jobs for the growing numbers of very elderly people. But it cannot be guaranteed that people will want to do this work so possibly all that will have been achieved is a fuller Christchurch with the elderly no better off - and more elderly to care for in the future.</p> <p>In the CN3 area we have a particular problem because Christchurch Junior School is full. Children from the neighbourhood are having to go to school in Burton. This is unacceptable. It adds to pressure on roads and it means that children are less likely to have friends where they live.</p> <p>I cannot find anything in the Core Strategy document about getting Christchurch's services working more satisfactorily before adding hugely to the numbers those services have to cope with.</p> <p>I believe Policy CN3 is unworkable. It is not appropriate strategy and not sound. A more appropriate strategy would be to make better provision for existing residents in the form of services that we all need at some times in our lives.</p> <p>(G) Flooding The Land East of Marsh Lane, marked out for development in Policy CN3 lies in very close proximity to the River Avon. Marsh Lane and Bronte Avenue are at some points less than 500 metres from the river so the housing development will be even closer to it. Local people say this land has been known to flood. This does not happen frequently but flooding has occurred in freak conditions. Homeowners are most unlikely, therefore, to be able to insure their properties so Policy CN3 is not an appropriate or sound strategy. The area known as Cowards Marsh, approximately 600 metres away from the northern edge of the CN3 area for development always floods. Because the CN3</p>					

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>area will no longer be a green area, it will no longer be available to help drain away excess water so there is a real danger of flooding extending from Cowards Marsh to roads such as Dudmoor Farm Road, Marsh Lane and Huntingdon Gardens. Further upstream Winkton and Sopley could be affected.</p> <p>CN3 is an unsound policy because the consequences of concreting over an area so close to a river cannot be fully known until it is too late. There is every possibility that flooding will increase in areas surrounding the Land East of Marsh Lane development area. The National Policy Planning Framework Page 23 Paragraph 100 says that land needed for current and future flood management should be safeguarded from development. Policy CN3 is not consistent with national policy and not sustainable.</p> <p>When we bear in mind that climate change is likely to increase flood risk it makes even less sense to build so close to a river. Even some existing housing areas may not be sustainable. This plan to build so close to the River Avon, Policy CN3, is ineffective, unsustainable, not positively prepared and inappropriate. It is not consistent with National Policy and should therefore be deleted from the Core Strategy. To build here would be unacceptably risky for the local environment because flood danger has not been taken sufficiently into account.</p> <p>(H) Water Supply and Sewerage The Land East of Marsh Lane is at present water company land and with the ever increasing demand for water and potential water scarcity could turn out to be a valuable resource for water supply. But not if it is built on.</p> <p>3,025 new homes in Christchurch will place enormous extra demands on water supply and sewerage. This at a time of climate change when it is not possible to predict whether there will be lengthy periods of drought surely means that our water supply must be protected as much as ever possible.</p> <p>Since our future climate is uncertain, the effect of all these new dwellings, including those in Policy CN3, on Christchurch's water supply must therefore also be uncertain.</p> <p>It is both unjustified and unsustainable to build on land in the CN3 area. We do not know what water demand will be in future.</p> <p>The National Planning Policy Framework says (Page 21 Para 93) "Planning plays a key role in providing resilience to climate change". It also says (page 22 para 94) "Local planning authorities should adopt proactive strategies to mitigate and adapt to climate</p>					

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>change, taking full account of flood risk, coastal change and water supply and demand considerations". It would seem that water supply and demand considerations have not been fully taken into account. Policy CN3 does not therefore deliver sustainable development in line with the National Planning Policy Framework.</p> <p>(I) Local Opposition Many people in the local area close to Marsh Lane simply do not want Policy CN3. Opposition to building East of Marsh Lane is huge. The local government website www.communities.gov.uk says 'Decisions should be driven by people and governments locally'. It does not say that decisions should be taken by those in local government on their own. Furthermore, the National Planning Policy Framework page 17 paragraph 69 says that local planning authorities should 'create a shared vision with communities of the residential environment'. The greater part of the community here does not hold a vision that 90 extra homes on Land East of Marsh Lane would be desirable. People live here because it is a relatively quiet area and they appreciate that. The tranquillity is special to this community and 90 new homes would impact on that hugely.</p> <p>The National Planning Policy Framework says on page 29 paragraph 123 'Planning policies and decisions should aim to: avoid noise from giving rise to significant adverse impacts on health and quality of life as a result of new developmentand identify and protect areas of tranquillity which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their recreational and amenity value for this reason'. Not everywhere should be like Piccadilly Circus. Quiet places should be kept for people to choose to live in if they so wish.</p> <p>(J) The Pre-Submission Consultation I believe that the consultation is in itself unsound. It began on 2 April and nearly into June there were still people in the CN3 - Land East of Marsh Lane area who were unaware that 90 homes may possibly be built on their doorstep. There has been very little publicity for the consultation. Yes, it was included in the Spring 2012 Courier but several people have told me they did not receive this. Also, receipt of the Courier does not automatically mean knowledge of the Core Strategy, as people may receive it but not be in the habit of reading it. More efforts should have been made by the council to ensure that everyone knows. At election time we have people going door to door and we receive leaflets with arresting headings. So why did this very important</p>					

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>event not have similar publicity ? Several leaflet drops were called for - big headlines etc to make sure everyone was aware of the consultation. As matters stand local campaigners have had to do the Council's work - going door to door, letting people know. This is not what should have happened. If the Council wants a consultation they should engage in it wholeheartedly. So, the words inappropriate and ineffective could be applied to this consultation. You cannot have a proper consultation if the people it most concerns do not know it is happening. Politicians are not reluctant to knock on doors at election time so why over this very important matter ?</p> <p>The unavailability of the full Core Strategy document is another cause for concern. The council Offices, the Information Office and the Library are, to the best of my knowledge, the only places where this can be seen. No copies are available for the general public. Certainly it is on the internet but not everyone has the internet and anyway how can they go searching on the internet for a consultation they don't know about ? Furthermore, a printed version of the National Planning Policy Framework should have been available at several venues. I have not seen one copy of this anywhere and have had to print out my own from the internet. People's attention should have been drawn to this document very expressly and clearly for it forms the basis for arguments for and against the core strategy.</p> <p>Not enough publicity was given to the 'drop ins' - these should have been much more widely advertised.</p>					
654753	Ms Julie Phillips		CSPS793	Policy CN 3		No			No	No	<p>No - Our Objections Area: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services & infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)</p>				317	
654763	Mrs R.V Cheater		CSPS797	Policy CN 3		No			No	No	<p>No - Our objections are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise</p>				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											Poor environment for new homes (water beds/flies)					
654767	Mr & Mrs Roberts		CSPS801	Policy CN 3		No			No	No	No - Our objections are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services & infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact o SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds and flies)				317	
653545	Mr James Vanlint		CSPS1122	Policy CN 3							No. Our objections are:- Loss of green belt Strain on water/utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services & infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
653562	Mr & Mrs D.R. Speake		CSPS1123	Policy CN 3							No. Our objections are:- Loss of green belt Strain on water/utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services & infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
653565	Mr & Mrs A Honniball		CSPS1121	Policy CN 3							No. Our objections are:- Loss of green belt Strain on water/utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services & infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
653576	Mrs Sue Ellis		CSPS1120	Policy CN 3							90 dwellings 180 cars! Traffic is already heavy on this stretch of road - Fairmile.				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
653586	Mr Robert Stephen Homer		CSPS1126	Policy CN 3							Policy CN3 does not meet the tests of soundness, for reasons referred to in previous policies (CN1 and CN2) regarding this relentless assault on the Green Belt. It appears that since the tragic loss of Purewell Watermeadows to housing the only policy that Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy has is to destroy the last vestiges of the Borough's precious Green Belt and replace it with concrete and tarmac urban sprawl. Next stop city status?				317	
653591	Mr A Hart		CSPS1128	Policy CN 3							No! Another crazy idea from Christchurch/East Dorset Council. This land is on a flood plain - increased risk of flooding. 90 homes could mean 180 extra cars, plus service and delivery vehicles. Existing roads are unsuitable for extra traffic (road safety and noise). Bad environment for new homes, flies and insects from waterworks. No public transport (bus service) De-value existing property prices. Pressure on existing infrastructure and services Loss of more green belt land No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
654962	Mr Christopher Chope		CSPS919	Policy CN 3	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Because Policy CN3 involves deleting land from the Green Belt which is currently protected as Green Belt without justification and in breach of the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework.	Deletion of Policy CN3 from the Plan.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	To bring to the attention of the Inspector the strength of feeling of local residents about this proposal.	317	
359461	Mrs Nicola Brunt	Dorset Wildlife Trust	CSPS1314	Policy CN 3	No	No	No	No	No	No	Dorset Wildlife Trust does not consider that this site can meet the environmental strand of sustainability and backs the views of Natural England. Our concerns are: 1. No ecological survey has informed this allocation. The site is in an area of high biodiversity value and could support priority habitat and species. NPPF (165) states that planning policies and decisions should be based on up-to-date information about the natural environment. 2. Housing development would have potential impacts on European designated sites, which would require significant mitigation. Given the scale of the development in relation to the size of the site and the	We support Natural England's view that paragraphs 6.60-6.62, policy CN 3 and Map 6.4 should be deleted.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											lack of any further land for mitigation, we consider there is insufficient certainty that this mitigation could be provided and the policy deliverable. 3. The housing proposal would impact on the management of the adjacent designated sites by removing important grazing land and there is insufficient certainty that mitigation could be provided for this.					
654700	Mr & Mrs F L Crabb		CSPS1113	Policy CN 3							No provision for road improvement. Increased traffic through Fairmile Road and Barrack Road. This development and other building plans for that area will lead to grid lock.				317	
654704	Mrs J E John		CSPS1056	Policy CN 3							At this late stage in the 40 year old + plans to put a relief road (most urgently needed) then extra housing at least is fairly welcome. You don't mention the number of housing which will be social housing, very important given that Christchurch has already built a steady number of social housing all along the main roads. Affordable homes must mean also with a view to purchase for young couples. It would mean a bus route and extra school and GP services.				317	
654861	Mr John Alborough		CSPS1112	Policy CN 3							On Green Belt land. Near river, subject to flooding. River danger for children. Proposed housing out of keeping with area, Town Common and Cowards Marsh. Precious area for locals is being encroached on. Also area supports many species wildlife Dear Councillor I note that the planning strategy for Christchurch Borough includes the building of 90 homes on Land East of Marsh Lane (Policy CN3). I recognise that a consultation is taking place but in addition to this I would like to point out the following planning problems:- The land East of Marsh Lane is Green Belt land. The land East of Marsh Lane is on a flood plain. Building 90 new homes will make additional demands on water supply. The proposed development is close to the Avon Valley and Dorset Heathland Special Protection areas and Ramsar site. The large influx of people to the 90 new homes is likely to have a detrimental effect on wildlife and there is uncertainty as to whether potential damage to the sensitive areas can be adequately mitigated. Access to the site for vehicles will cause planning difficulties because the heathland and the bungalows already East of Marsh Lane with their gardens etc form a barrier. There will be significant increase in traffic noise. This				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>will have an adverse impact on quality of life in the adjoining area between the Fairmile Road and Marsh Lane. This is a quiet area that so far has remained undisturbed by noise. Planning should seek to preserve tranquillity, not introduce noise.</p> <p>90 new homes will result in substantial additional traffic on Fairmile Road (B3073), a very busy highway, already severely congested at certain times. Christchurch has the worst traffic congestion in Dorset. Planning should aim to ease this, not add to it.</p> <p>90 new homes will require new infrastructure and also more services. There is already huge pressure on schools, medical services, policing, social services etc. With services currently strained, it is difficult to envisage future provision being adequate.</p> <p>Restricting building development to brownfield sites will at least not add any more to urban sprawl and will help to ensure that Christchurch remains a place where time is pleasant. We cannot go on building indefinitely.</p> <p>I would be very interested to know what steps you intend to take to acknowledge local feeling and oppose Policy CN3, Land East of Marsh Lane – Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy. No new homes should be built in this location.</p> <p>I look forward to your reply</p>					
655432	Mr Andy Davies		CSPS1023	Policy CN 3							<p>Do we need more houses in Christchurch? Fairmile and Barrack Road already very busy. Assess the areas with bill boards and blend in houses if required. Look at the areas nearer major roads like Wessex Way, rear of Blackwater.</p>				317	
655526	Mr Paul Morrison		CSPS1038	Policy CN 3							<p>In reality no. There again who, when it comes to either keeping your three adult children at home or digging up the fly-tipped green belt to provide homes for three is going to worry about old bricks and china?</p>				317	
655594	Mrs Nuala Bissett		CSPS1042	Policy CN 3							<p>Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)</p>				317	
655605	Mr & Mrs Helga & Richard Fell		CSPS1043	Policy CN 3							<p>Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access</p>				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)					
655612	Mr Arno Gerber		CSPS1044	Policy CN 3							Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
655613	Mr James Williams		CSPS1045	Policy CN 3							Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
655623	Mr Andrew Hammond		CSPS1046	Policy CN 3							Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
656337	Mrs Catherine Player		CSPS1132	Policy CN 3							No! Another crazy idea from Christchurch/East Dorset Council. This land is on a flood plain - increased risk of flooding. 90 homes could mean 180 extra cars, plus service and delivery vehicles. Existing roads are unsuitable for extra traffic (road safety and noise). Bad environment for new homes, flies and insects from waterworks. No public transport (bus service) De-value existing property prices. Pressure on existing infrastructure and services Loss of more green belt land				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
656355	Mr Anthony Allen		CSPS1138	Policy CN 3							No! Another crazy idea from Christchurch/East Dorset Council. This land is on a flood plain - increased risk of flooding. 90 homes could mean 180 extra cars, plus service and delivery vehicles. Existing roads are unsuitable for extra traffic (road safety and noise). Bad environment for new homes, flies and insects from waterworks. No public transport (bus service) De-value existing property prices. Pressure on existing infrastructure and services Loss of more green belt land				317	
656357	Mrs Angela Hammond		CSPS1139	Policy CN 3							No! Another crazy idea from Christchurch/East Dorset Council. This land is on a flood plain - increased risk of flooding. 90 homes could mean 180 extra cars, plus service and delivery vehicles. Existing roads are unsuitable for extra traffic (road safety and noise). Bad environment for new homes, flies and insects from waterworks. No public transport (bus service) De-value existing property prices. Pressure on existing infrastructure and services Loss of more green belt land				317	
656362	Mrs Terri Brandon Quick		CSPS1142	Policy CN 3							No! Another crazy idea from Christchurch/East Dorset Council. This land is on a flood plain - increased risk of flooding. 90 homes could mean 180 extra cars, plus service and delivery vehicles. Existing roads are unsuitable for extra traffic (road safety and noise). Bad environment for new homes, flies and insects from waterworks. No public transport (bus service) De-value existing property prices. Pressure on existing infrastructure and services Loss of more green belt land				317	
656364	Mr S.L. Ellacott		CSPS1144	Policy CN 3											317	
656365	Mr Tony Woods		CSPS1145	Policy CN 3							No! Another crazy idea from Christchurch/East Dorset Council. This land is on a flood plain - increased risk of flooding. 90 homes could mean 180 extra cars, plus service and delivery vehicles. Existing roads are unsuitable for extra traffic (road safety and noise). Bad environment for new homes, flies and insects from waterworks. No public transport (bus service) De-value existing property prices. Pressure on existing infrastructure and services				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											Loss of more green belt land					
656371	Ms Sally Bell		CSPS1147	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
656375	Mrs N McCormaele		CSPS1149	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
656383	Mrs Eileen Stephens		CSPS1152	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
656384	Mr Alan Smith		CSPS1153	Policy CN 3							No. Our objections are:- Loss of green belt Strain on water/utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services & infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
656388	Mrs Hawkins		CSPS1154	Policy CN 3							No. Our objections are:- Loss of green belt Strain on water/utilities				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services & infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies) Dear Councillor</p> <p>I note that the planning strategy for Christchurch Borough includes the building of 90 homes on Land East of Marsh Lane (Policy CN3). I recognise that a consultation is taking place but in addition to this I would like to point out the following planning problems:-</p> <p>The land East of Marsh Lane is Green Belt land and on a flood plain. Building 90 new homes will make additional demands on water supply. The proposed development is close to the Avon Valley and Dorset Heathland Special Protection areas and Ramsar site. The large influx of people to the 90 new homes is likely to have a detrimental effect on wildlife and there is uncertainty as to whether potential damage to the sensitive areas can be adequately mitigated. Access to the site for vehicles will cause planning difficulties because the heathland and the bungalows already East of Marsh Lane with their gardens etc form a barrier. There will be significant increase in traffic noise. This will have an adverse impact on quality of life in the adjoining area between the Fairmile Road and Marsh Lane. This is a quiet area that so far has remained undisturbed by noise. Planning should seek to preserve tranquillity, not introduce noise. 90 new homes will result in substantial additional traffic on Fairmile Road (B3073), a very busy highway, already severely congested at certain times. Christchurch has the worst traffic congestion in Dorset. Planning should aim to ease this, not add to it. 90 new homes will require new infrastructure and also more services. There is already huge pressure on schools, medical services, policing, social services etc. With services currently strained, it is difficult to envisage future provision being adequate. Developments are also planned at Parley Cross and Roeshot Hill. These developments, together with the building East of Marsh Lane, will have a huge impact on the B3073 and other roads. This will not only affect residents, it will also damage tourism. Restricting building development to brownfield sites</p>					

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											will at least not add any more to urban sprawl and will help to ensure that Christchurch remains a place where time is pleasant. We cannot go on building indefinitely. I would ask you, please, to address the planning irregularities outlined above by deleting Policy CN3, Land East of Marsh Lane, from the Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy. No new homes should be built in this location.					
656392	Mr Paul Watson		CSPS1156	Policy CN 3							No. Our objections are:- Loss of green belt Strain on water/utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services & infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
656401	Mr C Mills		CSPS1160	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
656409	Mr D I Gullick		CSPS1162	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
656412	Mr Frank Jetten		CSPS1163	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)					
656415	Mr R Renshaw		CSPS1164	Policy CN 3							No. Our objections are:- Loss of green belt Strain on water/utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services & infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
656416	Mr Robert Lack		CSPS1165	Policy CN 3							No. Our objections are:- Loss of green belt Strain on water/utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services & infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
656420	Mr Jonathon Worsfold		CSPS1166	Policy CN 3							No. Our objections are:- Loss of green belt Strain on water/utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services & infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
656423	Miss Carol Davies		CSPS1167	Policy CN 3							No. Our objections are:- Loss of green belt Strain on water/utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services & infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
656431	Miss Cheryl Pardy		CSPS1169	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
656433	Mr Jose Perez		CSPS1170	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
628085	Mr and Mrs Olliffe		CSPS1241	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
656435	Miss Priscilla Rawles		CSPS1173	Policy CN 3							No. Our objections are:- Loss of green belt Strain on water/utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services & infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
656436	Mr Thomas Huir		CSPS1172	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)					
656441	Mrs V Z Martin		CSPS1175	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
656443	Mr Andrew Addison		CSPS1176	Policy CN 3							No. Our objections are:- Loss of green belt Strain on water/utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services & infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
656447	Mr J F Adlington		CSPS1178	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
656449	Mr L Wheatley		CSPS1180	Policy CN 3							No. Our objections are:- Loss of green belt Strain on water/utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services & infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)					
656450	Mr John Newton		CSPS1179	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
656454	Ms Nicola Pateman		CSPS1182	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
656456	Mr Anthony Webb		CSPS1183	Policy CN 3							No. Our objections are:- Loss of green belt Strain on water/utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services & infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
656460	Ms Nicola Williams		CSPS1184	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
656461	Ms Margaret Kinsella		CSPS1185	Policy CN 3							No. Our objections are:- Loss of green belt Strain on water/utilities				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services & infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)					
656464	Ms Hilary Haynes		CSPS1187	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
656465	Ms Margaret Thompson		CSPS1188	Policy CN 3							No. Our objections are:- Loss of green belt Strain on water/utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services & infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
656469	Mr J A Burger		CSPS1189	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
656470	Mr George Alexis Papageorgis		CSPS1190	Policy CN 3							No. Our objections are:- Loss of green belt Strain on water/utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services & infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)					
656472	Mr James Simpson		CSPS1191	Policy CN 3							No. Our objections are:- Loss of green belt Strain on water/utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services & infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
656474	Mrs Andrea Bushnell		CSPS1192	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
656478	Ms Diana Mawson		CSPS1194	Policy CN 3							No. Our objections are:- Loss of green belt Strain on water/utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services & infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
656482	Ms J Newell		CSPS1196	Policy CN 3							No. Our objections are:- Loss of green belt Strain on water/utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services & infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
656486	Miss Jean Codling		CSPS1198	Policy CN 3							No. Our objections are:-				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											Loss of green belt Strain on water/utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services & infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)					
656495	Mrs Emma Whitehead		CSPS1201	Policy CN 3							No. Our objections are:- Loss of green belt Strain on water/utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services & infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
656507	Mr Keith Barnes		CSPS1204	Policy CN 3							No. Our objections are:- Loss of green belt Strain on water/utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services & infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
656511	Mr & Mrs Paul and Patricia Butterworth		CSPS1205	Policy CN 3							No. Our objections are:- Loss of green belt Strain on water/utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services & infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
656515	Mr David Causley		CSPS1206	Policy CN 3							No. Our objections are:- Loss of green belt Strain on water/utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services & infrastructure				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)					
656518	Mr E J Richbell		CSPS1207	Policy CN 3							No. Our objections are:- Loss of green belt Strain on water/utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services & infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
656522	Ms Bridget Fletcher		CSPS1208	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
656528	Mr Mark Adams		CSPS1212	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
656540	Mr Connor Sleightholme		CSPS1214	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
656551	Mr & Mrs Wall		CSPS1216	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
656553	Ms Barbara Martino		CSPS1217	Policy CN 3							No. Our objections are:- Loss of green belt Strain on water/utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services & infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
656554	Ms Heidi Tame		CSPS1218	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
656556	Mr & Mrs Wateridge		CSPS1219	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
656559	Mr Carl Churcher		CSPS1220	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)					
656563	Ms Irene Goodson		CSPS1221	Policy CN 3							No. Our objections are:- Loss of green belt Strain on water/utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services & infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
656566	Mr Paul Turner		CSPS1222	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
656569	Mr Lewis Chaffey		CSPS1223	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
656570	Ms Rachel Clark		CSPS1224	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)					
656572	Mrs M J Schafheitle		CSPS1225	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
656573	Mr Mark Jackson		CSPS1226	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
656575	Mr Robert Grant		CSPS1227	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
656657	Mr Richard Lamont		CSPS1228	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
656676	Mr N Green		CSPS1229	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)					
656681	Ms Louise Tranter		CSPS1230	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
656690	Ms Lisa Davies		CSPS1232	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
656694	Mrs Jennifer Burriss		CSPS1233	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
656700	Mr and Mrs K Blasius		CSPS1234	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)					
656702	Mrs M Wright		CSPS1235	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
656706	Ms Victoria Williams		CSPS1237	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
656716	Mr Ronald Gillman		CSPS1238	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
656720	Ms Zoe Avery		CSPS1239	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
656724	Mr John Noble		CSPS1240	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are:				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)					
656755	Ms Sandra Castle		CSPS1242	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
656762	Mr & Mrs N Porter		CSPS1244	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
656768	Mrs J Allen		CSPS1245	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
656771	Mr and Mrs B Jones		CSPS1246	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)					
656774	Mrs Fiona Palmer		CSPS1247	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
656777	Mr & Mrs J Morris		CSPS1248	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
656782	Mrs Tania Clements		CSPS1249	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
656784	Mr Jason Meaning		CSPS1250	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
656788	Ms Sharon Welling		CSPS1251	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
656793	Mrs A W Leaper		CSPS1252	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies) Dear Councillor I note that the planning strategy for Christchurch Borough includes the building of 90 homes on Land East of Marsh Lane (Policy CN3). I recognise that a consultation is taking place but in addition to this I would like to point out the following planning problems:- The land East of Marsh Lane is Green Belt land and on a flood plain. Building 90 new homes will make additional demands on water supply. The proposed development is close to the Avon Valley and Dorset Heathland Special Protection areas and Ramsar site. The large influx of people to the 90 new homes is likely to have a detrimental effect on wildlife and there is uncertainty as to whether potential damage to the sensitive areas can be adequately mitigated. Access to the site for vehicles will cause planning difficulties because the heathland and the bungalows already East of Marsh Lane with their gardens etc form a barrier. There will be significant increase in traffic noise. This will have an adverse impact on quality of life in the adjoining area between the Fairmile Road and Marsh Lane. This is a quiet area that so far has remained undisturbed by noise. Planning should seek to preserve tranquillity, not introduce noise. 90 new homes will result in substantial additional traffic				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>on Fairmile Road (B3073), a very busy highway, already severely congested at certain times. Christchurch has the worst traffic congestion in Dorset. Planning should aim to ease this, not add to it. 90 new homes will require new infrastructure and also more services. There is already huge pressure on schools, medical services, policing, social services etc. With services currently strained, it is difficult to envisage future provision being adequate. Developments are also planned at Parley Cross and Roeshot Hill. These developments, together with the building East of Marsh Lane, will have a huge impact on the B3073 and other roads. This will not only affect residents, it will also damage tourism. Restricting building development to brownfield sites will at least not add any more to urban sprawl and will help to ensure that Christchurch remains a place where time is pleasant. We cannot go on building indefinitely. I would ask you, please, to address the planning irregularities outlined above by deleting Policy CN3, Land East of Marsh Lane, from the Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy. No new homes should be built in this location.</p>					
656805	Mr G Marshall		CSPS1253	Policy CN 3							<p>No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)</p>				317	
656809	Mrs J Payne		CSPS1254	Policy CN 3							<p>No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)</p>				317	
656815	Mrs Pamela Aislan		CSPS1255	Policy CN 3							<p>No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access</p>				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)					
656818	Ms Sharon Duffield		CSPS1256	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
656822	Mr & Mrs J Wilkinson		CSPS1257	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
656825	Mr Simon Jillings		CSPS1258	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
656833	Mr G Wimrow		CSPS1259	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)					
656881	Ms Mathilde Roberts		CSPS1261	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
656884	Mr Alan Newton		CSPS1262	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
656886	Mr Roger Andrews		CSPS1263	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
656887	Mrs Jeanette Bennett		CSPS1264	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
656889	Mrs Angie Camara		CSPS1265	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)					
656890	Mr M Wing		CSPS1266	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
656892	Mr Peter Savage		CSPS1267	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
656892	Mr Peter Savage		CSPS1268	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
657284	Mr & Mrs P Fay		CSPS1293	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)					
657285	Mr & Mrs R Storer		CSPS1294	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
657289	Mr Ross Clarke		CSPS1295	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
657292	Mrs J Johnson		CSPS1296	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
657293	D A Coombes		CSPS1297	Policy CN 3											317	
657295	Ms Leeanne Faulkner		CSPS1298	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)					
657298	Mrs Bowes		CSPS1299	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
657301	Ms Sarah Hall		CSPS1300	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
657303	Mr Ben Antell		CSPS1302	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
657307	Ms Rachel Chambers		CSPS1303	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
657309	Mr Richard Lines		CSPS1306	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	
											Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)						
657352	Mrs Lisa Hayward		CSPS1334	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317		
657366	Mrs Jacqueline Everingham		CSPS1338	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317		
654861	Mr John Alborough		CSPS1680	Policy CN 3	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No mention on plan CN3 where access or exit from proposed housing site, will the bridle paths be affected. The housing proposed will be out of keeping with the adjoining Bronte Park Estate, which consists of 39 retirement bungalows, also it is green belt land, a conservation area known as Cowards Marsh and Town Common. In the past there was and still is opposition to a bypass crossing this land, if housing is allowed, it will probably be the thin edge of the wedge, for further development. This site is close to River Avon, it will be unsafe for children, areas get flooded occassionally, it is also a recognised haven for wildlife, it is on a green belt site, there will be at least 100 to 180 extra cars to be accommodated. I have lived here 84 years, and local residents have always wanted this land left untouched for this reason. I feel the proposal unsound. I think more effort should be made to find brown field sites.		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination			317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	
656198	Mrs P J Dunn										<p>No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies) Dear Councillor I note that the planning strategy for Christchurch Borough includes the building of 90 homes on Land East of Marsh Lane (Policy CN3). I recognise that a consultation is taking place but in addition to this I would like to point out the following planning problems:- The land East of Marsh Lane is Green Belt land. The land East of Marsh Lane is on a flood plain. Building 90 new homes will make additional demands on water supply. The proposed development is close to the Avon Valley and Dorset Heathland Special Protection areas and Ramsar site. The large influx of people to the 90 new homes is likely to have a detrimental effect on wildlife and there is uncertainty as to whether potential damage to the sensitive areas can be adequately mitigated. Access to the site for vehicles will cause planning difficulties because the heathland and the bungalows already East of Marsh Lane with their gardens etc form a barrier. There will be significant increase in traffic noise. This will have an adverse impact on quality of life in the adjoining area between the Fairmile Road and Marsh Lane. This is a quiet area that so far has remained undisturbed by noise. Planning should seek to preserve tranquillity, not introduce noise. 90 new homes will result in substantial additional traffic on Fairmile Road (B3073), a very busy highway, already severely congested at certain times. Christchurch has the worst traffic congestion in Dorset. Planning should aim to ease this, not add to it. 90 new homes will require new infrastructure and also more services. There is already huge pressure on schools, medical services, policing, social services etc. With services currently strained, it is difficult to envisage future provision being adequate. Restricting building development to brownfield sites will at least not add any more to urban sprawl and will help to ensure that Christchurch remains a place</p>						

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	
											where time is pleasant. We cannot go on building indefinitely. I would be very interested to know what steps you intend to take to acknowledge local feeling and oppose Policy CN3, Land East of Marsh Lane – Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy. No new homes should be built in this location. I look forward to your reply						
656965	Mrs Maise Muir		CSPS1520	Policy CN 3	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	To close to river and floodplain. Natural environment at risk.	I feel it would be impossible to obtain home insurance with a floodplain on the doorstep.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		317		
656970	Miss Dorothy Taylor		CSPS1518	Policy CN 3	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Not justified in an area of natural beauty and risk of flooding.	Unjustified.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		317		
656975	Mr John Page		CSPS1515	Policy CN 3	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	I think that the document is unsound, as the idea of building 90 homes on land that slopes down to the River Avon, and is part of the flood plain would seem unwise. Having lived in the area for many years and watched housing development around your proposed building land, I dont think you have left any room for access roads of sufficient size to be built. Mill Road, Knapp Mill Ave or Suffolk Ave would be totally unsuitable.	Not legally compliant.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	I would like him to convince me that this proposed development would be a good or practical idea.	317		
656978	Mr Donald George Thomas		CSPS1513	Policy CN 3	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Not an area to be considered. Flood plain, nearby river, loss of natural environment and open space.	none.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		317		
656982	Mr Martin Turley		CSPS1511	Policy CN 3	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Green Belt Area - risk of flooding. Close to river. Wildlife affected. Do not consider the area consistent with national policy. Dear Councillor I note that the planning strategy for Christchurch Borough includes the building of 90 homes on Land East of Marsh Lane (Policy CN3). I recognise that a consultation is taking place but in addition to this I would like to point out the following planning problems:- The land East of Marsh Lane is Green Belt land. The land East of Marsh Lane is on a flood plain. Building 90 new homes will make additional demands on water supply. The proposed development is close to the Avon Valley and Dorset Heathland Special Protection areas and Ramsar site. The large influx of people to the 90 new homes is likely to have a detrimental effect on wildlife and there is uncertainty as to whether potential damage to the sensitive areas can be adequately mitigated.	Do not consider.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		317		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>Access to the site for vehicles will cause planning difficulties because the heathland and the bungalows already East of Marsh Lane with their gardens etc form a barrier.</p> <p>There will be significant increase in traffic noise. This will have an adverse impact on quality of life in the adjoining area between the Fairmile Road and Marsh Lane. This is a quiet area that so far has remained undisturbed by noise. Planning should seek to preserve tranquillity, not introduce noise.</p> <p>90 new homes will result in substantial additional traffic on Fairmile Road (B3073), a very busy highway, already severely congested at certain times.</p> <p>Christchurch has the worst traffic congestion in Dorset. Planning should aim to ease this, not add to it.</p> <p>90 new homes will require new infrastructure and also more services. There is already huge pressure on schools, medical services, policing, social services etc. With services currently strained, it is difficult to envisage future provision being adequate.</p> <p>Restricting building development to brownfield sites will at least not add any more to urban sprawl and will help to ensure that Christchurch remains a place where time is pleasant. We cannot go on building indefinitely.</p> <p>I would be very interested to know what steps you intend to take to acknowledge local feeling and oppose Policy CN3, Land East of Marsh Lane – Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy. No new homes should be built in this location.</p> <p>I look forward to your reply</p>					
656985	Mr Lionel Green		CSPS1501	Policy CN 3	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	<p>Traffic would be a hazard. Because the site is in close proximity to residents who have purchased their bungalows for retirement taking into account the seclusion and quietness of the location.</p> <p>The land to the rear and side of the proposed area becomes flooded from the over flow of the nearby river (a health and safety problem) especially for young children.</p> <p>This is a designated flood plain (as we were assured when purchasing the property), and would not be built on. With the freak weather we have this strategy could cause more flooding to everyone concerned near the River up to Ringwood and beyond. It would be a catastrophe and disastrous happening for everyone - please listen to those who matter.</p> <p>No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion</p>	None	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	To strongly object to this idiotic project.	317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)					
656988	Mr Andrew J Skinner		CSPS1497	Policy CN 3	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Do not agree to loss of further green belt area. Any properties built on this area would greatly affect the environment, animals, wildlife, and the ecological system.	Not suitable.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		317	
657008	Mrs Jacqueline Habgood		CSPS1437	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
657062	Mrs Jane Morgan		CSPS1432	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
657371	Ms Susan Jeneson		CSPS1341	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
657374	Mr Adam Topp		CSPS1343	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)					
657379	Roineile C Northover		CSPS1347	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
657381	Mr Robert Burns		CSPS1354	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
657400	Mr Russell John Yearworth		CSPS1355	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
657402	Mrs Susan Bridle		CSPS1356	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)					
657408	Mr Paul Newport		CSPS1357	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
657409	Ms Victoria Durrant		CSPS1358	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
657413	Mr J Clarke		CSPS1359	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
657416	Mrs Shirley Ashworth		CSPS1360	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
657417	Mrs Elizabeth Ritchley		CSPS1361	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)					
657420	Wing Tam Young		CSPS1362	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
657440	Mrs E Budden		CSPS1363	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
657449	Mr Gary A Jeavons		CSPS1364	Policy CN 3											317	
657460	Mr Brian Preston		CSPS1365	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
657466	Mr Darren Fooks		CSPS1366	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)					
657467	Mr Stephen Pidgley		CSPS1367	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
657482	Ms Linda Lamont		CSPS1368	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
657722	Mr Gary Stuart Nesbitt		CSPS1369	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
657727	Mrs Susan Butler		CSPS1371	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)					
657732	Mr Errol Dudley Hunkin		CSPS1375	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
657734	Ms Romana Kamal		CSPS1376	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
657740	Mrs P Laurent		CSPS1377	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
657743	Mr Kevin Rough		CSPS1379	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
657744	Mrs Alison Leclerc		CSPS1378	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)					
657746	Mr and Mrs Walter Gladly Pritchard		CSPS1381	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
657750	Mrs Pauline Shawcross		CSPS1382	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
657757	Mr Graham Legg		CSPS1386	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
657758	Mrs Pamela Hattersley		CSPS1387	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)					
657761	Ms Neda Yarahmadi		CSPS1388	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
657762	Mr G Yinson		CSPS1389	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
657764	Ms Tanya Phelps		CSPS1391	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
657765	Mrs Wendy Holt		CSPS1392	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
657767	Mr John Bolt		CSPS1396	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:-				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)					
657768	Mr D W Preston		CSPS1397	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
657770	Mrs S Childs		CSPS1399	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
657771	Miss Tiffanie Lowe		CSPS1400	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
657773	Mrs Janet Marchant		CSPS1401	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)					
657774	Mr D R Oliver		CSPS1402	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
657777	Mr Alan Hodgkinson		CSPS1404	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
657778	Mrs Ann Price		CSPS1405	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies) Dear Councillor I note that the planning strategy for Christchurch Borough includes the building of 90 homes on Land East of Marsh Lane (Policy CN3). I recognise that a consultation is taking place but in addition to this I would like to point out the following planning problems:- The land East of Marsh Lane is Green Belt land and on a flood plain. Building 90 new homes will make additional demands on water supply. The proposed development is close to the Avon Valley				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>and Dorset Heathland Special Protection areas and Ramsar site. The large influx of people to the 90 new homes is likely to have a detrimental effect on wildlife and there is uncertainty as to whether potential damage to the sensitive areas can be adequately mitigated.</p> <p>Access to the site for vehicles will cause planning difficulties because the heathland and the bungalows already East of Marsh Lane with their gardens etc form a barrier.</p> <p>There will be significant increase in traffic noise. This will have an adverse impact on quality of life in the adjoining area between the Fairmile Road and Marsh Lane. This is a quiet area that so far has remained undisturbed by noise. Planning should seek to preserve tranquillity, not introduce noise.</p> <p>90 new homes will result in substantial additional traffic on Fairmile Road (B3073), a very busy highway, already severely congested at certain times.</p> <p>Christchurch has the worst traffic congestion in Dorset. Planning should aim to ease this, not add to it.</p> <p>90 new homes will require new infrastructure and also more services. There is already huge pressure on schools, medical services, policing, social services etc. With services currently strained, it is difficult to envisage future provision being adequate.</p> <p>Developments are also planned at Parley Cross and Roeshot Hill. These developments, together with the building East of Marsh Lane, will have a huge impact on the B3073 and other roads. This will not only affect residents, it will also damage tourism.</p> <p>Restricting building development to brownfield sites will at least not add any more to urban sprawl and will help to ensure that Christchurch remains a place where time is pleasant. We cannot go on building indefinitely.</p> <p>I would ask you, please, to address the planning irregularities outlined above by deleting Policy CN3, Land East of Marsh Lane, from the Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy. No new homes should be built in this location.</p>					
657780	Mrs Maureen Dwight		CSPS1406	Policy CN 3							<p>No – Our Objections Are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety 				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies) Dear Councillor I note that the planning strategy for Christchurch Borough includes the building of 90 homes on Land East of Marsh Lane (Policy CN3). I recognise that a consultation is taking place but in addition to this I would like to point out the following planning problems:- The land East of Marsh Lane is Green Belt land and on a flood plain. Building 90 new homes will make additional demands on water supply. The proposed development is close to the Avon Valley and Dorset Heathland Special Protection areas and Ramsar site. The large influx of people to the 90 new homes is likely to have a detrimental effect on wildlife and there is uncertainty as to whether potential damage to the sensitive areas can be adequately mitigated. Access to the site for vehicles will cause planning difficulties because the heathland and the bungalows already East of Marsh Lane with their gardens etc form a barrier. There will be significant increase in traffic noise. This will have an adverse impact on quality of life in the adjoining area between the Fairmile Road and Marsh Lane. This is a quiet area that so far has remained undisturbed by noise. Planning should seek to preserve tranquillity, not introduce noise. 90 new homes will result in substantial additional traffic on Fairmile Road (B3073), a very busy highway, already severely congested at certain times. Christchurch has the worst traffic congestion in Dorset. Planning should aim to ease this, not add to it. 90 new homes will require new infrastructure and also more services. There is already huge pressure on schools, medical services, policing, social services etc. With services currently strained, it is difficult to envisage future provision being adequate. Developments are also planned at Parley Cross and Roeshot Hill. These developments, together with the building East of Marsh Lane, will have a huge impact on the B3073 and other roads. This will not only affect residents, it will also damage tourism. Restricting building development to brownfield sites will at least not add any more to urban sprawl and will help to ensure that Christchurch remains a place where time is pleasant. We cannot go on building indefinitely. I would ask you, please, to address the planning irregularities outlined above by deleting Policy CN3, Land East of Marsh Lane, from the Christchurch and</p>					

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											East Dorset Core Strategy. No new homes should be built in this location.					
657783	Mr N Rice		CSPS1407	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
657787	Mr M Davis		CSPS1408	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies) Dear Councillor I note that the planning strategy for Christchurch Borough includes the building of 90 homes on Land East of Marsh Lane (Policy CN3). I recognise that a consultation is taking place but in addition to this I would like to point out the following planning problems:- The land East of Marsh Lane is Green Belt land and on a flood plain. Building 90 new homes will make additional demands on water supply. The proposed development is close to the Avon Valley and Dorset Heathland Special Protection areas and Ramsar site. The large influx of people to the 90 new homes is likely to have a detrimental effect on wildlife and there is uncertainty as to whether potential damage to the sensitive areas can be adequately mitigated. Access to the site for vehicles will cause planning difficulties because the heathland and the bungalows already East of Marsh Lane with their gardens etc form a barrier. There will be significant increase in traffic noise. This will have an adverse impact on quality of life in the adjoining area between the Fairmile Road and Marsh Lane. This is a quiet area that so far has remained undisturbed by noise. Planning should seek to				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	
											<p>preserve tranquillity, not introduce noise. 90 new homes will result in substantial additional traffic on Fairmile Road (B3073), a very busy highway, already severely congested at certain times. Christchurch has the worst traffic congestion in Dorset. Planning should aim to ease this, not add to it. 90 new homes will require new infrastructure and also more services. There is already huge pressure on schools, medical services, policing, social services etc. With services currently strained, it is difficult to envisage future provision being adequate. Developments are also planned at Parley Cross and Roeshot Hill. These developments, together with the building East of Marsh Lane, will have a huge impact on the B3073 and other roads. This will not only affect residents, it will also damage tourism. Restricting building development to brownfield sites will at least not add any more to urban sprawl and will help to ensure that Christchurch remains a place where time is pleasant. We cannot go on building indefinitely. I would ask you, please, to address the planning irregularities outlined above by deleting Policy CN3, Land East of Marsh Lane, from the Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy. No new homes should be built in this location.</p>						
657789	Mrs Jane Hanson		CSPS1410	Policy CN 3							<p>No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies) Dear Councillor I note that the planning strategy for Christchurch Borough includes the building of 90 homes on Land East of Marsh Lane (Policy CN3). I recognise that a consultation is taking place but in addition to this I would like to point out the following planning problems:- The land East of Marsh Lane is Green Belt land. The land East of Marsh Lane is on a flood plain. Building 90 new homes will make additional demands on water supply. The proposed development is close to the Avon Valley and Dorset Heathland Special Protection areas and Ramsar site. The large influx of people to the 90 new</p>					317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>homes is likely to have a detrimental effect on wildlife and there is uncertainty as to whether potential damage to the sensitive areas can be adequately mitigated.</p> <p>Access to the site for vehicles will cause planning difficulties because the heathland and the bungalows already East of Marsh Lane with their gardens etc form a barrier.</p> <p>There will be significant increase in traffic noise. This will have an adverse impact on quality of life in the adjoining area between the Fairmile Road and Marsh Lane. This is a quiet area that so far has remained undisturbed by noise. Planning should seek to preserve tranquillity, not introduce noise.</p> <p>90 new homes will result in substantial additional traffic on Fairmile Road (B3073), a very busy highway, already severely congested at certain times. Christchurch has the worst traffic congestion in Dorset. Planning should aim to ease this, not add to it.</p> <p>90 new homes will require new infrastructure and also more services. There is already huge pressure on schools, medical services, policing, social services etc. With services currently strained, it is difficult to envisage future provision being adequate.</p> <p>Restricting building development to brownfield sites will at least not add any more to urban sprawl and will help to ensure that Christchurch remains a place where time is pleasant. We cannot go on building indefinitely.</p> <p>I would be very interested to know what steps you intend to take to acknowledge local feeling and oppose Policy CN3, Land East of Marsh Lane – Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy. No new homes should be built in this location.</p> <p>I look forward to your reply</p>					
657791	Mr A Holtby		CSPS1411	Policy CN 3							<p>No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies) Dear Councillor</p> <p>I note that the planning strategy for Christchurch Borough includes the building of 90 homes on Land East of Marsh Lane (Policy CN3). I recognise that a consultation is taking place but in addition to this I</p>				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>would like to point out the following planning problems:-</p> <p>The land East of Marsh Lane is Green Belt land. The land East of Marsh Lane is on a flood plain. Building 90 new homes will make additional demands on water supply. The proposed development is close to the Avon Valley and Dorset Heathland Special Protection areas and Ramsar site. The large influx of people to the 90 new homes is likely to have a detrimental effect on wildlife and there is uncertainty as to whether potential damage to the sensitive areas can be adequately mitigated. Access to the site for vehicles will cause planning difficulties because the heathland and the bungalows already East of Marsh Lane with their gardens etc form a barrier. There will be significant increase in traffic noise. This will have an adverse impact on quality of life in the adjoining area between the Fairmile Road and Marsh Lane. This is a quiet area that so far has remained undisturbed by noise. Planning should seek to preserve tranquillity, not introduce noise. 90 new homes will result in substantial additional traffic on Fairmile Road (B3073), a very busy highway, already severely congested at certain times. Christchurch has the worst traffic congestion in Dorset. Planning should aim to ease this, not add to it. 90 new homes will require new infrastructure and also more services. There is already huge pressure on schools, medical services, policing, social services etc. With services currently strained, it is difficult to envisage future provision being adequate. Restricting building development to brownfield sites will at least not add any more to urban sprawl and will help to ensure that Christchurch remains a place where time is pleasant. We cannot go on building indefinitely. I would be very interested to know what steps you intend to take to acknowledge local feeling and oppose Policy CN3, Land East of Marsh Lane – Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy. No new homes should be built in this location. I look forward to your reply</p>					
657792	Mrs Sharon Wells		CSPS1413	Policy CN 3							<p>No – our objections are:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding 				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)					
657794	Mrs M Westmore		CSPS1414	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
657798	Mrs J Haines		CSPS1416	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
657799	Mr Godfrey Jones		CSPS1415	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
657801	Mr Paul Marchant		CSPS1417	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
657802	Mrs Tracy Gray		CSPS1418	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
657805	Mr Peter Watts		CSPS1419	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
657806	Mrs Alena Galton		CSPS1421	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
657807	Mr B C Law		CSPS1422	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
657810	Mrs Sheila Whitehorn		CSPS1423	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies) Dear Councillor I note that the planning strategy for Christchurch Borough includes the building of 90 homes on Land East of Marsh Lane (Policy CN3). I recognise that a consultation is taking place but in addition to this I would like to point out the following planning problems:- The land East of Marsh Lane is Green Belt land. The land East of Marsh Lane is on a flood plain. Building 90 new homes will make additional demands on water supply. The proposed development is close to the Avon Valley and Dorset Heathland Special Protection areas and Ramsar site. The large influx of people to the 90 new homes is likely to have a detrimental effect on wildlife and there is uncertainty as to whether potential damage to the sensitive areas can be adequately mitigated. Access to the site for vehicles will cause planning difficulties because the heathland and the bungalows already East of Marsh Lane with their gardens etc form a barrier. There will be significant increase in traffic noise. This will have an adverse impact on quality of life in the adjoining area between the Fairmile Road and Marsh Lane. This is a quiet area that so far has remained undisturbed by noise. Planning should seek to preserve tranquillity, not introduce noise. 90 new homes will result in substantial additional traffic on Fairmile Road (B3073), a very busy highway, already severely congested at certain times. Christchurch has the worst traffic congestion in Dorset. Planning should aim to ease this, not add to it. 90 new homes will require new infrastructure and also more services. There is already huge pressure on schools, medical services, policing, social services etc. With services currently strained, it is difficult to envisage future provision being adequate. Restricting building development to brownfield sites will at least not add any more to urban sprawl and will help to ensure that Christchurch remains a place where time is pleasant. We cannot go on building indefinitely. I would be very interested to know what steps you intend to take to acknowledge local feeling and oppose Policy CN3, Land East of Marsh Lane – Christchurch</p>					

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											and East Dorset Core Strategy. No new homes should be built in this location. I look forward to your reply					
657811	Miss Hayley Lowe		CSPS1424	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
657813	Mrs H Mellish		CSPS1425	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
657814	Mr Matthew Richards		CSPS1426	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
657815	Mr Michael Feeley		CSPS1428	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
657817	Mr Philip Knowles		CSPS1430	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:-				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)					
657821	Mr David Morris		CSPS1431	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
657828	Mr Chris Dancer		CSPS1436	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies) Dear Councillor I note that the planning strategy for Christchurch Borough includes the building of 90 homes on Land East of Marsh Lane (Policy CN3). I recognise that a consultation is taking place but in addition to this I would like to point out the following planning problems:- The land East of Marsh Lane is Green Belt land and on a flood plain. Building 90 new homes will make additional demands on water supply. The proposed development is close to the Avon Valley and Dorset Heathland Special Protection areas and Ramsar site. The large influx of people to the 90 new homes is likely to have a detrimental effect on wildlife and there is uncertainty as to whether potential damage to the sensitive areas can be adequately mitigated. Access to the site for vehicles will cause planning				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>difficulties because the heathland and the bungalows already East of Marsh Lane with their gardens etc form a barrier.</p> <p>There will be significant increase in traffic noise. This will have an adverse impact on quality of life in the adjoining area between the Fairmile Road and Marsh Lane. This is a quiet area that so far has remained undisturbed by noise. Planning should seek to preserve tranquillity, not introduce noise.</p> <p>90 new homes will result in substantial additional traffic on Fairmile Road (B3073), a very busy highway, already severely congested at certain times.</p> <p>Christchurch has the worst traffic congestion in Dorset. Planning should aim to ease this, not add to it.</p> <p>90 new homes will require new infrastructure and also more services. There is already huge pressure on schools, medical services, policing, social services etc. With services currently strained, it is difficult to envisage future provision being adequate.</p> <p>Developments are also planned at Parley Cross and Roeshot Hill. These developments, together with the building East of Marsh Lane, will have a huge impact on the B3073 and other roads. This will not only affect residents, it will also damage tourism.</p> <p>Restricting building development to brownfield sites will at least not add any more to urban sprawl and will help to ensure that Christchurch remains a place where time is pleasant. We cannot go on building indefinitely.</p> <p>I would ask you, please, to address the planning irregularities outlined above by deleting Policy CN3, Land East of Marsh Lane, from the Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy. No new homes should be built in this location.</p>					
657832	Miss Claire Marchant		CSPS1438	Policy CN 3							<p>No – Our Objections Are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies) 				317	
657834	Mrs P Lawrence		CSPS1440	Policy CN 3							<p>No – Our Objections Are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure 				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)					
657837	Mrs Amy King		CSPS1442	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
657839	Mr Michael Rodway		CSPS1443	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
657845	Mr J Edwards		CSPS1444	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
657847	Mr & Mrs Farmer		CSPS1445	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
657849	Mr Berry		CSPS1448	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
657852	Mr Ioan Cornwall		CSPS1450	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies) Dear Councillor I note that the planning strategy for Christchurch Borough includes the building of 90 homes on Land East of Marsh Lane (Policy CN3). I recognise that a consultation is taking place but in addition to this I would like to point out the following planning problems:- The land East of Marsh Lane is Green Belt land. The land East of Marsh Lane is on a flood plain. Building 90 new homes will make additional demands on water supply. The proposed development is close to the Avon Valley and Dorset Heathland Special Protection areas and Ramsar site. The large influx of people to the 90 new homes is likely to have a detrimental effect on wildlife and there is uncertainty as to whether potential damage to the sensitive areas can be adequately mitigated. Access to the site for vehicles will cause planning difficulties because the heathland and the bungalows already East of Marsh Lane with their gardens etc form a barrier. There will be significant increase in traffic noise. This will have an adverse impact on quality of life in the adjoining area between the Fairmile Road and Marsh Lane. This is a quiet area that so far has remained undisturbed by noise. Planning should seek to preserve tranquillity, not introduce noise. 90 new homes will result in substantial additional traffic				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>on Fairmile Road (B3073), a very busy highway, already severely congested at certain times. Christchurch has the worst traffic congestion in Dorset. Planning should aim to ease this, not add to it. 90 new homes will require new infrastructure and also more services. There is already huge pressure on schools, medical services, policing, social services etc. With services currently strained, it is difficult to envisage future provision being adequate. Restricting building development to brownfield sites will at least not add any more to urban sprawl and will help to ensure that Christchurch remains a place where time is pleasant. We cannot go on building indefinitely.</p> <p>I would be very interested to know what steps you intend to take to acknowledge local feeling and oppose Policy CN3, Land East of Marsh Lane – Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy. No new homes should be built in this location.</p> <p>I look forward to your reply</p>					
657854	Mr Michael Cooper		CSPS1452	Policy CN 3							<p>No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)</p>				317	
657855	Mr Keith Boyde		CSPS1453	Policy CN 3							<p>No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)</p>				317	
657857	Ms Helen Steel		CSPS1454	Policy CN 3							<p>No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI</p>				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)					
657871	Mrs Ethel Fletcher		CSPS1463	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
657873	Mr Harry Foxton		CSPS1464	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
657877	Mr D P Partiss		CSPS1469	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
657878	Mr Ian Marks		CSPS1471	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
657879	Mr W F Symmons		CSPS1476	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are:				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	
											Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)						
657881	Mr & Mrs P Wardner		CSPS1479	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies) Dear Councillor I note that the planning strategy for Christchurch Borough includes the building of 90 homes on Land East of Marsh Lane (Policy CN3). I recognise that a consultation is taking place but in addition to this I would like to point out the following planning problems:- The land East of Marsh Lane is Green Belt land. The land East of Marsh Lane is on a flood plain. Building 90 new homes will make additional demands on water supply. The proposed development is close to the Avon Valley and Dorset Heathland Special Protection areas and Ramsar site. The large influx of people to the 90 new homes is likely to have a detrimental effect on wildlife and there is uncertainty as to whether potential damage to the sensitive areas can be adequately mitigated. Access to the site for vehicles will cause planning difficulties because the heathland and the bungalows already East of Marsh Lane with their gardens etc form a barrier. There will be significant increase in traffic noise. This will have an adverse impact on quality of life in the adjoining area between the Fairmile Road and Marsh Lane. This is a quiet area that so far has remained undisturbed by noise. Planning should seek to preserve tranquillity, not introduce noise. 90 new homes will result in substantial additional traffic on Fairmile Road (B3073), a very busy highway,					317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>already severely congested at certain times. Christchurch has the worst traffic congestion in Dorset. Planning should aim to ease this, not add to it. 90 new homes will require new infrastructure and also more services. There is already huge pressure on schools, medical services, policing, social services etc. With services currently strained, it is difficult to envisage future provision being adequate. Restricting building development to brownfield sites will at least not add any more to urban sprawl and will help to ensure that Christchurch remains a place where time is pleasant. We cannot go on building indefinitely.</p> <p>I would be very interested to know what steps you intend to take to acknowledge local feeling and oppose Policy CN3, Land East of Marsh Lane – Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy. No new homes should be built in this location.</p> <p>I look forward to your reply</p>					
657882	Mr Paul Francis		CSPS1481	Policy CN 3							<p>No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)</p>				317	
657884	Miss Rita Philbey		CSPS1483	Policy CN 3							<p>No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)</p>				317	
657885	Ms Jane Freak		CSPS1491	Policy CN 3							<p>No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise</p>				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)					
657887	Mrs Lyn Petrie		CSPS1498	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
657890	Mr Philip Moseley		CSPS1500	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
657892	Mr Triston Chapman		CSPS1504	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies) Dear Councillor I note that the planning strategy for Christchurch Borough includes the building of 90 homes on Land East of Marsh Lane (Policy CN3). I recognise that a consultation is taking place but in addition to this I would like to point out the following planning problems:- The land East of Marsh Lane is Green Belt land. The land East of Marsh Lane is on a flood plain. Building 90 new homes will make additional demands on water supply. The proposed development is close to the Avon Valley and Dorset Heathland Special Protection areas and Ramsar site. The large influx of people to the 90 new homes is likely to have a detrimental effect on wildlife				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>and there is uncertainty as to whether potential damage to the sensitive areas can be adequately mitigated.</p> <p>Access to the site for vehicles will cause planning difficulties because the heathland and the bungalows already East of Marsh Lane with their gardens etc form a barrier.</p> <p>There will be significant increase in traffic noise. This will have an adverse impact on quality of life in the adjoining area between the Fairmile Road and Marsh Lane. This is a quiet area that so far has remained undisturbed by noise. Planning should seek to preserve tranquillity, not introduce noise.</p> <p>90 new homes will result in substantial additional traffic on Fairmile Road (B3073), a very busy highway, already severely congested at certain times.</p> <p>Christchurch has the worst traffic congestion in Dorset. Planning should aim to ease this, not add to it.</p> <p>90 new homes will require new infrastructure and also more services. There is already huge pressure on schools, medical services, policing, social services etc. With services currently strained, it is difficult to envisage future provision being adequate.</p> <p>Restricting building development to brownfield sites will at least not add any more to urban sprawl and will help to ensure that Christchurch remains a place where time is pleasant. We cannot go on building indefinitely.</p> <p>I would be very interested to know what steps you intend to take to acknowledge local feeling and oppose Policy CN3, Land East of Marsh Lane – Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy. No new homes should be built in this location.</p> <p>I look forward to your reply</p>					
657894	Mr Peter Johnson		CSPS1508	Policy CN 3							<p>No – Our Objections Are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies) 				317	
657896	Mr Gary Whant		CSPS1509	Policy CN 3							<p>No – Our Objections Are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure 				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)					
657897	Mr Paul Hodgkinson		CSPS1510	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
657898	Mr John Trowbridge		CSPS1512	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
657900	Mr David Webber		CSPS1514	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
657902	Ms Julie Machant		CSPS1516	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
657905	Mr Mark Taylor		CSPS1517	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
657910	Ms Samantha Jacobs		CSPS1522	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
657911	Ms Angela Papworth		CSPS1523	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
657913	Mr Richard Hayes		CSPS1524	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
656823	Mr Philip J Pulley		CSPS1627	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies) A letter was also sent with the following comments:- Having examined the recently distributed leaflets and the overall plan and infrastructure plan on the 'Dorset for you' website I wish to clearly state my strong objection to this proposal for the reasons summarised below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Negative impact on wildlife in the Avon valley and adjacent SSSI This area is rich in wildlife including foxes, bats, birds, amphibians (frogs and toads), reptiles and birds - the addition of close to 100 dwellings, with associated noise; traffic etc. will disturb this currently tranquil area and the wildlife inhabiting it. 2. Extra traffic on an already congested road system The additional houses, each with at least 1 car and probably 2 in many cases, will cause unacceptable congestion on the already busy Fairmile road. This road is already jammed at certain times of the day. I believe Christchurch is already the most congested town in Dorset – this would make it far worse. 3. Access to proposed development There is no obvious access point to the proposed development without crossing privately owned land – none of which I am sure would be willingly sold for this purpose. 4. Green belt infringement This area is currently green belt for good reasons and provides a natural corridor for wildlife right down to the town. 5. Health and Safety of residents Residents of the nearby estates already complain of the amount of biting insects coming from the filter beds in the summer months – this proposed development is closer and so will suffer more severely, thus not a healthy place to live ! 6. Inadequate provision of schools As a parent of school age children I am aware that the local infant and junior schools are close to capacity – an additional 90 plus families will overstretch them – causing children to have to be educated at schools farther away with consequent 'school run' traffic problems. <p>In addition to the above I would appeal to you to consider what a tragedy it would be to develop this unspoilt area to the detriment of Christchurch as a whole – it is green belt for a reason and once it's gone</p>					

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											it's gone for ever. Enough is enough, let's not spoil Christchurch! Please ensure that my strong objections reach the relevant persons and departments responsible for consideration of this plan.					
656956	Mrs Nora Restall		CSPS1679	Policy CN 3	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Loss of Green Belt Flooding Road safety Traffic congestion and noise No peace	Not compliant	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		317	
656959	Mr Peter Denman		CSPS1670	Policy CN 3	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Not a suitable site. Risk of flooding. Green belt. Old gravel and sand pit. Problem with traffic flow.	Not suitable.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		317	
656961	Mr and Mrs Cyril and Doreen Beavis		CSPS1672	Policy CN 3	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Policy CN3. "NO" certainly not, no building of any description should be built on this piece of ground. It is an environmental flood plain, with a fast flowing river near by. Green Belt, area definatley should not be used for any building. NOT A SUITABLE SITE. Will there be insurance cover, for any building so close to a river??? Dear Councillor I note that the planning strategy for Christchurch Borough includes the building of 90 homes on Land East of Marsh Lane (Policy CN3). I recognise that a consultation is taking place but in addition to this I would like to point out the following planning problems:- The land East of Marsh Lane is Green Belt land. The land East of Marsh Lane is on a flood plain. Building 90 new homes will make additional demands on water supply. The proposed development is close to the Avon Valley and Dorset Heathland Special Protection areas and Ramsar site. The large influx of people to the 90 new homes is likely to have a detrimental effect on wildlife and there is uncertainty as to whether potential damage to the sensitive areas can be adequately mitigated. Access to the site for vehicles will cause planning difficulties because the heathland and the bungalows already East of Marsh Lane with their gardens etc form a barrier. There will be significant increase in traffic noise. This will have an adverse impact on quality of life in the adjoining area between the Fairmile Road and Marsh Lane. This is a quiet area that so far has remained undisturbed by noise. Planning should seek to preserve tranquillity, not introduce noise.	Not justifiable.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	
											<p>90 new homes will result in substantial additional traffic on Fairmile Road (B3073), a very busy highway, already severely congested at certain times. Christchurch has the worst traffic congestion in Dorset. Planning should aim to ease this, not add to it. 90 new homes will require new infrastructure and also more services. There is already huge pressure on schools, medical services, policing, social services etc. With services currently strained, it is difficult to envisage future provision being adequate. Restricting building development to brownfield sites will at least not add any more to urban sprawl and will help to ensure that Christchurch remains a place where time is pleasant. We cannot go on building indefinitely.</p> <p>I would be very interested to know what steps you intend to take to acknowledge local feeling and oppose Policy CN3, Land East of Marsh Lane – Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy. No new homes should be built in this location.</p> <p>I look forward to your reply</p>						
656964	Mrs Dorothy Hallett		CSPS1674	Policy CN 3	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	<p>Natural environment, the most important asset for this area is decidedly at risk from CN3. Climate change and risk of flooding makes CN3 inappropriate. Green belt, according to vision, is only protected if it is not needed for housing and for CN3 this includes being adjacent to a highly designated area making it inappropriate. Previous sand and gravel pits. Traffic problems / access / exit.</p> <p>Dear Councillor</p> <p>I note that the planning strategy for Christchurch Borough includes the building of 90 homes on Land East of Marsh Lane (Policy CN3). I recognise that a consultation is taking place but in addition to this I would like to point out the following planning problems:-</p> <p>The land East of Marsh Lane is Green Belt land. The land East of Marsh Lane is on a flood plain. Building 90 new homes will make additional demands on water supply. The proposed development is close to the Avon Valley and Dorset Heathland Special Protection areas and Ramsar site. The large influx of people to the 90 new homes is likely to have a detrimental effect on wildlife and there is uncertainty as to whether potential damage to the sensitive areas can be adequately mitigated. Access to the site for vehicles will cause planning difficulties because the heathland and the bungalows already East of Marsh Lane with their gardens etc form</p>	<p>The aforementioned makes CN3 undeliverable and hence does not comply with the requirements for being effective and, in addition, is not justifiable.</p>	<p>Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination</p>	<p>Such a proposal can only have been devised on paper without full consideration of the site.</p>	317		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>a barrier. There will be significant increase in traffic noise. This will have an adverse impact on quality of life in the adjoining area between the Fairmile Road and Marsh Lane. This is a quiet area that so far has remained undisturbed by noise. Planning should seek to preserve tranquillity, not introduce noise. 90 new homes will result in substantial additional traffic on Fairmile Road (B3073), a very busy highway, already severely congested at certain times. Christchurch has the worst traffic congestion in Dorset. Planning should aim to ease this, not add to it. 90 new homes will require new infrastructure and also more services. There is already huge pressure on schools, medical services, policing, social services etc. With services currently strained, it is difficult to envisage future provision being adequate. Restricting building development to brownfield sites will at least not add any more to urban sprawl and will help to ensure that Christchurch remains a place where time is pleasant. We cannot go on building indefinitely. I would be very interested to know what steps you intend to take to acknowledge local feeling and oppose Policy CN3, Land East of Marsh Lane – Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy. No new homes should be built in this location. I look forward to your reply</p>					
656970	Miss Dorothy Taylor		CSPS1652	Policy CN 3							<p>No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)</p>				317	
656972	Mr Leslie Hutt		CSPS1678	Policy CN 3	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	<p>Marsh Lane is called so for a reason. It is a flood plain. Close proximity to a private estate of mature residents who have bought their properties for peace and quiet. Wild life would be seriously affected. Previous sand and gravel pits.</p>	<p>CN3 does not comply and is not justifiable.</p>	<p>No. I do not wish to participate at the oral examination</p>		317	
656982	Mr Martin Turley		CSPS1637	Policy CN 3							<p>No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure</p>				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)					
657916	Mr Leslie Dwight		CSPS1525	Policy CN 3							<p>No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)</p> <p>Dear Councillor</p> <p>I note that the planning strategy for Christchurch Borough includes the building of 90 homes on Land East of Marsh Lane (Policy CN3). I recognise that a consultation is taking place but in addition to this I would like to point out the following planning problems:-</p> <p>The land East of Marsh Lane is Green Belt land and on a flood plain. Building 90 new homes will make additional demands on water supply. The proposed development is close to the Avon Valley and Dorset Heathland Special Protection areas and Ramsar site. The large influx of people to the 90 new homes is likely to have a detrimental effect on wildlife and there is uncertainty as to whether potential damage to the sensitive areas can be adequately mitigated. Access to the site for vehicles will cause planning difficulties because the heathland and the bungalows already East of Marsh Lane with their gardens etc form a barrier. There will be significant increase in traffic noise. This will have an adverse impact on quality of life in the adjoining area between the Fairmile Road and Marsh Lane. This is a quiet area that so far has remained undisturbed by noise. Planning should seek to preserve tranquillity, not introduce noise. 90 new homes will result in substantial additional traffic on Fairmile Road (B3073), a very busy highway, already severely congested at certain times. Christchurch has the worst traffic congestion in Dorset. Planning should aim to ease this, not add to it. 90 new homes will require new infrastructure and also more services. There is already huge pressure on</p>				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>schools, medical services, policing, social services etc. With services currently strained, it is difficult to envisage future provision being adequate. Developments are also planned at Parley Cross and Roeshot Hill. These developments, together with the building East of Marsh Lane, will have a huge impact on the B3073 and other roads. This will not only affect residents, it will also damage tourism. Restricting building development to brownfield sites will at least not add any more to urban sprawl and will help to ensure that Christchurch remains a place where time is pleasant. We cannot go on building indefinitely. I would ask you, please, to address the planning irregularities outlined above by deleting Policy CN3, Land East of Marsh Lane, from the Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy. No new homes should be built in this location.</p>					
657917	Mr Mark Palmer		CSPS1526	Policy CN 3							<p>No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)</p>				317	
658028	Mr W McLuckie		CSPS1549	Policy CN 3							<p>No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)</p>				317	
658039	Mr I W Stone		CSPS1552	Policy CN 3							<p>No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety</p>				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)					
658043	Mr Andrew Martin		CSPS1554	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
658045	Mr Timothy Ian Fitcher		CSPS1556	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
658054	Miss and MR Maureen and Russell Reardon and McGoldrick		CSPS1564	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies) Dear Councillor I note that the planning strategy for Christchurch Borough includes the building of 90 homes on Land East of Marsh Lane (Policy CN3). I recognise that a consultation is taking place but in addition to this I would like to point out the following planning problems:- The land East of Marsh Lane is Green Belt land. The land East of Marsh Lane is on a flood plain. Building 90 new homes will make additional demands on water supply. The proposed development is close to the Avon Valley and Dorset Heathland Special Protection areas and Ramsar site. The large influx of people to the 90 new homes is likely to have a detrimental effect on wildlife and there is uncertainty as to whether potential				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>damage to the sensitive areas can be adequately mitigated.</p> <p>Access to the site for vehicles will cause planning difficulties because the heathland and the bungalows already East of Marsh Lane with their gardens etc form a barrier.</p> <p>There will be significant increase in traffic noise. This will have an adverse impact on quality of life in the adjoining area between the Fairmile Road and Marsh Lane. This is a quiet area that so far has remained undisturbed by noise. Planning should seek to preserve tranquillity, not introduce noise.</p> <p>90 new homes will result in substantial additional traffic on Fairmile Road (B3073), a very busy highway, already severely congested at certain times.</p> <p>Christchurch has the worst traffic congestion in Dorset. Planning should aim to ease this, not add to it.</p> <p>90 new homes will require new infrastructure and also more services. There is already huge pressure on schools, medical services, policing, social services etc. With services currently strained, it is difficult to envisage future provision being adequate.</p> <p>Restricting building development to brownfield sites will at least not add any more to urban sprawl and will help to ensure that Christchurch remains a place where time is pleasant. We cannot go on building indefinitely.</p> <p>I would be very interested to know what steps you intend to take to acknowledge local feeling and oppose Policy CN3, Land East of Marsh Lane – Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy. No new homes should be built in this location.</p> <p>I look forward to your reply</p>					
658057	Mr Keith John Whatson		CSPS1567	Policy CN 3							<p>No – our objections are:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies) 				317	
658060	Mr Ray Murphy		CSPS1573	Policy CN 3							<p>No – our objections are:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding 				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)					
658069	Mr Roy Stacey		CSPS1578	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
658077	Mrs Joanne Sheppard		CSPS1582	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
658084	Mr Randy Lopez		CSPS1583	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
658093	Mr Malcolm Maclean		CSPS1587	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
658101	Mr David Roger Lambert		CSPS1589	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
658105	Mr Louis Brencher		CSPS1590	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
658107	Mr Robert A Barnett		CSPS1591	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
658114	Mr D Ferry		CSPS1593	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies) Dear Councillor I note that the planning strategy for Christchurch Borough includes the building of 90 homes on Land East of Marsh Lane (Policy CN3). I recognise that a consultation is taking place but in addition to this I would like to point out the following planning				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>problems:- The land East of Marsh Lane is Green Belt land. The land East of Marsh Lane is on a flood plain. Building 90 new homes will make additional demands on water supply. The proposed development is close to the Avon Valley and Dorset Heathland Special Protection areas and Ramsar site. The large influx of people to the 90 new homes is likely to have a detrimental effect on wildlife and there is uncertainty as to whether potential damage to the sensitive areas can be adequately mitigated. Access to the site for vehicles will cause planning difficulties because the heathland and the bungalows already East of Marsh Lane with their gardens etc form a barrier. There will be significant increase in traffic noise. This will have an adverse impact on quality of life in the adjoining area between the Fairmile Road and Marsh Lane. This is a quiet area that so far has remained undisturbed by noise. Planning should seek to preserve tranquillity, not introduce noise. 90 new homes will result in substantial additional traffic on Fairmile Road (B3073), a very busy highway, already severely congested at certain times. Christchurch has the worst traffic congestion in Dorset. Planning should aim to ease this, not add to it. 90 new homes will require new infrastructure and also more services. There is already huge pressure on schools, medical services, policing, social services etc. With services currently strained, it is difficult to envisage future provision being adequate. Restricting building development to brownfield sites will at least not add any more to urban sprawl and will help to ensure that Christchurch remains a place where time is pleasant. We cannot go on building indefinitely. I would be very interested to know what steps you intend to take to acknowledge local feeling and oppose Policy CN3, Land East of Marsh Lane – Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy. No new homes should be built in this location. I look forward to your reply</p>					
658117	Mr Mark Stone		CSPS1594	Policy CN 3							<p>No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI</p>				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)					
658119	Mr Jarvis Kay		CSPS1595	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
658125	Ms Jean Stevens		CSPS1596	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
658131	Mrs J Arenas		CSPS1598	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
658136	Mrs D Rogers		CSPS1599	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
658138	Mr Gary Shephard		CSPS1600	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:-				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	
											Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)						
658141	Mr M E Reynolds		CSPS1601	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies) Dear Councillor I note that the planning strategy for Christchurch Borough includes the building of 90 homes on Land East of Marsh Lane (Policy CN3). I recognise that a consultation is taking place but in addition to this I would like to point out the following planning problems:- The land East of Marsh Lane is Green Belt land. The land East of Marsh Lane is on a flood plain. Building 90 new homes will make additional demands on water supply. The proposed development is close to the Avon Valley and Dorset Heathland Special Protection areas and Ramsar site. The large influx of people to the 90 new homes is likely to have a detrimental effect on wildlife and there is uncertainty as to whether potential damage to the sensitive areas can be adequately mitigated. Access to the site for vehicles will cause planning difficulties because the heathland and the bungalows already East of Marsh Lane with their gardens etc form a barrier. There will be significant increase in traffic noise. This will have an adverse impact on quality of life in the adjoining area between the Fairmile Road and Marsh Lane. This is a quiet area that so far has remained undisturbed by noise. Planning should seek to preserve tranquillity, not introduce noise. 90 new homes will result in substantial additional traffic on Fairmile Road (B3073), a very busy highway,					317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>already severely congested at certain times. Christchurch has the worst traffic congestion in Dorset. Planning should aim to ease this, not add to it. 90 new homes will require new infrastructure and also more services. There is already huge pressure on schools, medical services, policing, social services etc. With services currently strained, it is difficult to envisage future provision being adequate. Restricting building development to brownfield sites will at least not add any more to urban sprawl and will help to ensure that Christchurch remains a place where time is pleasant. We cannot go on building indefinitely.</p> <p>I would be very interested to know what steps you intend to take to acknowledge local feeling and oppose Policy CN3, Land East of Marsh Lane – Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy. No new homes should be built in this location.</p> <p>I look forward to your reply</p>					
658164	Miss Cheryl Maling		CSPS1613	Policy CN 3							<p>No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)</p>				317	
658174	Mr Barry Channon		CSPS1618	Policy CN 3							<p>No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)</p>				317	
658175	Mr & Mrs Dow		CSPS1619	Policy CN 3							<p>No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise</p>				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies) Dear Councillor I note that the planning strategy for Christchurch Borough includes the building of 90 homes on Land East of Marsh Lane (Policy CN3). I recognise that a consultation is taking place but in addition to this I would like to point out the following planning problems:- The land East of Marsh Lane is Green Belt land and on a flood plain. Building 90 new homes will make additional demands on water supply. The proposed development is close to the Avon Valley and Dorset Heathland Special Protection areas and Ramsar site. The large influx of people to the 90 new homes is likely to have a detrimental effect on wildlife and there is uncertainty as to whether potential damage to the sensitive areas can be adequately mitigated. Access to the site for vehicles will cause planning difficulties because the heathland and the bungalows already East of Marsh Lane with their gardens etc form a barrier. There will be significant increase in traffic noise. This will have an adverse impact on quality of life in the adjoining area between the Fairmile Road and Marsh Lane. This is a quiet area that so far has remained undisturbed by noise. Planning should seek to preserve tranquillity, not introduce noise. 90 new homes will result in substantial additional traffic on Fairmile Road (B3073), a very busy highway, already severely congested at certain times. Christchurch has the worst traffic congestion in Dorset. Planning should aim to ease this, not add to it. 90 new homes will require new infrastructure and also more services. There is already huge pressure on schools, medical services, policing, social services etc. With services currently strained, it is difficult to envisage future provision being adequate. Developments are also planned at Parley Cross and Roeshot Hill. These developments, together with the building East of Marsh Lane, will have a huge impact on the B3073 and other roads. This will not only affect residents, it will also damage tourism. Restricting building development to brownfield sites will at least not add any more to urban sprawl and will help to ensure that Christchurch remains a place where time is pleasant. We cannot go on building indefinitely. I would ask you, please, to address the planning irregularities outlined above by deleting Policy CN3,</p>					

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											Land East of Marsh Lane, from the Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy. No new homes should be built in this location.					
658177	Mr & Mrs M Taylor		CSPS1621	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
658179	Mr T Francis		CSPS1622	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
658183	Mrs Christine Perry		CSPS1625	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies) Dear Councillor I note that the planning strategy for Christchurch Borough includes the building of 90 homes on Land East of Marsh Lane (Policy CN3). I recognise that a consultation is taking place but in addition to this I would like to point out the following planning problems:- The land East of Marsh Lane is Green Belt land and on a flood plain. Building 90 new homes will make additional demands on water supply. The proposed development is close to the Avon Valley and Dorset Heathland Special Protection areas and Ramsar site. The large influx of people to the 90 new				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>homes is likely to have a detrimental effect on wildlife and there is uncertainty as to whether potential damage to the sensitive areas can be adequately mitigated.</p> <p>Access to the site for vehicles will cause planning difficulties because the heathland and the bungalows already East of Marsh Lane with their gardens etc form a barrier.</p> <p>There will be significant increase in traffic noise. This will have an adverse impact on quality of life in the adjoining area between the Fairmile Road and Marsh Lane. This is a quiet area that so far has remained undisturbed by noise. Planning should seek to preserve tranquillity, not introduce noise.</p> <p>90 new homes will result in substantial additional traffic on Fairmile Road (B3073), a very busy highway, already severely congested at certain times. Christchurch has the worst traffic congestion in Dorset. Planning should aim to ease this, not add to it.</p> <p>90 new homes will require new infrastructure and also more services. There is already huge pressure on schools, medical services, policing, social services etc. With services currently strained, it is difficult to envisage future provision being adequate.</p> <p>Developments are also planned at Parley Cross and Roeshot Hill. These developments, together with the building East of Marsh Lane, will have a huge impact on the B3073 and other roads. This will not only affect residents, it will also damage tourism.</p> <p>Restricting building development to brownfield sites will at least not add any more to urban sprawl and will help to ensure that Christchurch remains a place where time is pleasant. We cannot go on building indefinitely.</p> <p>I would ask you, please, to address the planning irregularities outlined above by deleting Policy CN3, Land East of Marsh Lane, from the Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy. No new homes should be built in this location.</p>					
658184	Ms Christine Robertson		CSPS1629	Policy CN 3							<p>No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)</p>				317	
658187	Mr		CSPS1630	Policy							<p>No – Our Objections Are:</p>				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
	Gavin Foxwell			CN 3							Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)					
658189	Ms Sian Golden		CSPS1633	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
658190	Mr David Port		CSPS1632	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
658195	Mr James Tunnicliffe		CSPS1640	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
658198	Mr Don Thomas		CSPS1641	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)					
658200	Mr Stephen Walker		CSPS1645	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
658222	Miss Susan Crow and Mr David Fenner		CSPS1655	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies) Dear Councillor I note that the planning strategy for Christchurch Borough includes the building of 90 homes on Land East of Marsh Lane (Policy CN3). I recognise that a consultation is taking place but in addition to this I would like to point out the following planning problems:- The land East of Marsh Lane is Green Belt land. The land East of Marsh Lane is on a flood plain. Building 90 new homes will make additional demands on water supply. The proposed development is close to the Avon Valley and Dorset Heathland Special Protection areas and Ramsar site. The large influx of people to the 90 new homes is likely to have a detrimental effect on wildlife and there is uncertainty as to whether potential damage to the sensitive areas can be adequately mitigated. Access to the site for vehicles will cause planning difficulties because the heathland and the bungalows already East of Marsh Lane with their gardens etc form a barrier. There will be significant increase in traffic noise. This will have an adverse impact on quality of life in the				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>adjoining area between the Fairmile Road and Marsh Lane. This is a quiet area that so far has remained undisturbed by noise. Planning should seek to preserve tranquillity, not introduce noise.</p> <p>90 new homes will result in substantial additional traffic on Fairmile Road (B3073), a very busy highway, already severely congested at certain times.</p> <p>Christchurch has the worst traffic congestion in Dorset. Planning should aim to ease this, not add to it.</p> <p>90 new homes will require new infrastructure and also more services. There is already huge pressure on schools, medical services, policing, social services etc. With services currently strained, it is difficult to envisage future provision being adequate.</p> <p>Restricting building development to brownfield sites will at least not add any more to urban sprawl and will help to ensure that Christchurch remains a place where time is pleasant. We cannot go on building indefinitely.</p> <p>I would be very interested to know what steps you intend to take to acknowledge local feeling and oppose Policy CN3, Land East of Marsh Lane – Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy. No new homes should be built in this location.</p> <p>I look forward to your reply</p>					
658224	Mrs Anne-Marie Walker		CSPS1656	Policy CN 3							<p>No – our objections are:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies) <p>Dear Councillor</p> <p>I note that the planning strategy for Christchurch Borough includes the building of 90 homes on Land East of Marsh Lane (Policy CN3). I recognise that a consultation is taking place but in addition to this I would like to point out the following planning problems:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The land East of Marsh Lane is Green Belt land and on a flood plain. Building 90 new homes will make additional demands on water supply. The proposed development is close to the Avon Valley and Dorset Heathland Special Protection areas and Ramsar site. The large influx of people to the 90 new homes is likely to have a detrimental effect on wildlife 				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>and there is uncertainty as to whether potential damage to the sensitive areas can be adequately mitigated.</p> <p>Access to the site for vehicles will cause planning difficulties because the heathland and the bungalows already East of Marsh Lane with their gardens etc form a barrier.</p> <p>There will be significant increase in traffic noise. This will have an adverse impact on quality of life in the adjoining area between the Fairmile Road and Marsh Lane. This is a quiet area that so far has remained undisturbed by noise. Planning should seek to preserve tranquillity, not introduce noise.</p> <p>90 new homes will result in substantial additional traffic on Fairmile Road (B3073), a very busy highway, already severely congested at certain times.</p> <p>Christchurch has the worst traffic congestion in Dorset. Planning should aim to ease this, not add to it.</p> <p>90 new homes will require new infrastructure and also more services. There is already huge pressure on schools, medical services, policing, social services etc. With services currently strained, it is difficult to envisage future provision being adequate.</p> <p>Developments are also planned at Parley Cross and Roeshot Hill. These developments, together with the building East of Marsh Lane, will have a huge impact on the B3073 and other roads. This will not only affect residents, it will also damage tourism.</p> <p>Restricting building development to brownfield sites will at least not add any more to urban sprawl and will help to ensure that Christchurch remains a place where time is pleasant. We cannot go on building indefinitely.</p> <p>I would ask you, please, to address the planning irregularities outlined above by deleting Policy CN3, Land East of Marsh Lane, from the Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy. No new homes should be built in this location.</p>					
658229	Mrs Gladys Halsey		CSPS1657	Policy CN 3							<p>No – Our Objections Are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies) <p>Dear Councillor</p> <p>I note that the planning strategy for Christchurch</p>				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>Borough includes the building of 90 homes on Land East of Marsh Lane (Policy CN3). I recognise that a consultation is taking place but in addition to this I would like to point out the following planning problems:-</p> <p>The land East of Marsh Lane is Green Belt land and on a flood plain.</p> <p>Building 90 new homes will make additional demands on water supply.</p> <p>The proposed development is close to the Avon Valley and Dorset Heathland Special Protection areas and Ramsar site. The large influx of people to the 90 new homes is likely to have a detrimental effect on wildlife and there is uncertainty as to whether potential damage to the sensitive areas can be adequately mitigated.</p> <p>Access to the site for vehicles will cause planning difficulties because the heathland and the bungalows already East of Marsh Lane with their gardens etc form a barrier.</p> <p>There will be significant increase in traffic noise. This will have an adverse impact on quality of life in the adjoining area between the Fairmile Road and Marsh Lane. This is a quiet area that so far has remained undisturbed by noise. Planning should seek to preserve tranquillity, not introduce noise.</p> <p>90 new homes will result in substantial additional traffic on Fairmile Road (B3073), a very busy highway, already severely congested at certain times.</p> <p>Christchurch has the worst traffic congestion in Dorset. Planning should aim to ease this, not add to it.</p> <p>90 new homes will require new infrastructure and also more services. There is already huge pressure on schools, medical services, policing, social services etc. With services currently strained, it is difficult to envisage future provision being adequate.</p> <p>Developments are also planned at Parley Cross and Roeshot Hill. These developments, together with the building East of Marsh Lane, will have a huge impact on the B3073 and other roads. This will not only affect residents, it will also damage tourism.</p> <p>Restricting building development to brownfield sites will at least not add any more to urban sprawl and will help to ensure that Christchurch remains a place where time is pleasant. We cannot go on building indefinitely.</p> <p>I would ask you, please, to address the planning irregularities outlined above by deleting Policy CN3, Land East of Marsh Lane, from the Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy. No new homes should be built in this location.</p>					

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	
658231	Miss Samantha Dollin										<p>No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies) Dear Councillor I note that the planning strategy for Christchurch Borough includes the building of 90 homes on Land East of Marsh Lane (Policy CN3). I recognise that a consultation is taking place but in addition to this I would like to point out the following planning problems:- The land East of Marsh Lane is Green Belt land. The land East of Marsh Lane is on a flood plain. Building 90 new homes will make additional demands on water supply. The proposed development is close to the Avon Valley and Dorset Heathland Special Protection areas and Ramsar site. The large influx of people to the 90 new homes is likely to have a detrimental effect on wildlife and there is uncertainty as to whether potential damage to the sensitive areas can be adequately mitigated. Access to the site for vehicles will cause planning difficulties because the heathland and the bungalows already East of Marsh Lane with their gardens etc form a barrier. There will be significant increase in traffic noise. This will have an adverse impact on quality of life in the adjoining area between the Fairmile Road and Marsh Lane. This is a quiet area that so far has remained undisturbed by noise. Planning should seek to preserve tranquillity, not introduce noise. 90 new homes will result in substantial additional traffic on Fairmile Road (B3073), a very busy highway, already severely congested at certain times. Christchurch has the worst traffic congestion in Dorset. Planning should aim to ease this, not add to it. 90 new homes will require new infrastructure and also more services. There is already huge pressure on schools, medical services, policing, social services etc. With services currently strained, it is difficult to envisage future provision being adequate. Restricting building development to brownfield sites will at least not add any more to urban sprawl and will help to ensure that Christchurch remains a place</p>						

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											where time is pleasant. We cannot go on building indefinitely. I would be very interested to know what steps you intend to take to acknowledge local feeling and oppose Policy CN3, Land East of Marsh Lane – Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy. No new homes should be built in this location. I look forward to your reply					
658233	Mr Gareth Smith		CSPS1659	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
658238	Mr & Mrs D S Whatman		CSPS1660	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
658239	Mrs P.C Melvin		CSPS1661	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
658241	Ms Cher Lourens		CSPS1662	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)					
658242	Mr Paul Stockley		CSPS1663	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
658244	Ms Janine Stockley		CSPS1664	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
658246	Mr & Mrs N Major		CSPS1665	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
658247	Mr & Mrs Challoner		CSPS1667	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
658249	Mr Andrew Morris		CSPS1668	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are:				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)					
658250	Mr Graham Lemon		CSPS1669	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
648946	Ms Barbara Hamilton		CSPS1751	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
657002	Mr Jose Arenas		CSPS1783	Policy CN 3	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Traffic congestion SSSI impact and many others	Not compliant			317	
657004	Mrs Lynda Booker		CSPS1780	Policy CN 3	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Too close to river and filter beds. Area will be disrupted and elderly residents disturbed. Noise from traffic and road congestion. The following comments also submitted on circulated extract of leaflet:- No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding	Not sound.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies) Dear Councillor I note that the planning strategy for Christchurch Borough includes the building of 90 homes on Land East of Marsh Lane (Policy CN3). I recognise that a consultation is taking place but in addition to this I would like to point out the following planning problems:- The land East of Marsh Lane is Green Belt land and on a flood plain. Building 90 new homes will make additional demands on water supply. The proposed development is close to the Avon Valley and Dorset Heathland Special Protection areas and Ramsar site. The large influx of people to the 90 new homes is likely to have a detrimental effect on wildlife and there is uncertainty as to whether potential damage to the sensitive areas can be adequately mitigated. Access to the site for vehicles will cause planning difficulties because the heathland and the bungalows already East of Marsh Lane with their gardens etc form a barrier. There will be significant increase in traffic noise. This will have an adverse impact on quality of life in the adjoining area between the Fairmile Road and Marsh Lane. This is a quiet area that so far has remained undisturbed by noise. Planning should seek to preserve tranquillity, not introduce noise. 90 new homes will result in substantial additional traffic on Fairmile Road (B3073), a very busy highway, already severely congested at certain times. Christchurch has the worst traffic congestion in Dorset. Planning should aim to ease this, not add to it. 90 new homes will require new infrastructure and also more services. There is already huge pressure on schools, medical services, policing, social services etc. With services currently strained, it is difficult to envisage future provision being adequate. Developments are also planned at Parley Cross and Roeshot Hill. These developments, together with the building East of Marsh Lane, will have a huge impact on the B3073 and other roads. This will not only affect residents, it will also damage tourism. Restricting building development to brownfield sites will at least not add any more to urban sprawl and will help to ensure that Christchurch remains a place where time is pleasant. We cannot go on building indefinitely.</p>					

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											I would ask you, please, to address the planning irregularities outlined above by deleting Policy CN3, Land East of Marsh Lane, from the Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy. No new homes should be built in this location.					
657006	Mr Brian Antill		CSPS1778	Policy CN 3	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Loss of green belt. Traffic congestion / road safety. Wildlife. SSSI site nearby.	none			317	
657008	Mrs Jacqueline Habgood		CSPS1776	Policy CN 3	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No thought been given to surrounding area. Loss of green belts. Mosquito and flies around river and flood plain. Traffic congestion Noise	Not compatible. It ruins our estate.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		317	
657014	Mrs Julia Lo Nigro		CSPS1773	Policy CN 3	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Area not conducive to the range of buildings. Green belt. Flood plain. Traffic congestion. No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)	None.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	To meet inspector.	317	
657015	Mr Barrie Nott		CSPS1764	Policy CN 3	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Policy CN3 Section 1: "The Green Belt boundary will be amended to exclude land identified for new housing". To quote planning minister, Greg Clarke (Feb 2012). "Only in exceptional circumstances should Green Belt boundaries be amended, and only after robust public consultation and independent examination of the draft proposal". Dear Councillor I note that the planning strategy for Christchurch Borough includes the building of 90 homes on Land East of Marsh Lane (Policy CN3). I recognise that a consultation is taking place but in addition to this I would like to point out the following planning problems:- The land East of Marsh Lane is Green Belt land and on a flood plain. Building 90 new homes will make additional demands on water supply. The proposed development is close to the Avon Valley and Dorset Heathland Special Protection areas and Ramsar site. The large influx of people to the 90 new	Not legally compliant.			317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>homes is likely to have a detrimental effect on wildlife and there is uncertainty as to whether potential damage to the sensitive areas can be adequately mitigated.</p> <p>Access to the site for vehicles will cause planning difficulties because the heathland and the bungalows already East of Marsh Lane with their gardens etc form a barrier.</p> <p>There will be significant increase in traffic noise. This will have an adverse impact on quality of life in the adjoining area between the Fairmile Road and Marsh Lane. This is a quiet area that so far has remained undisturbed by noise. Planning should seek to preserve tranquillity, not introduce noise.</p> <p>90 new homes will result in substantial additional traffic on Fairmile Road (B3073), a very busy highway, already severely congested at certain times. Christchurch has the worst traffic congestion in Dorset. Planning should aim to ease this, not add to it.</p> <p>90 new homes will require new infrastructure and also more services. There is already huge pressure on schools, medical services, policing, social services etc. With services currently strained, it is difficult to envisage future provision being adequate.</p> <p>Developments are also planned at Parley Cross and Roeshot Hill. These developments, together with the building East of Marsh Lane, will have a huge impact on the B3073 and other roads. This will not only affect residents, it will also damage tourism.</p> <p>Restricting building development to brownfield sites will at least not add any more to urban sprawl and will help to ensure that Christchurch remains a place where time is pleasant. We cannot go on building indefinitely.</p> <p>I would ask you, please, to address the planning irregularities outlined above by deleting Policy CN3, Land East of Marsh Lane, from the Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy. No new homes should be built in this location.</p>					
657019	Mrs Margaret Stephenson		CSPS1763	Policy CN 3	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Loss of green belt. No adequate access points. Flood plain - mosquitoes and flies. Wildlife in danger.	Not suitable.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	Important for estate.	317	
657022	Miss Ingrid Powers		CSPS1759	Policy CN 3	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	<p>Why are you building on green belt land that is quiet and attractive, which also houses wildlife, e.g. horses and cows when there is a large area empty on Bronte Avenue (near to Fairmile) which is crying out for development? Totally unsound plan and there has been no thought of the impact of high buildings and the noise levels on what is essentially an area of elderly people living nearby and surrounding areas.</p> <p>18.6.12 - Also submitted the following comments on</p>	Please do not build on green belt land - look at large area down Bronte Avenue which is lying vacant.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											circulated extract of leaflet:- No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)					
657059	Mr and Mrs T R Beaumont		CSPS1893	Policy CN 3							Does not meet the test of soundness. No credible evidence justifying moving the Green Belt boundary for housing development. If the 90 dwellings proposed are required they should be built on existing Brown Field sites within the Borough.				317	
657062	Mrs Jane Morgan		CSPS1882	Policy CN 3	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	This development CN3 should not go through because this area is a existing green belt piece of land. This is one of the reasons I bought this property and that it was a quiet retirement estate which enjoys the countryside around it. This will impact on my quality of life and the safety of my property. As it is not overlooked at all I do not need or want my privacy impacted by these unreasonably plans.	The area of Christchurch is so over developed for the infrastructure and we should resist any of these silly imposing and unsettling planning stunts. You should direct these well needed estates in northern towns which have exhausted industries that can be converted without changing centuries old rules of green belt land.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		317	
657087	Mr John Philip Bareham		CSPS1881	Policy CN 3	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Too close to flood plain. Take notice of the recent Wales disaster we could have the same type of weather. Not enough access for type of development could be up to 180 vehicles. 2/3 of boundary to proposed development is a private estate of 39 bungalows (Bronte Park anagement LTD) for retired residents.	Not to build close to flood plain, this could be a disaster in the making and could be down to you if you do not take advice.			317	
657087	Mr John Philip Bareham		CSPS1781	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
658463	Major Stephen Taylor		CSPS1725	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
658468	Ms Julie Kelly		CSPS1727	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
658474	Mr E Beesley		CSPS1729	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
658477	Ms N Hallam & Mr G Higley		CSPS1731	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
658480	Mr Nigel Stephens		CSPS1732	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)					
658484	Mr Warren Douglas		CSPS1733	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
658489	Mr D R Bartlett		CSPS1735	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
658491	Mr Brian Cran		CSPS1736	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
658496	Mr N A L Sheikley		CSPS1737	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)					
658498	Ms Elsie Smith		CSPS1738	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
658500	Mr M Bayati		CSPS1739	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
658505	Mr Nigel Spencer		CSPS1742	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
658506	Mr Daniel Parker		CSPS1743	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
658508	Mr & Mrs Feller		CSPS1744	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)					
658509	Mr Rob Carper		CSPS1745	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
658515	Mrs A Rees		CSPS1746	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
658522	Mr Steve Collins		CSPS1748	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
658527	Mrs Natasha Halliwell		CSPS1752	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)					
658528	Mr Clive King		CSPS1755	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
658533	Mrs Clare Cochrane		CSPS1758	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
658536	Ms Debbie Patton		CSPS1760	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
658542	Mr S Green		CSPS1762	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
658559	Mrs J Garnett		CSPS1767	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are:				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
	Brown										Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)					
658561	Mrs Amanda Jenkins		CSPS1770	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
658563	J Stephenson		CSPS1772	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
658564	Mrs Anne Nott		CSPS1775	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies) Dear Councillor I note that the planning strategy for Christchurch Borough includes the building of 90 homes on Land East of Marsh Lane (Policy CN3). I recognise that a consultation is taking place but in addition to this I would like to point out the following planning problems:-				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>The land East of Marsh Lane is Green Belt land. The land East of Marsh Lane is on a flood plain. Building 90 new homes will make additional demands on water supply.</p> <p>The proposed development is close to the Avon Valley and Dorset Heathland Special Protection areas and Ramsar site. The large influx of people to the 90 new homes is likely to have a detrimental effect on wildlife and there is uncertainty as to whether potential damage to the sensitive areas can be adequately mitigated.</p> <p>Access to the site for vehicles will cause planning difficulties because the heathland and the bungalows already East of Marsh Lane with their gardens etc form a barrier.</p> <p>There will be significant increase in traffic noise. This will have an adverse impact on quality of life in the adjoining area between the Fairmile Road and Marsh Lane. This is a quiet area that so far has remained undisturbed by noise. Planning should seek to preserve tranquillity, not introduce noise.</p> <p>90 new homes will result in substantial additional traffic on Fairmile Road (B3073), a very busy highway, already severely congested at certain times. Christchurch has the worst traffic congestion in Dorset. Planning should aim to ease this, not add to it.</p> <p>90 new homes will require new infrastructure and also more services. There is already huge pressure on schools, medical services, policing, social services etc. With services currently strained, it is difficult to envisage future provision being adequate.</p> <p>Restricting building development to brownfield sites will at least not add any more to urban sprawl and will help to ensure that Christchurch remains a place where time is pleasant. We cannot go on building indefinitely.</p> <p>I would be very interested to know what steps you intend to take to acknowledge local feeling and oppose Policy CN3, Land East of Marsh Lane – Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy. No new homes should be built in this location.</p> <p>I look forward to your reply</p>					
658565	Mr Joe Sweeney		CSPS1777	Policy CN 3							<p>No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise</p>				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)					
658568	Ms Tracey Graham		CSPS1779	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
658571	Mr Chris James		CSPS1782	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
658572	Mr Andrew Simmons		CSPS1784	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
658576	Ms & Mr Nicola & Neal Simpson & Smith		CSPS1788	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
658578	Mr John Hadley		CSPS1790	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)					
658579	Dr Debbie Lewis		CSPS1792	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
658581	Mrs Vanessa Webb		CSPS1800	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
658588	Ms Susan Morris		CSPS1801	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
658592	Mr F W Thomas		CSPS1803	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)					
658595	Miss Andrea Lewis		CSPS1805	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
658599	Mr Carl Phillips		CSPS1806	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
658602	Mr Paul Chandler		CSPS1807	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
658605	Dr S R J Bellamy		CSPS1809	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	
658606	Ms Evelyn Gibby										<p>No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies) Dear Councillor I note that the planning strategy for Christchurch Borough includes the building of 90 homes on Land East of Marsh Lane (Policy CN3). I recognise that a consultation is taking place but in addition to this I would like to point out the following planning problems:- The land East of Marsh Lane is Green Belt land. The land East of Marsh Lane is on a flood plain. Building 90 new homes will make additional demands on water supply. The proposed development is close to the Avon Valley and Dorset Heathland Special Protection areas and Ramsar site. The large influx of people to the 90 new homes is likely to have a detrimental effect on wildlife and there is uncertainty as to whether potential damage to the sensitive areas can be adequately mitigated. Access to the site for vehicles will cause planning difficulties because the heathland and the bungalows already East of Marsh Lane with their gardens etc form a barrier. There will be significant increase in traffic noise. This will have an adverse impact on quality of life in the adjoining area between the Fairmile Road and Marsh Lane. This is a quiet area that so far has remained undisturbed by noise. Planning should seek to preserve tranquillity, not introduce noise. 90 new homes will result in substantial additional traffic on Fairmile Road (B3073), a very busy highway, already severely congested at certain times. Christchurch has the worst traffic congestion in Dorset. Planning should aim to ease this, not add to it. 90 new homes will require new infrastructure and also more services. There is already huge pressure on schools, medical services, policing, social services etc. With services currently strained, it is difficult to envisage future provision being adequate. Restricting building development to brownfield sites will at least not add any more to urban sprawl and will help to ensure that Christchurch remains a place</p>						

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											where time is pleasant. We cannot go on building indefinitely. I would be very interested to know what steps you intend to take to acknowledge local feeling and oppose Policy CN3, Land East of Marsh Lane – Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy. No new homes should be built in this location. I look forward to your reply					
658607	Mr Stephen Johnson		CSPS1811	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
658608	Mr Geoffrey Drummond		CSPS1815	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
658609	Ms Kim Summers		CSPS1816	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
658665	Ms Melanie Clark		CSPS1824	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)					
658692	S Jordon		CSPS1826	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
658697	L Grimaldi		CSPS1828	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
658715	Ms Liz Cox		CSPS1834	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
658781	Mrs Jillian Meaning		CSPS1843	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies) Dear Councillor I note that the planning strategy for Christchurch				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>Borough includes the building of 90 homes on Land East of Marsh Lane (Policy CN3). I recognise that a consultation is taking place but in addition to this I would like to point out the following planning problems:-</p> <p>The land East of Marsh Lane is Green Belt land. The land East of Marsh Lane is on a flood plain. Building 90 new homes will make additional demands on water supply. The proposed development is close to the Avon Valley and Dorset Heathland Special Protection areas and Ramsar site. The large influx of people to the 90 new homes is likely to have a detrimental effect on wildlife and there is uncertainty as to whether potential damage to the sensitive areas can be adequately mitigated. Access to the site for vehicles will cause planning difficulties because the heathland and the bungalows already East of Marsh Lane with their gardens etc form a barrier. There will be significant increase in traffic noise. This will have an adverse impact on quality of life in the adjoining area between the Fairmile Road and Marsh Lane. This is a quiet area that so far has remained undisturbed by noise. Planning should seek to preserve tranquillity, not introduce noise. 90 new homes will result in substantial additional traffic on Fairmile Road (B3073), a very busy highway, already severely congested at certain times. Christchurch has the worst traffic congestion in Dorset. Planning should aim to ease this, not add to it. 90 new homes will require new infrastructure and also more services. There is already huge pressure on schools, medical services, policing, social services etc. With services currently strained, it is difficult to envisage future provision being adequate. Restricting building development to brownfield sites will at least not add any more to urban sprawl and will help to ensure that Christchurch remains a place where time is pleasant. We cannot go on building indefinitely. I would be very interested to know what steps you intend to take to acknowledge local feeling and oppose Policy CN3, Land East of Marsh Lane – Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy. No new homes should be built in this location. I look forward to your reply</p>					
658794	Mrs Tina Harrop		CSPS1847	Policy CN 3							<p>No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access</p>				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)					
658796	Mrs B A Deering		CSPS1848	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
658803	Ms Julie Warren		CSPS1851	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
658808	Mr & Mrs J Davis		CSPS1855	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
658814	Mr Kevin Scares		CSPS1858	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)					
658821	Mr John Albert Medcalf		CSPS1859	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
658829	Mr Mark E Davey		CSPS1863	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
658836	Mr Austin Mark Hubbard		CSPS1868	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
658847	Mrs C A Sellers		CSPS1872	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
658853	L Arthur		CSPS1874	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)					
658906	Mr G Wedge		CSPS1883	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
658922	Mr Stephn C Palmer		CSPS1884	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
658946	Mr Christopher Guy		CSPS1887	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
658949	Mrs Elizabeth Jones		CSPS1889	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)					
658951	Mr Mark Elson		CSPS1892	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
658956	Mr & Mrs V Mills		CSPS1894	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
658967	Mrs S Vaughan		CSPS1898	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
359824	Mrs Carol Hellicar		CSPS2089	Policy CN 3							No comments - unaware of this area.				317	
612430	Mr Nick Squirrell	Natural England, Dorset and Somerset Team	CSPS1919	Policy CN 3	No	No	No	No	No	No	Policies; CN 1, CN 2, CN 3, WMC 3, WMC 4, WMC 5, WMC 6, FWP 3, FWP 4, FWP 6, FWP 7, FWP 8, VTSW 2, VTSW3, VTSW 4, VTSW 8 etc are all proposing development and or mitigation in the form of SANGs on greenfield locations. In order to avoid a conflict with policy ME1 at a later stage in the planning process Natural England advise the authorities to bring to the attention of those with an interest in these locations the need to carry out a basic biodiversity	Delete paragraphs 6.60-6.62, policy CN 3 and Map 6.4. The policies may need to include specific paragraphs about features of biodiversity importance which are to be secured or enhanced.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	The policy raises complex matters on demonstrating compliance with legislative considerations under the Habitats Regulations involving 2 distinctly different European sites.	317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>survey eg Phase 1 habitat survey including assessment of the likely presence or evidence of other features likely to restrict or delay development eg badger setts, priority species such as reptiles, water voles etc in time for consideration at the EIP. In many cases this will simply be a statement as the proposer has already engaged an ecological advisor.</p> <p>These policies appear to have been brought forward in an absence of adequate information and assessment on the biodiversity features held by the policy land. There is reason to suspect that on some there may be a significant biodiversity interest owing to close proximity with designated sites and or other biodiversity sites. The NPPF requires that planning policies should be based on up-to date information on the natural environment (paragraph 165). These policies are not shown to be compliant with this requirement. Thus, irrespective of the above matters concerning other nearby designated sites, it is not possible to identify whether the policies are compliant with policy considerations in the NPPF on sustainable development for the sites alone, especially the aspect on sustainable development set out in paragraph 9 of moving from a net loss of biodiversity to achieving net gains (for example on priory habitats and species). This policy is not legally compliant and unsound because:</p> <p>1. The housing proposal is of a scale and location likely to generate off site recreational and other pressures, including cat predation on ground nesting/feeding birds, on the Dorset Heathlands SPA, SAC and Ramsar site, especially the area at Town Common SSSI. These pressures raise a likely significant effect on the designated sites. There will be a need for significant mitigation, including but not solely the provision of SANG, to demonstrate that there would be no adverse effect on the integrity of the SPA/SAC/Ramsar site (under the Habitats Directive/Regulations) or harm to the SSSI. There is insufficient land at the site to provide both the proposed scale of housing and a SANG of sufficient size and quality to be confident that there would not be additional adverse pressures on the designated sites given the very close proximity and accessibility of the designated land and the high attractiveness of this land for access. There is no other land available to provide an adequate SANG in the locality, other than land in the Avon Valley SPA/Ramsar site and SSSI where provision a SANG would be contrary to Habitats Directive/Regulations requirements and policy for the protection of these sites.</p> <p>2. The housing proposal is of a scale and location</p>					

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>likely to generate off site recreational and other pressures, including cat predation on ground nesting/feeding birds, on the Avon Valley SPA and Ramsar site and SSSI. These pressures raise a likely significant effect on the designated sites, especially in relation to the designated bird features. The policy site has a long boundary that directly borders and almost borders land in these designated sites and we suggest this will not enable an adverse pressure from cat predation to be removed with any certainty. In respect of access, there will be a need for mitigation, such as land to divert access away from the Access Land in the designated sites, to demonstrate that there would be no other adverse effect on the integrity of the SPA/Ramsar site (under the Habitats Directive/Regulations) or harm to the SSSI. There is insufficient land at the site to provide both the proposed scale of housing and land of sufficient size and quality to be confident that there would not be additional adverse pressures on the designated sites given the very close proximity and accessibility of the Access Land in the designated sites and the attractiveness of this land for access. There is no other land available to provide an adequate alternative land for recreational access in the locality.</p> <p>3. The housing proposal will undermine the delivery of management on adjacent grazing marsh in the Avon Valley SPA and Ramsar site and SSSI that is essential to the conservation of the designated features. This is because the housing site will remove the availability of high land that currently acts to support grazing management of the designated grazing marsh by providing safe pasture for livestock to retreat to when the grazing marsh floods and other livestock management such as feeding that would be inappropriate if displaced onto the designated land and possibly not practicable on this land. These matters also raise a likely significant effect on these designated sites. Mitigation will be required in the form of available support land for grazing management of the designated sites. A land area, unless large in size and the scale of housing proposal does not provide this, will not be suitable to adequately perform both SANG functions for the heathland designated sites and grazing/management support functions for the Avon Valley designated sites. The pre-submission document does not demonstrate that adequate mitigation on this matter is deliverable.</p> <p>4. The policy appears to have been put forward in an absence of adequate information and assessment on the biodiversity features held by the policy land. There is reason to suspect that there may be a significant</p>					

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											biodiversity interest owing to its close proximity with designated sites, the history of non-intensive agricultural management and similarity of habitat with other high land nearby included within the Avon Valley SSSI for grassland interest features. The NPPF requires that planning policies should be based on up-to date information on the natural environment (paragraph 165). The policy is not shown to be compliant with this requirement. Thus, irrespective of the above matters concerning adjacent designated sites, it is not possible to identify whether the policy is compliant with policy considerations in the NPPF on sustainable development for the site alone, especially the aspect on sustainable development set out in paragraph 9 of moving from a net loss of biodiversity to achieving net gains (for example on priority habitats and species).					
657048	Mr Ian David Kirchin		CSPS2076	Policy CN 3							The land proposed for this development is adjacent to if not on a flood plain and Site of Special Scientific Interest. Does this not fly in the face of all government guidelines concerning sustainable development? Leave this important and delicate wildlife habitat well alone and look for suitable brownfield sites to build AFFORDABLE HOMES FOR LOCAL PEOPLE.				317	
657055	Mr and Mrs Gavin and Daf Kewley		CSPS1933	Policy CN 3							This appears to meet "appropriate" test as it extends existing housing, with 50%+ affordable housing, joining with existing industrial use. Existing infrastructure supports this within the Christchurch area with easy access to the town.				317	
657057	Mrs C Moss		CSPS1905	Policy CN 3							What is affordable? The local schools are already full. Doctors and hospital overloaded. The only good thing would be better transport. Also submitted the following comments on circulated extract of leaflet:- No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
657063	Mrs Pamela Scanlon		CSPS2114	Policy CN 3	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Increase risk of flooding: Health and safety issues from mosquitoes and flies, also adders. Traffic congestion. Disturbance to elderly population.	Not a good idea.			317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
657066	Miss Eileen Stephenson		CSPS2116	Policy CN 3	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No thought been given to surrounding areas. Loss of green belt. Flood risk. Traffic noise and congestion. Also submitted the following comments on circulated extract of leaflet:- No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)	None - not suitable.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	To ask questions.	317	
657067	Mr Edward Biggs		CSPS2124	Policy CN 3	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Bronte Park Bungalow Estate is an area where predominately older Christchurch residents have chosen retirement homes for their quiet, secluded setting. High density housing behind them will drastically change that. 90 families with cars, necessary delivery vans, lorries etc, will cause considerable disruption to this peaceful retirement catchment. Access roads will be needed? "Short-cuts" by the new residence is likely through the bungalow estate! Consideration is surely due to the present ratepayers who live quietly in Bronte Park Bungalows! Extra building coverage of already marshy land will cause land drainage problems in wet weather when the river levels rise and flood anyway. This will of course affect existing homes and possibly their house insurance costs? It's very questionable whether (1) Marshy land and adjacent river is a suitable or safe area for children to play, and (2) reserved heathland with important wildlife, including adders, is not a safe area either. 18.6.12 Also submitted the following comments on circulated extract of leaflet:- No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)	Do not amend "Green Belt" land to build on. Do not build on land liable to flooding where home owners may have trouble getting home insurance.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		317	
658986	M A Roberts		CSPS1911	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)					
658987	Mr Brian Allwin		CSPS1914	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
659156	Ms Julie Bishop		CSPS1987	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
659160	Mr Stephen Hearn		CSPS1988	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
659161	Mrs Sheila Anne Carson		CSPS1990	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)					
659166	Mrs Jean Rorbuck		CSPS1991	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
659168	Mr Martin King		CSPS1992	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
659171	Ms Julie Catherine Beech		CSPS1998	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
659172	Mrs McElwain		CSPS2002	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
659173	J Hurde		CSPS2005	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:-				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)					
659178	Mrs A Carpenter		CSPS2009	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
659253	Mr & Mrs Broom		CSPS2036	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
659255	Mrs Patricia West		CSPS2038	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
659256	Mr Alan Clarke		CSPS2039	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)					
659260	Mr Geraint Richards		CSPS2041	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
659262	Mr & Mrs Williams		CSPS2042	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
659264	Mr David Richards		CSPS2043	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
659266	Mrs Linda Goodman		CSPS2044	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
659267	Dr Ben Mason		CSPS2045	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
659270	Ms Sara Newman		CSPS2046	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
659271	Mr David Wilson		CSPS2047	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
657071	Mr Walter Pritchard		CSPS2128	Policy CN 3	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	This proposed plan is not sympathetic to the existing adjoining residents, who have bought our retirement properties with the knowledge that the surrounding land is green belt and heathland. The proposed changing of these boundaries are unjust and unfair and obviously in the planners oversight as an easy option. We have worked hard and deserve to retain what little we have left and we expect, not to be over developed, enclosed and expect this retirement area to have to deal with all the noise and upheaval of having an estate squeezed on an unsuitable plot.	This proposed plan should be scrapped, as the heathland and green belt should be protected at all costs. The need for extra housing should be focused on the development of brown field sites and conversion of existing buildings. The south cannot continue to be overdeveloped and other areas should shoulder more of the burden.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		317	
657079	Mr Charles Jones		CSPS2143	Policy CN 3	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Loss of greenbelt No safe access Increase in noise to elderly residents.	It is very clear that no thought has been given to existing residents. Maybe a site visit	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
												should happen.				
657083	Mrs Betty Bist		CSPS2159	Policy CN 3	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	<p>Loss of open space. Wildlife decimated. Flood plain. Traffic congestion. Elderly residents not happy with increased noise etc.</p> <p>Dear Councillor</p> <p>I note that the planning strategy for Christchurch Borough includes the building of 90 homes on Land East of Marsh Lane (Policy CN3). I recognise that a consultation is taking place but in addition to this I would like to point out the following planning problems:-</p> <p>The land East of Marsh Lane is Green Belt land and on a flood plain.</p> <p>Building 90 new homes will make additional demands on water supply.</p> <p>The proposed development is close to the Avon Valley and Dorset Heathland Special Protection areas and Ramsar site. The large influx of people to the 90 new homes is likely to have a detrimental effect on wildlife and there is uncertainty as to whether potential damage to the sensitive areas can be adequately mitigated.</p> <p>Access to the site for vehicles will cause planning difficulties because the heathland and the bungalows already East of Marsh Lane with their gardens etc form a barrier.</p> <p>There will be significant increase in traffic noise. This will have an adverse impact on quality of life in the adjoining area between the Fairmile Road and Marsh Lane. This is a quiet area that so far has remained undisturbed by noise. Planning should seek to preserve tranquillity, not introduce noise.</p> <p>90 new homes will result in substantial additional traffic on Fairmile Road (B3073), a very busy highway, already severely congested at certain times.</p> <p>Christchurch has the worst traffic congestion in Dorset. Planning should aim to ease this, not add to it.</p> <p>90 new homes will require new infrastructure and also more services. There is already huge pressure on schools, medical services, policing, social services etc. With services currently strained, it is difficult to envisage future provision being adequate.</p> <p>Developments are also planned at Parley Cross and Roeshot Hill. These developments, together with the building East of Marsh Lane, will have a huge impact on the B3073 and other roads. This will not only affect residents, it will also damage tourism.</p> <p>Restricting building development to brownfield sites will at least not add any more to urban sprawl and will help to ensure that Christchurch remains a place where time is pleasant. We cannot go on building</p>	Not suitable.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	To be made aware of continuation of strategy.	317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											indefinitely. I would ask you, please, to address the planning irregularities outlined above by deleting Policy CN3, Land East of Marsh Lane, from the Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy. No new homes should be built in this location.					
657115	Mrs Beatrice Smeed-Curd		CSPS2164	Policy CN 3	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Close to a SSSI site - wildlife will be affected. Flood plain - increased insurance costs. Congestion of traffic. H&S due to mosquitoes and flies. 18.6.12 - Also submitted the following comments on circulated extract of leaflet:- No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)	Not suitable.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		317	
657117	Mrs Maureen Jones		CSPS2170	Policy CN 3	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Unsound due to area of green belt and nearby river and filter beds.	Not viable.			317	
657118	Miss Faith Beesley		CSPS2147	Policy CN 3	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Nature environment at risk. Problems with noisy traffic and congestion in a peaceful area. Flood plain. Nearby river and filter beds - mosquitoes and flies. Dear Councillor I note that the planning strategy for Christchurch Borough includes the building of 90 homes on Land East of Marsh Lane (Policy CN3). I recognise that a consultation is taking place but in addition to this I would like to point out the following planning problems:- The land East of Marsh Lane is Green Belt land. The land East of Marsh Lane is on a flood plain. Building 90 new homes will make additional demands on water supply. The proposed development is close to the Avon Valley and Dorset Heathland Special Protection areas and Ramsar site. The large influx of people to the 90 new homes is likely to have a detrimental effect on wildlife and there is uncertainty as to whether potential damage to the sensitive areas can be adequately mitigated. Access to the site for vehicles will cause planning difficulties because the heathland and the bungalows already East of Marsh Lane with their gardens etc form a barrier.	Not effective or justifiable.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>There will be significant increase in traffic noise. This will have an adverse impact on quality of life in the adjoining area between the Fairmile Road and Marsh Lane. This is a quiet area that so far has remained undisturbed by noise. Planning should seek to preserve tranquillity, not introduce noise.</p> <p>90 new homes will result in substantial additional traffic on Fairmile Road (B3073), a very busy highway, already severely congested at certain times.</p> <p>Christchurch has the worst traffic congestion in Dorset. Planning should aim to ease this, not add to it.</p> <p>90 new homes will require new infrastructure and also more services. There is already huge pressure on schools, medical services, policing, social services etc. With services currently strained, it is difficult to envisage future provision being adequate.</p> <p>Restricting building development to brownfield sites will at least not add any more to urban sprawl and will help to ensure that Christchurch remains a place where time is pleasant. We cannot go on building indefinitely.</p> <p>I would be very interested to know what steps you intend to take to acknowledge local feeling and oppose Policy CN3, Land East of Marsh Lane – Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy. No new homes should be built in this location.</p> <p>I look forward to your reply</p>					
659272	Dr Karen Pendlebury		CSPS2049	Policy CN 3							<p>No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)</p> <p>Dear Councillor</p> <p>I note that the planning strategy for Christchurch Borough includes the building of 90 homes on Land East of Marsh Lane (Policy CN3). I recognise that a consultation is taking place but in addition to this I would like to point out the following planning problems:-</p> <p>The land East of Marsh Lane is Green Belt land. The land East of Marsh Lane is on a flood plain. Building 90 new homes will make additional demands on water supply. The proposed development is close to the Avon Valley and Dorset Heathland Special Protection areas and</p>				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>Ramsar site. The large influx of people to the 90 new homes is likely to have a detrimental effect on wildlife and there is uncertainty as to whether potential damage to the sensitive areas can be adequately mitigated.</p> <p>Access to the site for vehicles will cause planning difficulties because the heathland and the bungalows already East of Marsh Lane with their gardens etc form a barrier.</p> <p>There will be significant increase in traffic noise. This will have an adverse impact on quality of life in the adjoining area between the Fairmile Road and Marsh Lane. This is a quiet area that so far has remained undisturbed by noise. Planning should seek to preserve tranquillity, not introduce noise.</p> <p>90 new homes will result in substantial additional traffic on Fairmile Road (B3073), a very busy highway, already severely congested at certain times. Christchurch has the worst traffic congestion in Dorset. Planning should aim to ease this, not add to it.</p> <p>90 new homes will require new infrastructure and also more services. There is already huge pressure on schools, medical services, policing, social services etc. With services currently strained, it is difficult to envisage future provision being adequate.</p> <p>Restricting building development to brownfield sites will at least not add any more to urban sprawl and will help to ensure that Christchurch remains a place where time is pleasant. We cannot go on building indefinitely.</p> <p>I would be very interested to know what steps you intend to take to acknowledge local feeling and oppose Policy CN3, Land East of Marsh Lane – Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy. No new homes should be built in this location.</p> <p>I look forward to your reply</p>					
659273	Miss H Bishop		CSPS2051	Policy CN 3							<p>No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)</p>				317	
659275	Mrs K Alwin		CSPS2055	Policy CN 3							<p>No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access</p>				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)					
659277	Ms Natalie Kemp		CSPS2054	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
659278	Mr Andrew Flanagan		CSPS2056	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
659279	Mrs M J Allbut		CSPS2057	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
659280	Mr Jason Rabbets		CSPS2058	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	
											Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)						
659281	Mrs Lyn Squibb		CSPS2060	Policy CN 3							<p>No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies) Dear Councillor I note that the planning strategy for Christchurch Borough includes the building of 90 homes on Land East of Marsh Lane (Policy CN3). I recognise that a consultation is taking place but in addition to this I would like to point out the following planning problems:- The land East of Marsh Lane is Green Belt land and on a flood plain. Building 90 new homes will make additional demands on water supply. The proposed development is close to the Avon Valley and Dorset Heathland Special Protection areas and Ramsar site. The large influx of people to the 90 new homes is likely to have a detrimental effect on wildlife and there is uncertainty as to whether potential damage to the sensitive areas can be adequately mitigated. Access to the site for vehicles will cause planning difficulties because the heathland and the bungalows already East of Marsh Lane with their gardens etc form a barrier. There will be significant increase in traffic noise. This will have an adverse impact on quality of life in the adjoining area between the Fairmile Road and Marsh Lane. This is a quiet area that so far has remained undisturbed by noise. Planning should seek to preserve tranquillity, not introduce noise. 90 new homes will result in substantial additional traffic on Fairmile Road (B3073), a very busy highway, already severely congested at certain times. Christchurch has the worst traffic congestion in Dorset. Planning should aim to ease this, not add to it. 90 new homes will require new infrastructure and also more services. There is already huge pressure on schools, medical services, policing, social services etc. With services currently strained, it is difficult to envisage future provision being adequate.</p>					317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>Developments are also planned at Parley Cross and Roeshot Hill. These developments, together with the building East of Marsh Lane, will have a huge impact on the B3073 and other roads. This will not only affect residents, it will also damage tourism.</p> <p>Restricting building development to brownfield sites will at least not add any more to urban sprawl and will help to ensure that Christchurch remains a place where time is pleasant. We cannot go on building indefinitely.</p> <p>I would ask you, please, to address the planning irregularities outlined above by deleting Policy CN3, Land East of Marsh Lane, from the Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy. No new homes should be built in this location.</p>					
659282	Mrs Pauline Crouch		CSPS2061	Policy CN 3							<p>No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)</p>				317	
659436	Mr & Mrs Talbott		CSPS2126	Policy CN 3							<p>No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)</p>				317	
659437	Ms Diana Snell		CSPS2127	Policy CN 3							<p>No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)</p>				317	
659443	Mr & Mrs M J & J C		CSPS2137	Policy CN 3							<p>No – our objections are:-</p>				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	
	Daniels										Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)						
659445	Mr A Perry		CSPS2142	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies) Dear Councillor I note that the planning strategy for Christchurch Borough includes the building of 90 homes on Land East of Marsh Lane (Policy CN3). I recognise that a consultation is taking place but in addition to this I would like to point out the following planning problems:- The land East of Marsh Lane is Green Belt land. The land East of Marsh Lane is on a flood plain. Building 90 new homes will make additional demands on water supply. The proposed development is close to the Avon Valley and Dorset Heathland Special Protection areas and Ramsar site. The large influx of people to the 90 new homes is likely to have a detrimental effect on wildlife and there is uncertainty as to whether potential damage to the sensitive areas can be adequately mitigated. Access to the site for vehicles will cause planning difficulties because the heathland and the bungalows already East of Marsh Lane with their gardens etc form a barrier. There will be significant increase in traffic noise. This will have an adverse impact on quality of life in the adjoining area between the Fairmile Road and Marsh Lane. This is a quiet area that so far has remained undisturbed by noise. Planning should seek to preserve tranquillity, not introduce noise. 90 new homes will result in substantial additional traffic on Fairmile Road (B3073), a very busy highway,					317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>already severely congested at certain times. Christchurch has the worst traffic congestion in Dorset. Planning should aim to ease this, not add to it. 90 new homes will require new infrastructure and also more services. There is already huge pressure on schools, medical services, policing, social services etc. With services currently strained, it is difficult to envisage future provision being adequate. Restricting building development to brownfield sites will at least not add any more to urban sprawl and will help to ensure that Christchurch remains a place where time is pleasant. We cannot go on building indefinitely.</p> <p>I would be very interested to know what steps you intend to take to acknowledge local feeling and oppose Policy CN3, Land East of Marsh Lane – Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy. No new homes should be built in this location.</p> <p>I look forward to your reply</p>					
659451	Miss Claire Robinson		CSPS2145	Policy CN 3							<p>No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)</p>				317	
659490	Mr Stuart Clarke		CSPS2175	Policy CN 3							<p>No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)</p>				317	
659495	Mr John Raymond Brough		CSPS2178	Policy CN 3							<p>No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise</p>				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)					
659497	Mrs Samantha Rodwell		CSPS2180	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
659498	Mr Stephen Crockford		CSPS2182	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
659505	C Harris		CSPS2199	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
652947	Mrs Colette Riggs		CSPS2368	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies) I am writing to you regarding the proposed development behind Marsh Lane. I feel that these plans have not been thoroughly thought through for the				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>people of Christchurch at all. For a start this area is green belt, has many animals living on the area, is easily flooded and is a conservation area. Secondly, has anyone given any thought to the people that live near it? Not once have I seen a council officer in the area asking us how it will affect our lives? Affordable housing is needed no doubt in this area. However there are plenty of brown sites in Christchurch and particularly Mudeford/Highcliffe that are not being used at all, with derelict housing, why are you not using those? what do you propose to do about our over subscribed schools with all this extra housing in Fairmile and the antisocial behaviour problems that are increasing? The transport problems we already face which are not being addressed at all? GP facilities? The streets that are getting increasingly less cleaned. In my road I have witnessed the refuse van come with one member of staff, driving the van and collecting and emptying the bins single handed. I feel this is completely money driven and no thought to the local People who pay to live here or those that will end up in the properties has been considered. I ask you how many of the officers that have made these plans will be affected by living near it? Why are officers not out seeking appropriate places for these houses rather than causing all this upset to the local People. Please look at these plans again and make a sensible offer to the People of Christchurch.</p>					
659513	Ms Edna Harriss		CSPS2208	Policy CN 3							<p>No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)</p>				317	
659515	Mr Martin Wassell		CSPS2212	Policy CN 3							<p>No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety</p>				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)					
659519	C Marrant		CSPS2216	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
659521	Mrs Sarah Flatley		CSPS2219	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
659523	Mrs Norma Helena Doleman		CSPS2230	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
659528	F L Spicer		CSPS2249	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
659532	Mr BGV Peacock		CSPS2258	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)					
659536	Mr Leonard Carpenter		CSPS2261	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
659575	Ms Vera Graves		CSPS2273	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
659577	Mr David Randall		CSPS2274	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
659579	Mr & Mrs C Mackey		CSPS2275	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)					
659613	Mr & Mrs Richard & Alison Maidment		CSPS2285	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
659619	Mr & Mrs Robert and Jill Smith		CSPS2286	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
659626	Mr Ronald Kerry		CSPS2289	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
659636	Mr Andrew Fielding		CSPS2293	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
659643	Mrs Crisp		CSPS2300	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:-				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)					
659652	Mr Andrew Brindley		CSPS2307	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
659660	Mrs Jennifer King		CSPS2312	Policy CN 3											317	
659679	Ms Josephine Green		CSPS2336	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
659683	D M Addison		CSPS2340	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies) Dear Councillor I note that the planning strategy for Christchurch Borough includes the building of 90 homes on Land East of Marsh Lane (Policy CN3). I recognise that a				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>consultation is taking place but in addition to this I would like to point out the following planning problems:-</p> <p>The land East of Marsh Lane is Green Belt land. The land East of Marsh Lane is on a flood plain. Building 90 new homes will make additional demands on water supply. The proposed development is close to the Avon Valley and Dorset Heathland Special Protection areas and Ramsar site. The large influx of people to the 90 new homes is likely to have a detrimental effect on wildlife and there is uncertainty as to whether potential damage to the sensitive areas can be adequately mitigated. Access to the site for vehicles will cause planning difficulties because the heathland and the bungalows already East of Marsh Lane with their gardens etc form a barrier. There will be significant increase in traffic noise. This will have an adverse impact on quality of life in the adjoining area between the Fairmile Road and Marsh Lane. This is a quiet area that so far has remained undisturbed by noise. Planning should seek to preserve tranquillity, not introduce noise. 90 new homes will result in substantial additional traffic on Fairmile Road (B3073), a very busy highway, already severely congested at certain times. Christchurch has the worst traffic congestion in Dorset. Planning should aim to ease this, not add to it. 90 new homes will require new infrastructure and also more services. There is already huge pressure on schools, medical services, policing, social services etc. With services currently strained, it is difficult to envisage future provision being adequate. Restricting building development to brownfield sites will at least not add any more to urban sprawl and will help to ensure that Christchurch remains a place where time is pleasant. We cannot go on building indefinitely. I would be very interested to know what steps you intend to take to acknowledge local feeling and oppose Policy CN3, Land East of Marsh Lane – Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy. No new homes should be built in this location. I look forward to your reply</p>					
659686	Mrs D Dare		CSPS2344	Policy CN 3							<p>No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure</p>				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)					
659693	Mrs G Shanley		CSPS2352	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
659696	Ms Barbara Bist		CSPS2354	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
659701	Mr & Mrs D & C Eaton		CSPS2355	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
659704	Mrs Janet Holloway		CSPS2360	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
659707	Mr John Gary Easter		CSPS2365	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
659712	Mrs Wana Restall		CSPS2371	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
659721	Mrs J Jones		CSPS2376	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
659722	Mr Paul Hayes		CSPS2377	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies) Dear Councillor I note that the planning strategy for Christchurch Borough includes the building of 90 homes on Land East of Marsh Lane (Policy CN3). I recognise that a consultation is taking place but in addition to this I would like to point out the following planning				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>problems:- The land East of Marsh Lane is Green Belt land and on a flood plain. Building 90 new homes will make additional demands on water supply. The proposed development is close to the Avon Valley and Dorset Heathland Special Protection areas and Ramsar site. The large influx of people to the 90 new homes is likely to have a detrimental effect on wildlife and there is uncertainty as to whether potential damage to the sensitive areas can be adequately mitigated. Access to the site for vehicles will cause planning difficulties because the heathland and the bungalows already East of Marsh Lane with their gardens etc form a barrier. There will be significant increase in traffic noise. This will have an adverse impact on quality of life in the adjoining area between the Fairmile Road and Marsh Lane. This is a quiet area that so far has remained undisturbed by noise. Planning should seek to preserve tranquillity, not introduce noise. 90 new homes will result in substantial additional traffic on Fairmile Road (B3073), a very busy highway, already severely congested at certain times. Christchurch has the worst traffic congestion in Dorset. Planning should aim to ease this, not add to it. 90 new homes will require new infrastructure and also more services. There is already huge pressure on schools, medical services, policing, social services etc. With services currently strained, it is difficult to envisage future provision being adequate. Developments are also planned at Parley Cross and Roeshot Hill. These developments, together with the building East of Marsh Lane, will have a huge impact on the B3073 and other roads. This will not only affect residents, it will also damage tourism. Restricting building development to brownfield sites will at least not add any more to urban sprawl and will help to ensure that Christchurch remains a place where time is pleasant. We cannot go on building indefinitely. I would ask you, please, to address the planning irregularities outlined above by deleting Policy CN3, Land East of Marsh Lane, from the Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy. No new homes should be built in this location.</p>					
659727	Mrs H Arenas		CSPS2379	Policy CN 3							<p>No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access</p>				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)					
659732	Mr George Johnson		CSPS2384	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
659734	Mr J W Halsey		CSPS2385	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
659736	Mrs D Gadd		CSPS2386	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
659737	Ms Sophie Williams		CSPS2387	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)					
659740	Mr Peter Dean		CSPS2390	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
659742	Mr Barry Scott		CSPS2391	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
659745	Mr & Mrs P Hubbard		CSPS2393	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
656228	Mr Adrian Dwyer		CSPS2483	Policy CN 3							No. 1. The evidence is of no demand due to unprecedented levels of unsold properties. 2. The policy has not considered brownfield development				317	
656650	Mrs Patricia Fear		CSPS2441	Policy CN 3							No. Floodland. And nature reserve.				317	
656664	Mr Glen Morrison		CSPS2459	Policy CN 3							Christchurch Green Belt is diminishing to areas of residential development. Surrounding areas will be affected. The Fairmile Road will need to be accessed from both Bronte Avenue exit points adding further traffic to already primary traffic saturation points. Christchurch infrastructure will be stretched further				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											across all elements of the current framework ie roads, parking, household resources, water, energy footprint.					
659764	Mr Frank Walker		CSPS2415	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
659767	Mr Stuart Read		CSPS2416	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
659769	Mr Graham Whittaker		CSPS2419	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
659773	Mr Steve Rust		CSPS2421	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
659775	Mr Stephen Arnold		CSPS2423	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)					
659777	Mr & Mrs J Keehan		CSPS2425	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
659778	Mr Calvin Gray		CSPS2426	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
659780	Mrs Joan Smith		CSPS2427	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
659783	Mr John Burst		CSPS2428	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)					
659784	Mr A Hopkins		CSPS2429	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
659786	Mrs Miranda Cozens		CSPS2430	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
659788	R G Dutton		CSPS2431	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
659789	Ms Vicki Read		CSPS2432	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
659790	D Mife		CSPS2433	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
659791	Mrs Maureen Edwards		CSPS2434	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
659792	Mr Kenneth Edwards		CSPS2435	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
659794	Mr Richard Hislam		CSPS2437	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
659795	Mr & Ms Robert & Anne Staite		CSPS2439	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)					
659797	Mr C Nicholls		CSPS2443	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
659798	Ms Ffion Maund		CSPS2444	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
510796	Mr Rollo Reid		CSPS2718	Policy CN 3							No. Not needed. Not wanted. On flood plane. Only a loony would build here				317	
654854	Mrs Jeannie Seymour		CSPS2873	Policy CN 3							No. Green Belt land should be retained.				317	
656369	Mr Timothy Peter Cook	John Reid and Sons (Strucsteel) Ltd	CSPS2769	Policy CN 3							No. Roads too congested for travel development here.				317	
656426	Mrs Pauline Pritchard		CSPS2754	Policy CN 3							Do not know this area - as only a resident of Burton for the last year.				317	
656527	Ms Nicole Cox		CSPS2811	Policy CN 3							Great idea.				317	
656527	Ms Nicole Cox		CSPS2812	Policy CN 3											317	
656529	T Pratt		CSPS2818	Policy CN 3							A minor extension makes sense.				317	
656534	Mr Rob Warn		CSPS2823	Policy CN 3							Makes sense as little impact.				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
656536	Ms Wendy Voller		CSPS2830	Policy CN 3							Agree.				317	
656567	Mr Michael D Chappell		CSPS2862	Policy CN 3							No. Green Belt land should not be used, especially when brownfield sites are available.				317	
654861	Mr John Alborough		CSPS3013	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
660544	Mr Anthony Hawksworth		CSPS2883	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
660554	Mr & Mrs S Constantine		CSPS2888	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
660563	Mr Robert Davies		CSPS2891	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
660572	Ms Susan Knight		CSPS2893	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
660752	Mr David S Gurd		CSPS2908	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
660763	Ms Maureen Hodgkins		CSPS2909	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
660784	Mr David Brown		CSPS2912	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
660792	Mr Richard Cordery		CSPS2915	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies) Dear Councillor I note that the planning strategy for Christchurch Borough includes the building of 90 homes on Land East of Marsh Lane (Policy CN3). I recognise that a consultation is taking place but in addition to this I would like to point out the following planning problems:- The land East of Marsh Lane is Green Belt land. The land East of Marsh Lane is on a flood plain. Building 90 new homes will make additional demands on water supply. The proposed development is close to the Avon Valley and Dorset Heathland Special Protection areas and Ramsar site. The large influx of people to the 90 new homes is likely to have a detrimental effect on wildlife and there is uncertainty as to whether potential damage to the sensitive areas can be adequately mitigated. Access to the site for vehicles will cause planning difficulties because the heathland and the bungalows already East of Marsh Lane with their gardens etc form a barrier. There will be significant increase in traffic noise. This will have an adverse impact on quality of life in the adjoining area between the Fairmile Road and Marsh Lane. This is a quiet area that so far has remained undisturbed by noise. Planning should seek to preserve tranquillity, not introduce noise. 90 new homes will result in substantial additional traffic on Fairmile Road (B3073), a very busy highway, already severely congested at certain times. Christchurch has the worst traffic congestion in Dorset. Planning should aim to ease this, not add to it. 90 new homes will require new infrastructure and also more services. There is already huge pressure on schools, medical services, policing, social services etc. With services currently strained, it is difficult to envisage future provision being adequate. Restricting building development to brownfield sites will at least not add any more to urban sprawl and will help to ensure that Christchurch remains a place where time is pleasant. We cannot go on building indefinitely. I would be very interested to know what steps you intend to take to acknowledge local feeling and oppose Policy CN3, Land East of Marsh Lane – Christchurch</p>					

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											and East Dorset Core Strategy. No new homes should be built in this location. I look forward to your reply					
660816	Mr Michael Keynes		CSPS2925	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
660820	M W Shanley		CSPS2926	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
660825	Mr & Mrs G D & E A Morse		CSPS2927	Policy CN 3							Dear Councillor I note that the planning strategy for Christchurch Borough includes the building of 90 homes on Land East of Marsh Lane (Policy CN3). I recognise that a consultation is taking place but in addition to this I would like to point out the following planning problems:- The land East of Marsh Lane is Green Belt land and on a flood plain. Building 90 new homes will make additional demands on water supply. The proposed development is close to the Avon Valley and Dorset Heathland Special Protection areas and Ramsar site. The large influx of people to the 90 new homes is likely to have a detrimental effect on wildlife and there is uncertainty as to whether potential damage to the sensitive areas can be adequately mitigated. Access to the site for vehicles will cause planning difficulties because the heathland and the bungalows already East of Marsh Lane with their gardens etc form a barrier. There will be significant increase in traffic noise. This will have an adverse impact on quality of life in the adjoining area between the Fairmile Road and Marsh				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>Lane. This is a quiet area that so far has remained undisturbed by noise. Planning should seek to preserve tranquillity, not introduce noise. 90 new homes will result in substantial additional traffic on Fairmile Road (B3073), a very busy highway, already severely congested at certain times. Christchurch has the worst traffic congestion in Dorset. Planning should aim to ease this, not add to it. 90 new homes will require new infrastructure and also more services. There is already huge pressure on schools, medical services, policing, social services etc. With services currently strained, it is difficult to envisage future provision being adequate. Developments are also planned at Parley Cross and Roeshot Hill. These developments, together with the building East of Marsh Lane, will have a huge impact on the B3073 and other roads. This will not only affect residents, it will also damage tourism. Restricting building development to brownfield sites will at least not add any more to urban sprawl and will help to ensure that Christchurch remains a place where time is pleasant. We cannot go on building indefinitely. I would ask you, please, to address the planning irregularities outlined above by deleting Policy CN3, Land East of Marsh Lane, from the Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy. No new homes should be built in this location.</p>					
660828	Mr & Mrs Valerie and Paul Tudor		CSPS2928	Policy CN 3							<p>No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)</p>				317	
660833	Mrs O S Rose		CSPS2929	Policy CN 3							<p>No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)</p>				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
660837	Mr Martin Bevan		CSPS2930	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
660840	S Young		CSPS2931	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
660845	Mr & Mrs J & B Glenister		CSPS2934	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
660850	Mr K Harris		CSPS2935	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
660853	Mr Peter Pratt		CSPS2937	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)					
660907	Ms Kim Fletcher		CSPS2941	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
660908	Mr & Mrs N & J Clement		CSPS2942	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
660912	Mrs Michelle Chiverten		CSPS2943	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
660915	Mrs P J Wellstead		CSPS2944	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)					
660917	Mrs S.J Puttick		CSPS2945	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
660919	Ms Lesley Cave		CSPS2946	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
660921	Mrs Wendy Rayner		CSPS2947	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
660922	Mrs Alexandra Miller		CSPS2948	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
660925	Mrs Christine Trundell		CSPS2949	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)					
660930	Mr Terry Mynore		CSPS2950	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
660948	Ms G.J Greenwood		CSPS2952	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
660952	Mrs K Pilcher		CSPS2953	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
660956	Mr Richard Kelly		CSPS2954	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)					
660958	Mr and Ms I and D Ager and Page		CSPS2955	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
660966	Mr & Mrs T Kinsella		CSPS2956	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
660967	Mrs J Fisher		CSPS2957	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
660968	Mr Dare		CSPS2958	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
660969	A Evans		CSPS2959	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:-				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)					
660973	Mr Keith Webb		CSPS2960	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
660976	Ms Anne Read		CSPS2961	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
660977	Mr & Mrs R Griffiths		CSPS2962	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
660982	Mr R Barrows		CSPS2965	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)					
660984	Mrs Herbert		CSPS2967	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
660985	Mrs Janice Richards		CSPS2968	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
661012	Mr Paul Curran		CSPS3000	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
661013	Mr Darren Cooper		CSPS3003	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
661191	Ms Joyce Lillington		CSPS3012	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
661194	Mr Derren Hillman		CSPS3015	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
661196	Mrs Gwendoline Mirauer		CSPS3016	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
661197	Mr C Dowding		CSPS3017	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
661198	Mrs Joan Margaret Matten		CSPS3018	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)					
661200	Ms Lisa Edwards		CSPS3019	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
661202	Mr Brian King		CSPS3020	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
656964	Mrs Dorothy Hallett		CSPS3002	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
660987	Mr Dennis Doyle		CSPS2970	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)					
660988	Mr Hugo Milner		CSPS2973	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
660990	R Cheater		CSPS2978	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
660992	Mr V Goldash		CSPS2980	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
660994	Mrs B Hearn		CSPS2982	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
660995	Mr S Duffias		CSPS2983	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)					
660999	P Scorten		CSPS2987	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
661000	Mr & Mrs R Adnett		CSPS2988	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
661004	Ms Helen Bassett		CSPS2991	Policy CN 3							No – our objections are:- Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)				317	
661005	Mrs Evelyn Wade		CSPS2994	Policy CN 3							No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	
											Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)						
661007	Mr & Mrs Finlayson		CSPS2997	Policy CN 3							<p>No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies) Dear Councillor</p> <p>I note that the planning strategy for Christchurch Borough includes the building of 90 homes on Land East of Marsh Lane (Policy CN3). I recognise that a consultation is taking place but in addition to this I would like to point out the following planning problems:-</p> <p>The land East of Marsh Lane is Green Belt land and on a flood plain. Building 90 new homes will make additional demands on water supply. The proposed development is close to the Avon Valley and Dorset Heathland Special Protection areas and Ramsar site. The large influx of people to the 90 new homes is likely to have a detrimental effect on wildlife and there is uncertainty as to whether potential damage to the sensitive areas can be adequately mitigated. Access to the site for vehicles will cause planning difficulties because the heathland and the bungalows already East of Marsh Lane with their gardens etc form a barrier. There will be significant increase in traffic noise. This will have an adverse impact on quality of life in the adjoining area between the Fairmile Road and Marsh Lane. This is a quiet area that so far has remained undisturbed by noise. Planning should seek to preserve tranquillity, not introduce noise. 90 new homes will result in substantial additional traffic on Fairmile Road (B3073), a very busy highway, already severely congested at certain times. Christchurch has the worst traffic congestion in Dorset. Planning should aim to ease this, not add to it. 90 new homes will require new infrastructure and also more services. There is already huge pressure on schools, medical services, policing, social services etc. With services currently strained, it is difficult to</p>					317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	
											<p>envisage future provision being adequate. Developments are also planned at Parley Cross and Roeshot Hill. These developments, together with the building East of Marsh Lane, will have a huge impact on the B3073 and other roads. This will not only affect residents, it will also damage tourism. Restricting building development to brownfield sites will at least not add any more to urban sprawl and will help to ensure that Christchurch remains a place where time is pleasant. We cannot go on building indefinitely. I would ask you, please, to address the planning irregularities outlined above by deleting Policy CN3, Land East of Marsh Lane, from the Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy. No new homes should be built in this location.</p>						
360099	Mr John Foskett		CSPS3346	Policy CN 3							Again 50% !! will not be achieved. Transport access again a big issue.				317		
656807	Andrew O'Connor		CSPS3353	Policy CN 3							<p>I wish to register my strongest possible objection to any house building development that uses Green Belt land. I think any Council that even contemplates doing this, is showing their complete contempt for the existing residents of Christchurch. It should be a prime objective of any Council to protect Green Belt land under its control and to resist the temptation to cede to the overtures and pressures of property developers. Aside from the Green Belt issues, what possible rationale can the Council use to justify a massive building programme, when the property market is stagnated and is likely to remain so for years to come. I thought the inessential extension of the Christchurch Library, demonstrated the insular and confused thinking of the Council in the middle of this economic downturn. Councillors should be keeping their efforts focused on the substantial problems that already exist in Christchurch and not creating new ones.</p>					317	
662364	Mr Peter Fenning		CSPS3265	Policy CN 3							<p>I have read the parts of the above document concerned with the Borough of Christchurch and compared sections with our existing Town Plan of 2001 and the recently published National Planning Policy Framework document of 2012 I consider that this core strategy document lacks the policy descriptive clarity of the Town Plan. Firstly I see no reason to mix together in one document the next 15 year joint plan for Christchurch and East Dorset. It would be far more effective to produce two separate documents. Secondly the table of contents does not assist in finding a specific policy for a specific topic and an index of topics is required.</p>					317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>I wish to comment on policies as follows</p> <p>GREEN BELT</p> <p>The Town Plan is quite explicit in the need to preserve the Green Belt and defines the boundary limits of the Green Belt around Christchurch. The Plan comments at 3.44, page 23, "Now this final boundary has been defined it will not be altered except in "exceptional circumstances". The Core strategy document gives an Objective1, at page 22, which states that the Green Belt will be retained and protected, except for strategic release of land to provide new housing and for employment development in East Dorset and at Bournemouth Airport. This objective if accepted will drive a coach and horses through any firm boundary for the Green Belt,</p> <p>Already four incursions into the Green Belt are planned in this core strategy. One example of this is given in Policy CN3 which concerns the development of 90 houses on land within the Green Belt, and directly adjacent to the SSI, SPA and Ramsar site of the Avon Valley. Additionally it is also on the edge of the Heathland exclusion zone of The Town Common. It is hard to conceive a development which is more likely to harm the natural environment within our Borough.</p> <p>A large development of housing, termed the urban extension, and described in Policy CN1 is planned within the Green Belt at Roeshot Hill. Not content with this incursion the proposal is to move the existing allotments, within this urban extension, to a new site, nearly a mile away. In spite of many protests by allotment holders and others at this move. This proposed forcible move of allotment holders appears to be totally contrary to Policy CF6 of the Town Plan, as detailed on page 156. It is relevant to note the narrative in the Town Plan on this subject in section 8.74 where it is stated that "In the interests of the communities and in view of the demand for such facilities it is proposed to protect these allotment sites from development.</p> <p>In view of the above I oppose the Objective 1 on the grounds that it will lead to uncontrolled development within the local Green Belt. I oppose the development of housing at the Marsh Farm site because it will also have a disastrous consequence for the local natural environment and protected sites. I oppose the proposal to move the existing allotments in view of the non agreement of the allotment holders.</p> <p>TOWN CENTRE SHOPPING</p> <p>I am concerned at the proposal, At Policy CH1, page 48 to encourage "the expansion of evening economy uses such as restaurants/cafes/pubs will be encouraged along Church Street" Currently in Church</p>					

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>Street there are 7 restaurants in a total of 21 shops which is 33% which is well above the proposal, in Policy CH6, page 56 where an upper limit of 30% for non retail uses in the primary core of the High Street and Saxon Square. Currently there is one vacant shop in Church Street while the other shops are of mixed retail use, varying from a toy shop, the post office, a wine merchant, an optometrist, a delicatessen, to a golf goods supplier and several dress and apparel shops. Surely this is a good retail mix and the proposal to lower the status of this successful street to a secondary shopping zone is quite illogical. The statement, at page 5 section 5.9 that " it is vital the town centre maintains and improves its customer base , by providing an appropriate range of shops and services that are capable of meeting the day to day needs of residents within the town and its catchment area" is currently met by Church Street shops. I oppose the proposal to downgrade Church street to a secondary shopping zone, which it is not and I oppose the suggestion that more Restaurants/cafes/pubs are needed in this street.</p> <p>At 5.10, page 47, the 2008 Retail Study suggests that Christchurch Town Centre does not have a requirement for new supermarkets but it appears from disclosures at the special planning control meeting held on 14th June 2011 that such a large store/ supermarket development is to be proposed for the Town Centre Magistrates Site. In such a document as the core strategy it is imperative that a clear statement be made on the future zoning of the Magistrates Court site in terms of future retail usage</p> <p>I oppose any development of a supermarket type building at this site on the grounds of critical traffic problems at the adjacent Fountain roundabout and the effect on existing local shops.</p> <p>BUILT ENVIRONMENT</p> <p>It is disappointing to see so little comment on the rich historic Heritage of Christchurch. Policy HE1, page 166 is concerned with Protection of local historic and architectural interest and the paucity of the detail in just 8 lines of script does little to suggest that our rich inventory of buildings such as the Constables House and the Norman Castle will be protected from their current states of disrepair. It is not good enough to simply state that " Article 4 Directions will be considered where there are threats to Heritage Assets". A positive approach to conservation is required.</p> <p>An example a lack of a positive approach is seen at section 6.30, page 63 where Staple Cross, a scheduled ancient monument, sadly neglected, sitting</p>					

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											among a sea of traffic signs is stated as being enhanced by the future development of the urban extension. This monument has been in need of conservation for many years and sadly ignored by this Council. Opportunities to interest the public in our heritage has been frequently missed. An example of this was the proposal in the Druitt Gardens Masterplan that the ancient buried Saxon Buhr concealed beneath the surface would be exposed and conserved as an open feature to allow public inspection was simply forgotten and forms no part of the completed gardens. The future of our Red House Museum deserves a commitment that it will have a future as a history centre, I request that much more attention is devoted to local detail and to the points raised above. Currently this section is not fit for purpose.					
359264	Mr Peter Atfield	Goadsby Ltd	CSPS3653	Policy CN 3	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	Sembcorp Bournemouth Water is supportive of the allocation of the land east of Marsh Lane for residential development. The site is not required for operational use by the company and therefore has the potential to deliver housing in order to meet the acknowledged shortfall in Christchurch. However, there are some detailed matters in the policy that require amendment in order to make it more effective. 1. The site boundaries should be altered to be consistent with the plan reproduced at the end of this form of representation. Here, the boundaries represent the position of the fences on the site. These are fixed features that can be used to establish a revised boundary to the green belt in this part of Christchurch. This excludes the filter bed that has been constructed on the eastern part of the site, with the area now 'squared off' when compared against Map 6.4. 2. Mains drains are situated below ground running generally parallel to the western boundary. The construction of houses over, or in close proximity to these, must be avoided. However, this does offer the opportunity to create an area of open space to the rear of the existing properties in Marsh Lane. This potentially allows for footpath links to connect to the existing paths to the south of the site that ultimately lead to Mill Lane and beyond. 3. An open space strategy will need to be agreed, taking into account the matter referred to in Paragraph 2 (above), for the on site provision of a Sustainable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANGS) and to meet the requirements of Policy HE 4. It is therefore submitted that the wording of the second bullet point is amended so as to refer to "Up to 90 houses". This will	Amend the text of the start of the second bullet point of the policy to: "Up to 90 houses will be delivered" Amend the reference to the affordable housing quota – see our separate representations.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	To examine the extent to which the site can contribute to the acknowledged shortfall in housing land supply in the Borough of Christchurch.	317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>introduce greater flexibility into the policy, if appropriate allowing for a lower density of development to be accommodated on the site. This approach would also be consistent with the design and density matters set out in the policy, respecting the character of the adjoining residential area.</p> <p>4. The 50% affordable housing requirement is not justified. This is dealt with separately in respect of representations on Policy LN 3.</p> <p>Development of the site can be achieved in accordance with the requirements of the criteria set out in Policy CN 3 with regard to transport and access; sustainable construction and renewable energy; open space and recreation; and the protection of sensitive habitats and species. In respect of the latter, the provision of an on site SANGS has the potential to draw pressure away from more ecologically sensitive areas, such as Town Common.</p> <p>As set out in Paragraph 6.58 of the Core Strategy (CS), the site adjoins the existing urban area and is accessible to local facilities and Christchurch town centre. Its development offers the opportunity to contribute to the objectively assessed open market and affordable housing needs, as required by Paragraph 47 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). Although Policy CN 3 anticipates development commencing in 2016 / 17, the relative lack of constraints make the site deliverable in an earlier timescale, if required. It therefore meets the criteria set out in Footnote 11 of the NPPF; i.e. it is available now and is in a suitable location for development. Construction could therefore commence in the first five years of the CS. This flexibility is advantageous, taking into account the long lead in times associated with the implementation of a larger scale urban extension – which potentially exacerbates the shortfall of housing need in the borough in the early years of the CS.</p> <p>The allocation of the site for residential development also fulfils other requirements of the NPPF. It is a key site, critical to the delivery of the housing strategy of the plan (Para. 47). Without the urban extensions, Christchurch is entirely reliant on the delivery of ‘windfall’ sites to try to meet its identified housing need. The site can deliver a choice of high quality homes and widen the opportunity for home ownership (Para. 50).</p>					
656749	Mrs Valerie Roberts		CSPS3467	Policy CN 3							<p>I wish to strongly object to the proposed building of 90 homes on the above Green Belt land. As this is GREEN BELT, once it is built on we lose that Green Belt forever.</p> <p>My other objection is that the proposed site is</p>				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	
											<p>extremely close to the SSSI, which is the home for many different species of wild life, whose habitat will be destroyed.</p> <p>Another concern of mine is access to the proposed site. With possibly in excess of an extra 180 vehicles in and out of the site, the surrounding roads will be severely affected with access onto Fairmile Road being more difficult than it is now. Fairmile Road is often heavily congested with traffic as it is now, without numerous extra vehicles trying to turn onto it.</p> <p>I do hope that you will take note of my objections and those of other local residents before making your decision as to whether this Green Belt area is to be lost forever.</p>						
656817	Mrs Frances D Pulley		CSPS3574	Policy CN 3							<p>I understand that the Council is in the process of arranging consultation meetings around the borough with regard to the above but as I will be unable to attend any of these due to work commitments I have decided to write to you setting out the main reasons why I believe that this plan for residential development in the Marsh Lane area is not viable:</p> <p>1. Ecological impact to Avon Valley</p> <p>The land in question borders a site of special scientific interest (Town Common and St Catherine's Hill). This is grazed by horses and cows which help manage and protect the special ecology of this site.</p> <p>There are many species of birds (including owls, cuckoos, buzzards, woodpeckers, starlings, thrushes, herons and other waterfowl)</p> <p>There is a large reptile and amphibian population (including Adders, Grass Snakes, Smooth Snakes, Frogs, Lizards, Newts, and Toads) This land acts as a corridor for these animals to make their way between the various ponds, streams, ditches and other habitat in the common and elsewhere in the Avon Valley especially in the breeding season ..</p> <p>Bats are very common and are known to live in the oaks bordering the edges of the fields.</p> <p>Deer and foxes also use the land as a corridor to make their way down to the river and along to the town common.</p> <p>No pesticides are used on the fields and natural grazing meadow encourages all sorts of wild flowers in the summer for bees, butterflies and a host of other insects.</p> <p>The large established trees and hedgerows here provide homes for all sorts of insects and birds.</p> <p>2. Green belt</p> <p>This land is green belt for good reasons and should remain as such to be enjoyed by local residents, visitors and Avon Valley walkers.</p>					317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>3. Access to the site There will be problems providing access to the site as there are gardens and dwellings all around the proposed area. There will be the problem of increased traffic and additional parked cars will add to the dangers in what is already a fast traffic area.</p> <p>4. Residents quality of life People adjacent to the proposal bought their bungalows with the knowledge that they were moving to a quiet and open location. A perfect retirement spot. How can this be if they are overshadowed by houses and the noise it will bring.</p> <p>5. Unsuitable living area Anyone who lives in this area knows that most of the summer the area in question is plagued by flies, wasps and mosquitoes due to the close proximity of the water beds and river. This would cause health and safety risks for anyone living there in addition to being unpleasant.</p> <p>6. Infrastructure strain</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An extra 90 home would mean potentially 180 cars to add to the already severe congestion problems in this area of Christchurch • (Fairmile road is already a traffic jam at certain times of day). Other homes have already been designated to be built in Bronte Avenue at the site of the old nursing home) • This development would result in at least 100 more children living the area – the local schools are full already • Services of local doctors, dentists etc. would be overstretched • Other such as water supply and sewerage would also be overstretched <p>Finally – we have to ask ourselves if we really want Christchurch to become another urban sprawl. Christchurch is a place people want to visit at the moment. The Avon valley is unique and unspoilt. Build on precious green pockets such as this and what do we have for our visitors and our children to enjoy. Once it is built on it is it gone forever. Please take this letter as a formal objection to this plan. Dear Councillor I note that the planning strategy for Christchurch Borough includes the building of 90 homes on Land East of Marsh Lane (Policy CN3). I recognise that a consultation is taking place but in addition to this I would like to point out the following planning problems:- The land East of Marsh Lane is Green Belt land and on a flood plain.</p>					

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>Building 90 new homes will make additional demands on water supply.</p> <p>The proposed development is close to the Avon Valley and Dorset Heathland Special Protection areas and Ramsar site. The large influx of people to the 90 new homes is likely to have a detrimental effect on wildlife and there is uncertainty as to whether potential damage to the sensitive areas can be adequately mitigated.</p> <p>Access to the site for vehicles will cause planning difficulties because the heathland and the bungalows already East of Marsh Lane with their gardens etc form a barrier.</p> <p>There will be significant increase in traffic noise. This will have an adverse impact on quality of life in the adjoining area between the Fairmile Road and Marsh Lane. This is a quiet area that so far has remained undisturbed by noise. Planning should seek to preserve tranquillity, not introduce noise.</p> <p>90 new homes will result in substantial additional traffic on Fairmile Road (B3073), a very busy highway, already severely congested at certain times.</p> <p>Christchurch has the worst traffic congestion in Dorset. Planning should aim to ease this, not add to it.</p> <p>90 new homes will require new infrastructure and also more services. There is already huge pressure on schools, medical services, policing, social services etc. With services currently strained, it is difficult to envisage future provision being adequate.</p> <p>Developments are also planned at Parley Cross and Roeshot Hill. These developments, together with the building East of Marsh Lane, will have a huge impact on the B3073 and other roads. This will not only affect residents, it will also damage tourism.</p> <p>Restricting building development to brownfield sites will at least not add any more to urban sprawl and will help to ensure that Christchurch remains a place where time is pleasant. We cannot go on building indefinitely.</p> <p>I would ask you, please, to address the planning irregularities outlined above by deleting Policy CN3, Land East of Marsh Lane, from the Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy. No new homes should be built in this location.</p>					
656821	Miss Jessica Pulley		CSPS3579	Policy CN 3							<p>My name is Jessica and I am 12, I live right next to where you intend to build 90 houses. I don't agree with this idea simply because I have lived here my whole life and have grown to love where I live and its natural beauty. I am very glad I don't live in the town where it is busy and loud, but by building more houses it will increase the traffic along Fairmile (not to say it isn't</p>				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>busy already) and the whole area, making it congested even more.</p> <p>I will be very upset if you do decide to build because I like the open view when looking out the window, also it is teeming with natural wildlife (birds, amphibians, snakes etc.), there are a lot of horses and cows that graze along the fields and if disturbed, destroy the ecology of this site.</p>					
662954	Mr Neil White	Quantum Group	CSPS3624	Policy CN 3	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	<p>Quantum Group is a significant landowner in the Christchurch and East Dorset area. This includes the Former QinetiQ Site in Bailey Drive off Barrack Road, Christchurch. As a landowner and investor in the area, Quantum is please to provide the following representations and participate in the Strategy's preparation.</p> <p>Our representations relate to the following policies: Policy KS5 - Provision of Employment Land; Policy KS6 - Town Centre Hierarchy Policy CH3 - Christchurch Primary Shopping Area and Retail Cores. Policy CH3 – Christchurch Primary Shopping Area and Retail Cores</p> <p>10. We note that the Primary Shopping Area (PSA) of Christchurch Town Centre is proposed to be extended from the Local Plan definition to include the 'Pit Site' Car Park fronting the Barrack Road and the Fountains Roundabout. We object to this change on the following grounds: (i) The NPPF Annex 2 Glossary states that a PSA is an area where retail development is concentrated. This generally comprises the primary and those secondary frontages which are adjoining or closely related to the primary shopping frontage. This definition and that of Primary and Secondary Frontages does not include car parks and nor is retail development concentrated in this particular area.</p>	<p>Whilst the Joint Retail Study seeks to provide justification for this change and recommends the boundary, any justification and the recommendation in this document are not sound as it does not accord with the NPPF definition. The PSA should only be extended once the scale and type of development on this site is known.</p> <p>11. Such a change is necessary as it will allow this part of the Core Strategy to achieve soundness by being consistent with the NPPF.</p>	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	<p>The representations made relate to the soundness of the Plan and we require the opportunity to be heard.</p>	317	2260025_0_1.pdf
662970	Mrs Amy Holby		CSPS3557	Policy CN 3	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	<p>Flood plain Increased insurance costs Loss of green belt No adequate access points Traffic build up - pedestrian walkways ? Health risk of mosquitoes</p>		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		317	
662987	Mr Alan Hayden	Christchurch Harbour Ornithological Group	CSPS3568	Policy CN 3	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	<p>A supporting statement has been prepared setting out the main concerns of Christchurch Harbour Ornithological Group (CHOG) in more detail, but he main issues in relation to 'soundness' are set out below.</p> <p>Positively Prepared – The Pre-Submission Core Strategy is based on a s strategy that seeks to meet</p>	<p>The Pre-Submission Core Strategy could be made sound be deleting all of the following: Policy CN3; those parts of paragraphs 6.57 to 6.63 which retate to the proposed housing site at</p>	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	<p>Members of CHOG have recorded wildlife in the 'Lower Avon Valley', which lies immediately adjacent to the proposed housing site at Marsh Lane, Christchurch for many</p>	317	2258974_0_1.pdf

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>objectively assessed development needs. However, in relation to Policy CN3, the strategy is not consistent with achieving sustainable development due to the impact the proposed housing development would have on wildlife in the vicinity, including nationally and internationally protected sites and species.</p> <p>Justified – The Pre-Submission Core Strategy, in relation to Policy CN3 is not based on a robust and credible evidence base. Recording undertaken by CHOG over many years shows that nearby heathland and wetland sites support a wealth of bird species and other wildlife that would come under increased recreational and other pressures from additional housing development nearby. These potential impacts do not appear to have been taken into account when putting forward the proposed housing development at Marsh Lane, Christchurch. It is also not clear from the supporting text to Policy CN3 whether the wildlife interest of the proposed housing site itself has been assessed.</p> <p>Effective – it is questionable whether Policy CN3 is deliverable since there is not certainty that suitable mitigation measures could be put in place to address the potential harm caused to wildlife by housing development on the proposed site a Marsh Lane, Christchurch.</p> <p>Consistent with national policy – Policy CN3 is not consistent with national policy, which seeks to protect nationally and internationally important wildlife sites from harmful development. Also Paragraph 119 of the National Policy Planning Framework (NPPF) makes it clear that the ‘presumption in favour of sustainable development’ does not apply where development requiring appropriate assessment under the birds of Habitats Directive is being planned, as is the case with Policy CN3. These considerations strongly indicate that in this particular case, development should be restricted.</p>	Marsh Lane, Christchurch and Map 6.4: land to the east of Marsh Lane.		years. Members of CHOG are also familiar with the levels of recreational and other activities in the area that can have an impact on wildlife. It is considered that it may be helpful for the Inspector to have a representative of CHOG on hand to discuss these issues when considering the soundness of Policy CN3 and supporting text.		
359571	Mr Renny Henderson	Royal Society for the Protection of Birds	CSPS3718	Policy CN 3							<p>This policy relates to the allocation of land for 90 dwellings, development is to be located outside 400m of the Dorset heathlands European sites.</p> <p>Policy CN3 states that SANG is to be provided “within the site” and “appropriate survey work will be undertaken prior to development in order to allow suitable mitigation measures to be devised and implemented”. We are unclear as to the nature of potential impacts on the non-heathland European sites, but note that the HRA concludes “uncertain effects” (page 75).</p> <p>In recognition of the uncertainty over possible adverse impacts we object to this policy.</p>		Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	we would like to confirm that we wish to reserve the right to appear at the Examination into the Core Strategy, on the grounds the Core Strategy raises significant issues relating to the protection of internationally important wildlife sites (as highlighted in the HRA) and that there remains uncertainty over the delivery of appropriate	317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename		
														and effective mitigation measures.				
521508	Ms Lisa Jackson	Jackson Planning Ltd	CSPS3638	Policy CN 3	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	This policy is potentially not sound as there is no evidence to show that appropriate on site SANG provision can be made in compliance with policy ME2 and ME3 to mitigate potential harm to the Dorset Heaths SPA. It has not been demonstrated by evidence that this allocation is consistent with paragraph 110 of the NPPF.	The proposal must demonstrate that SANG on site will meet the criteria of policy ME3 and will create a sufficient diversion to trips to Town Common to satisfy the European Habitat Regulations. Evidence must be provided to satisfy Natural England that on-site mitigation will be effective, if this cannot be satisfied the site will need to be omitted from the Core Strategy.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	Bodorgan Environmental Management Ltd have indepth experience of local conditions, SANG criteria and SANG design following development of the SANG strategy for Roeshot Hill with Natural England.	317			
663376	Mr John Whiffen		CSPS3688	Policy CN 3		No		Yes	Yes		Core Strategy: Pullout from Christchurch Courier, Spring 2012 As with the Pullout from 2010, response to this document would have been so much easier to make had there been the opportunity to use tick-boxes. Perhaps they would have saved your colleagues much time instead of having to comprehend written answers. It has taken me much time to read and, therefore, to respond. Is it the fact, as it appears to be, that the entire business of the local development strategy in general and the core strategy in particular results from predictions of national, and, from that, local growth in population? Page 1 What was the percentage of rate-payers who responded to produce the "excellent results"? If the responses really did "inform this stage", how are you able to continue with plans to build on the allotments at Roeshot Hill when so many people do not want that to happen? It appears that the "consultation – responses", evidence, surely, have NOT been used in drafting this stage. Had those responses from allotment-holders alone been included, you would not be showing planned roads on the land used now as allotments! Page 2 1. Is not "Green Belt" intended as a protection against jut such intrusion? 850 dwellings will, quite likely but as a guess, house an average of three people. Over a thousand more cars in Christchurch, perhaps, but much ensuing congestion a certainty, especially into and from the roundabout at Sainsbury's. All those people would need additional facilities (doctors, dentists, shops,						317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>another petrol-station, perhaps, restaurant/pub – what else?) which would take more land adding to the sense of increasing density.</p> <p>2. Affordable by/to whom? Such an unquantifiable expression is meaningless as evidence, surely. Who are to be the intended purchasers?</p> <p>3. You have identified space “south of the railway line”. Presumably such land is already available and you are planning to cover at least some of it with “retail/community facilities”. For whom? The additional housing/population will be occupying it, your plan appears to show.</p> <p>4. “Will be relocated”? Have you absorbed at all the representations from RHAA and individuals? Not much point in “consulting”, it seems. LEAVE THE ALLOTMENTS where they are and build your new houses north of the railway line. Would you like years of your work in your hobby to be buried – literally?</p> <p>6. I agree. Who wouldn’t?</p> <p>7. Does this mean that the developer will be paying for some of the improvements?</p> <p>CN1 You ask if the policy meets the tests of soundness.</p> <p>It is not justified because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The number of British people is declining • It is unreasonable to build over or on excellent, friable, manured, allotments, tilled for decades, and to require allotment-holders to start again on a green field, losing year of effort • Efforts are being made to reduce the transportation of food and increase local production: the planned (no longer merely possible) move will work against both. (The Queen’s new Jubilee Fund will, in part, be advancing the idea of growing locally.) • “evidence” of population-growth is merely prediction and seems not to take account of emigration, • The possible repatriation of immigrants from the EU when Britain leaves the EU and the reduction in longevity likely to arise from continued over-eating, lack of exercise, congestion and the stress of ever-increasing over-crowding <p>It is not appropriate because reasonable alternatives are to build houses north of the railway, providing there the transportation and other facilities now shown south of it and, thus, to leave the allotments as they are (and the decades-long efforts input into them by plot-holders), enabling the continuing production of food locally, and close to those who produce it.</p> <p>It is not effective in that open space in the borough will be lost permanently, as will excellent arable land (the allotments), and density of population, crowding and congestion will increase, all to the detriment of the</p>					

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>interests of present rate-payers (who elected the council to administer those interests, not to damage them).</p> <p>What, precisely, does “deliverable” mean here? It usually means “capable of being delivered” but that would be far too vague for a document about policy, such as this, surely. “Flexible” or flexibility seems to be a contradiction when dealing with policy, or at least to be introducing uncertainty, especially for rate-payers and their interests. “Monitored”? Any project can be monitored. It sounds good to feed to rate-payers but it means merely comparing actuality to estimates/plans periodically.</p> <p>“Framework Masterplan”. Where is any alternative to building on the allotments offered? Why is there not an alternative plan for building north of the railway? Your decision seems to have been made. Your plan shows dwellings likely to be blighted both by consequential increased noise from increased use of local roads and the railway and built close to either (or both). Time will not be pleasant for them nor for existing residents in that immediate area. That aspect seems not to have been considered. Have you considered cancelling altogether plans for further building?</p> <p>Page 3: Land south of Burton village</p> <p>1. Why are you utilising for housing ANY land in the “Green Belt”, an area which the population understands as sacrosanct?</p> <p>2. The problem of defining “affordable” recurs and raises the same questions: by whom?, for whom? And in whose opinion?</p> <p>3. Does your statement mean that those whom you intend should undertake the development will make a financial contribution to improving “community facilities” (undefined)? If not, what?</p> <p>4. Does this mean that the developer will be paying for some of the improvements?</p> <p>Tests of soundness</p> <p>NO. The development cannot be justified as it is (also) based on prediction not evidence. Houses should not be built unless demand exists and is evident (as the Spanish have found in large measure) and not speculatively.</p> <p>Page 3: land east of Marsh Lane</p> <p>My comments are as for the other two areas.</p>					
654692	Mr Brian Smith	Highcliffe Residents Association Community Interest Company	CSPS3845	Policy CN 3							<p>We wish to object to the inclusion in the Core Strategy, the plan to allow the building of 90 houses in Marsh lane adjacent to Cowards Marsh.</p> <p>We object because this could jeopardise the SPA/RAMSAR status of land within 300 metres of the proposed development. This status was awarded</p>				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											because of the importance of the Lower Avon Valley to breeding waders such as lapwings and redshanks and is only given to 'internationally important' environmental sites. The Marsh Lane site will be within 300 metres of the edge of a very important breeding site for lapwings and redshanks and can only have a detrimental effect.					
656629	John Campbell	Roeshot Hill Allotment Association	CSPS3835	Policy CN 3							<p>We appreciate that the strategy within the Document relates to a wide geographic area and the rationalisation of demands from a wide range of competing interests. Whilst the interests and concerns of Christchurch allotment gardeners may seem almost incidental in such context, they are by no means so. We have examined the Document from three perspectives: (1) proposals affecting Christchurch; (2) allotment provision in Christchurch and (3) the impact on the rural environment of Christchurch. We have found that a number of the issues that concern us touch upon fundamental principles contained in the document.</p> <p>HOUSING POLICY - Christchurch</p> <p>The Document draws upon a number of assessments of housing supply and predicted demand to conclude that urban infill will be insufficient to meet future housing needs. After briefly reviewing the physical constraints on building elsewhere in Christchurch, it is proposed to adjust the Green Belt area at Roeshot Hill, Burton and Marsh Lane to accommodate housing developments.</p> <p>1. We consider these proposals to be unjustified in that:</p> <p>1.1 They rest on the assumption that 'housing trumps environment' in a Borough which is characterised by its urban, rural and coastal mix, which makes 'life pleasant' for its inhabitants and which attracts a large volume of visitors and vacationers. Our view is that the assumption in the document is merely a subjective assessment, and that it fails to grasp the inconvenient truth that Christchurch cannot accommodate all who may wish to live in the Borough whilst maintaining its present character.</p> <p>1.2 The proposals for housing at Burton fail to explain how an additional 45 dwellings will serve the 'specific needs' of the village. On the contrary, the effect of the proposal would be negative by turning Burton from a village into a conurbation.</p> <p>1.3 The Document contemplates the development of 'exception sites' in order to meet the need for affordable housing in the area. This weakens the case for provision of new market homes at the expense of the rural environment.</p>	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination		317	2267876_0_1.pdf	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>2. The proposals are ineffective in that:</p> <p>2.1 They would adversely affect the Green Belt by releasing some of the 'best and most versatile agricultural land' at Roeshot Hill and substituting unspecified land of lesser value.</p> <p>2.2 They do not ensure the reduction of local demand for new market homes in the absence of a residential qualification (such as applied elsewhere in Dorset) and/or other measures to ensure that local residents have the ability and opportunity to absorb new housing as it becomes available. The document admits the attractions of Christchurch as a retirement location, and the phenomenon of 'supply stimulating demand' could well result in migrants from other areas of the country exacerbating rather than reducing the demands on local resources without reducing local housing needs.</p> <p>3. The proposals are non-compliant with section 110 Localism Act 2011 Christchurch shares a housing market area and travel to work area with Bournemouth and Poole, New Forest Council and adjacent local authorities in Hampshire. It is mostly a matter of preference rather than strategic issues that determine where people live. If it is the case that Christchurch cannot accommodate more than 2060 additional homes without impacting on its rural villages and Green Belt, the question arises as to whether there has been a reasonable allocation of resources to absorb regional housing needs. Despite some reference to joint working with neighbouring Dorset authorities (but not Hampshire) there is no evidence of any specific arrangement whereby unmet requirements in Christchurch might be met by neighbouring authorities, particularly by Bournemouth, which is by far the largest authority. We feel that it is reasonable to conclude that the Christchurch Borough Council and East Dorset District Council have failed to fully exhaust the duty to co-operate with adjoining local authorities within the spirit of section 110.</p> <p>4. The proposals are non-compliant in respect of Sustainability The Sustainability Assessment is not on consultation and is only referred to in paragraph 1.21. By not have the SA open for consultation in the same way as the Core Strategy the Council are failing to complete stage D of the Sustainability Assessment effectively and thus the Core Strategy is unsound. This could be subject to Judicial Review.</p>					
657074	Mrs Monica Lattimer		CSPS3846	Policy CN 3	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Green Belt area. Too near private est.	Not a suitable area.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	To be kept informed of changes	317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											Not suitable for heavy traffic. Flooded area on plains.					
658575		Christchurch Commoners Association	CSPS3848	Policy CN 3		No					Our objections are: Loss of Green Belt, strain on water/utilities, inadequate vehicular access, Traffic congestion, extra strain on services and infrastructure, increased risk of flooding, impact on the SSSI, increased noise, road safety, poor environment for new homes (water beds/flies)				317	
659279	Mrs M J Allbut		CSPS3860	Policy CN 3							<p>Dear Councillor</p> <p>I note that the planning strategy for Christchurch Borough includes the building of 90 homes on Land East of Marsh Lane (Policy CN3). I recognise that a consultation is taking place but in addition to this I would like to point out the following planning problems:-</p> <p>The land East of Marsh Lane is Green Belt land and on a flood plain.</p> <p>Building 90 new homes will make additional demands on water supply.</p> <p>The proposed development is close to the Avon Valley and Dorset Heathland Special Protection areas and Ramsar site. The large influx of people to the 90 new homes is likely to have a detrimental effect on wildlife and there is uncertainty as to whether potential damage to the sensitive areas can be adequately mitigated.</p> <p>Access to the site for vehicles will cause planning difficulties because the heathland and the bungalows already East of Marsh Lane with their gardens etc form a barrier.</p> <p>There will be significant increase in traffic noise. This will have an adverse impact on quality of life in the adjoining area between the Fairmile Road and Marsh Lane. This is a quiet area that so far has remained undisturbed by noise. Planning should seek to preserve tranquillity, not introduce noise.</p> <p>90 new homes will result in substantial additional traffic on Fairmile Road (B3073), a very busy highway, already severely congested at certain times.</p> <p>Christchurch has the worst traffic congestion in Dorset. Planning should aim to ease this, not add to it.</p> <p>90 new homes will require new infrastructure and also more services. There is already huge pressure on schools, medical services, policing, social services etc. With services currently strained, it is difficult to envisage future provision being adequate.</p> <p>Developments are also planned at Parley Cross and Roeshot Hill. These developments, together with the building East of Marsh Lane, will have a huge impact on the B3073 and other roads. This will not only affect residents, it will also damage tourism.</p>				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	
											Restricting building development to brownfield sites will at least not add any more to urban sprawl and will help to ensure that Christchurch remains a place where time is pleasant. We cannot go on building indefinitely. I would ask you, please, to address the planning irregularities outlined above by deleting Policy CN3, Land East of Marsh Lane, from the Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy. No new homes should be built in this location.						
663588	Mr Roger Street	Christchurch Conservation Trust	CSPS3735	Policy CN 3							<p>2. POLICY CN3</p> <p>CCT is opposed to the proposed development of approximately 90 houses within the green belt to the east of Marsh Lane, off Fairmile Road. This site is in very close proximity to The Avon Valley SSSI which is also a Ramsar site and a Special Protection Site. The current Town Plan deals with these Nature Conservation areas in detail at page 19 (sections 3.31-3.33). This is followed by Policy ENV12 which states that " Proposals for development that, either individually or in combination with other projects, are likely to have an adverse effect on a designated or potential special protection area, a special area of conservation or a Ramsar site will not be permitted unless either it is:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Directly connected with or necessary to site management; or 2. On assessment it is found that that the development will not adversely affect the integrity of the site; or 3. There is no alternative solution and the development must be carried out for imperative reasons or overriding public interest. <p>CCT submits with regard to the above that 1. does not apply. So far as 2. is concerned, no scientific assessment of the site has been undertaken as to the effect of such a proposed development. However it takes little imagination to predict that with 90 new dwellings, and the consequent impact of humans and dogs roaming over this special nature conservation site, the effect will be devastating. On item 3., this development does not have to be carried out 'for imperative reasons or overriding public interest'. Already small parcels of brown field sites are becoming available for residential development. An example of this is a number of homes earmarked within the recently granted outline planning permission for the Bailey Bridge Supermarket. Other brown field sites can be found, without the necessity to carry out major development just a stone's throw from the Valley SSSI/SPOS and Ramsar. It must also be noted that this proposed development will also be at the edge of</p>					317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											the heath land exclusion zone of the Town Common. We submit that it is extremely unwise to consider this housing development in an existing green belt area, with so many adjacent sites of high nature conservation zoning. National Planning Policy Framework at Section 9 (page 19) entitled "Protecting Green Belt land" is relevant, and at item 79 states "the fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence". Item 80 of section 9 defines five purposes for the Green Belt, of which one is "to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment".					
664130	Geoffrey and Joyce Hands		CSPS3772	Policy CN 3							We object to the proposal to build 45 new houses , or indeed any new houses on the green belt land in the Burton Conservation Area. The road network is already at full capacity , both at the tworiversmeet roundabout and along the by-pass. Salisbury Rd and Stony Lane carry a lot of traffic at School time and in the rush hour. The extra traffic can be expected to be good for the village shop (which is good)except that parking around the shop already creates chaotic conditions and makes access to the road where i live (The Green) which opens next to the shop, difficult and sometimes impossible; extra traffic will be very bad.				317	
664216	Mr Stephen Roberts		CSPS3794	Policy CN 3	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	I wish to object in the strongest possible terms to the proposals to build 90 new homes on land east of Marsh Lane in Christchurch. I have a number of objections (10 in fact), but I am going to restrict this response the few that I believe are most crucial and will be the hardest for the Council to counter argue and mitigate against. Chief amongst these, of course, has to be the loss of precious green belt. We are told that 'Time is Pleasant' in Christchurch, yet here we are proposing to concrete over a vast swathe of green belt, badly harming what is currently a quiet, environmentally sensitive semi-rural location. Once green belt is built on, as you will well know, it is lost forever. We also know that once the developers get their way and build on the green belt here it will set a precedent for further encroachment in the future. Secondly there is the undeniable damage that will be done to the SSSI from building close to it. This is an area that is home to many endangered species and whilst I accept that detailed surveys can be done of the actual area where the Council proposes to build so that no creatures are harmed immediately, this building so close to the SSSI must have a detrimental impact in	I believe that for the reasons stated above the CN3 proposal should be removed completely from the Core Strategy.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	Because I have coordinated the activities of the Marsh Lane Action Group which at the time of writing has obtained 421 individual objections against CN3. I also wish to highlight the plight of the Bronte Trust residents who I believe have been treated un sympathetically by council representatives they have met with (I am being extremely polite there incidentally).	317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>the future. We have written to The Dorset Wildlife Trust, Natural England, the RSPB and the Bat Conservation Trust as agencies who will be interested to know what is being proposed here.</p> <p>The third objection that will be hard to mitigate against is the poor vehicular access to the proposed development, which in itself will further damage the SSSI. My understanding is that access is proposed somewhere near the Suffolk Avenue, Marsh Lane bend and that the access road will then traverse the SSSI in order to swing around behind the current houses in Marsh Lane to the proposed development site. A development of this size should have more than one access to it. Once can assume that 90 homes will bring with them in the region of 200 vehicles, all of which will be trying to access Suffolk Avenue and Marsh Lane from the one point. This is already an extremely dangerous bend.</p> <p>I do not intend to go through all the other objections as I know that the Council will have its counter arguments ready, although I would like to put on record that I believe that building on the flood plain here will be an act of extreme folly. Bad planning in Chichester saw the flood plain disappear under concrete and the result has been a city centre inundated with floodwater. Please do not do the same in our town. The flood plain currently does its job, as the oft-ignored local residents will tell you.</p> <p>Whilst I appreciate that we have to concern ourselves with 'planning issues' it would nevertheless be appreciated if the wishes of local residents were actually heeded in a sympathetic manner. I gather that there was a meeting last week where two Council officials spoke to the members of the 'Bronte Trust'. Sadly it seems that the attitude of the officials at that meeting could, at best, be described as off-hand, showing very little sympathy or compassion to a predominantly elderly population, who are obviously concerned at these proposals.</p> <p>For your information we are currently canvassing a dozen local roads in the neighbourhood to ensure that as many of the Council response forms are completed as possible. We aim to have some 400 of these completed by the deadline of Monday June 25th in order to demonstrate to the Council just how much local opposition there is to this proposal. Other local groups have also been taking their own action.</p> <p>In speaking to local residents we have been struck by just how many people have not heard about these proposals (a consequence possibly of the Council not having sufficient people to deliver 'The Courier' locally). Whilst it may suit the council for these</p>					

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>outrageous plans not to be too widely broadcast for fear of stirring up a hornet's nest, it is very much in our interest to do just that. Rest assured we are stirring up the hornet's nest for you.</p> <p>I will also be speaking to Chris Chope, MP, on Friday 8th June, when I will be acquainting him with some of what has been going on.</p> <p>Dear Councillor</p> <p>I note that the planning strategy for Christchurch Borough includes the building of 90 homes on Land East of Marsh Lane (Policy CN3). I recognise that a consultation is taking place but in addition to this I would like to point out the following planning problems:-</p> <p>The land East of Marsh Lane is Green Belt land and on a flood plain.</p> <p>Building 90 new homes will make additional demands on water supply.</p> <p>The proposed development is close to the Avon Valley and Dorset Heathland Special Protection areas and Ramsar site. The large influx of people to the 90 new homes is likely to have a detrimental effect on wildlife and there is uncertainty as to whether potential damage to the sensitive areas can be adequately mitigated.</p> <p>Access to the site for vehicles will cause planning difficulties because the heathland and the bungalows already East of Marsh Lane with their gardens etc form a barrier.</p> <p>There will be significant increase in traffic noise. This will have an adverse impact on quality of life in the adjoining area between the Fairmile Road and Marsh Lane. This is a quiet area that so far has remained undisturbed by noise. Planning should seek to preserve tranquillity, not introduce noise.</p> <p>90 new homes will result in substantial additional traffic on Fairmile Road (B3073), a very busy highway, already severely congested at certain times.</p> <p>Christchurch has the worst traffic congestion in Dorset. Planning should aim to ease this, not add to it.</p> <p>90 new homes will require new infrastructure and also more services. There is already huge pressure on schools, medical services, policing, social services etc. With services currently strained, it is difficult to envisage future provision being adequate.</p> <p>Developments are also planned at Parley Cross and Roeshot Hill. These developments, together with the building East of Marsh Lane, will have a huge impact on the B3073 and other roads. This will not only affect residents, it will also damage tourism.</p> <p>Restricting building development to brownfield sites will at least not add any more to urban sprawl and will</p>					

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>help to ensure that Christchurch remains a place where time is pleasant. We cannot go on building indefinitely.</p> <p>I would ask you, please, to address the planning irregularities outlined above by deleting Policy CN3, Land East of Marsh Lane, from the Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy. No new homes should be built in this location.</p> <p>. I believe that the green belt (at land east of Marsh Lane) should be protected from development. Chris Chope MP also believes this and will be making his own representations to the council (see attached copy of his letter). I also do not believe we should build on the flood plain here. I am sure there will be counter arguments, but the policy is dangerous and will increase the risk of flooding.</p> <p>Damage to the SSSI is highly likely and 'Natural England' and the Dorset Wildlife Trust already have concerns about the possible encroachment into this area.</p> <p>Finally the vehicular access into the proposed site is restricted and likely to be poor and will involve building across the SSSI exclusion zone.</p>					
664220	K J Rochester		CSPS3795	Policy CN 3							<p>Dear Councillor</p> <p>I note that the planning strategy for Christchurch Borough includes the building of 90 homes on Land East of Marsh Lane (Policy CN3). I recognise that a consultation is taking place but in addition to this I would like to point out the following planning problems:-</p> <p>The land East of Marsh Lane is Green Belt land.</p> <p>The land East of Marsh Lane is on a flood plain.</p> <p>Building 90 new homes will make additional demands on water supply.</p> <p>The proposed development is close to the Avon Valley and Dorset Heathland Special Protection areas and Ramsar site. The large influx of people to the 90 new homes is likely to have a detrimental effect on wildlife and there is uncertainty as to whether potential damage to the sensitive areas can be adequately mitigated.</p> <p>Access to the site for vehicles will cause planning difficulties because the heathland and the bungalows already East of Marsh Lane with their gardens etc form a barrier.</p> <p>There will be significant increase in traffic noise. This will have an adverse impact on quality of life in the adjoining area between the Fairmile Road and Marsh Lane. This is a quiet area that so far has remained undisturbed by noise. Planning should seek to preserve tranquillity, not introduce noise.</p>				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>90 new homes will result in substantial additional traffic on Fairmile Road (B3073), a very busy highway, already severely congested at certain times. Christchurch has the worst traffic congestion in Dorset. Planning should aim to ease this, not add to it. 90 new homes will require new infrastructure and also more services. There is already huge pressure on schools, medical services, policing, social services etc. With services currently strained, it is difficult to envisage future provision being adequate. Restricting building development to brownfield sites will at least not add any more to urban sprawl and will help to ensure that Christchurch remains a place where time is pleasant. We cannot go on building indefinitely.</p> <p>I would be very interested to know what steps you intend to take to acknowledge local feeling and oppose Policy CN3, Land East of Marsh Lane – Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy. No new homes should be built in this location.</p> <p>I look forward to your reply</p>					
664237	Michael Hall		CSPS3796	Policy CN 3							<p>Dear Councillor</p> <p>I note that the planning strategy for Christchurch Borough includes the building of 90 homes on Land East of Marsh Lane (Policy CN3). I recognise that a consultation is taking place but in addition to this I would like to point out the following planning problems:-</p> <p>The land East of Marsh Lane is Green Belt land.</p> <p>The land East of Marsh Lane is on a flood plain.</p> <p>Building 90 new homes will make additional demands on water supply.</p> <p>The proposed development is close to the Avon Valley and Dorset Heathland Special Protection areas and Ramsar site. The large influx of people to the 90 new homes is likely to have a detrimental effect on wildlife and there is uncertainty as to whether potential damage to the sensitive areas can be adequately mitigated.</p> <p>Access to the site for vehicles will cause planning difficulties because the heathland and the bungalows already East of Marsh Lane with their gardens etc form a barrier.</p> <p>There will be significant increase in traffic noise. This will have an adverse impact on quality of life in the adjoining area between the Fairmile Road and Marsh Lane. This is a quiet area that so far has remained undisturbed by noise. Planning should seek to preserve tranquillity, not introduce noise.</p> <p>90 new homes will result in substantial additional traffic on Fairmile Road (B3073), a very busy highway,</p>				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>already severely congested at certain times. Christchurch has the worst traffic congestion in Dorset. Planning should aim to ease this, not add to it. 90 new homes will require new infrastructure and also more services. There is already huge pressure on schools, medical services, policing, social services etc. With services currently strained, it is difficult to envisage future provision being adequate. Restricting building development to brownfield sites will at least not add any more to urban sprawl and will help to ensure that Christchurch remains a place where time is pleasant. We cannot go on building indefinitely.</p> <p>I would be very interested to know what steps you intend to take to acknowledge local feeling and oppose Policy CN3, Land East of Marsh Lane – Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy. No new homes should be built in this location.</p> <p>I look forward to your reply</p>					
664259	H Elford		CSPS3799	Policy CN 3							<p>Dear Councillor</p> <p>I note that the planning strategy for Christchurch Borough includes the building of 90 homes on Land East of Marsh Lane (Policy CN3). I recognise that a consultation is taking place but in addition to this I would like to point out the following planning problems:-</p> <p>The land East of Marsh Lane is Green Belt land.</p> <p>The land East of Marsh Lane is on a flood plain.</p> <p>Building 90 new homes will make additional demands on water supply.</p> <p>The proposed development is close to the Avon Valley and Dorset Heathland Special Protection areas and Ramsar site. The large influx of people to the 90 new homes is likely to have a detrimental effect on wildlife and there is uncertainty as to whether potential damage to the sensitive areas can be adequately mitigated.</p> <p>Access to the site for vehicles will cause planning difficulties because the heathland and the bungalows already East of Marsh Lane with their gardens etc form a barrier.</p> <p>There will be significant increase in traffic noise. This will have an adverse impact on quality of life in the adjoining area between the Fairmile Road and Marsh Lane. This is a quiet area that so far has remained undisturbed by noise. Planning should seek to preserve tranquillity, not introduce noise.</p> <p>90 new homes will result in substantial additional traffic on Fairmile Road (B3073), a very busy highway, already severely congested at certain times.</p> <p>Christchurch has the worst traffic congestion in Dorset.</p>				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>Planning should aim to ease this, not add to it. 90 new homes will require new infrastructure and also more services. There is already huge pressure on schools, medical services, policing, social services etc. With services currently strained, it is difficult to envisage future provision being adequate. Restricting building development to brownfield sites will at least not add any more to urban sprawl and will help to ensure that Christchurch remains a place where time is pleasant. We cannot go on building indefinitely.</p> <p>I would be very interested to know what steps you intend to take to acknowledge local feeling and oppose Policy CN3, Land East of Marsh Lane – Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy. No new homes should be built in this location.</p> <p>I look forward to your reply</p>					
664260	A L Willett		CSPS3800	Policy CN 3							<p>Dear Councillor</p> <p>I note that the planning strategy for Christchurch Borough includes the building of 90 homes on Land East of Marsh Lane (Policy CN3). I recognise that a consultation is taking place but in addition to this I would like to point out the following planning problems:-</p> <p>The land East of Marsh Lane is Green Belt land and on a flood plain.</p> <p>Building 90 new homes will make additional demands on water supply.</p> <p>The proposed development is close to the Avon Valley and Dorset Heathland Special Protection areas and Ramsar site. The large influx of people to the 90 new homes is likely to have a detrimental effect on wildlife and there is uncertainty as to whether potential damage to the sensitive areas can be adequately mitigated.</p> <p>Access to the site for vehicles will cause planning difficulties because the heathland and the bungalows already East of Marsh Lane with their gardens etc form a barrier.</p> <p>There will be significant increase in traffic noise. This will have an adverse impact on quality of life in the adjoining area between the Fairmile Road and Marsh Lane. This is a quiet area that so far has remained undisturbed by noise. Planning should seek to preserve tranquillity, not introduce noise.</p> <p>90 new homes will result in substantial additional traffic on Fairmile Road (B3073), a very busy highway, already severely congested at certain times.</p> <p>Christchurch has the worst traffic congestion in Dorset. Planning should aim to ease this, not add to it.</p> <p>90 new homes will require new infrastructure and also</p>				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>more services. There is already huge pressure on schools, medical services, policing, social services etc. With services currently strained, it is difficult to envisage future provision being adequate. Developments are also planned at Parley Cross and Roeshot Hill. These developments, together with the building East of Marsh Lane, will have a huge impact on the B3073 and other roads. This will not only affect residents, it will also damage tourism. Restricting building development to brownfield sites will at least not add any more to urban sprawl and will help to ensure that Christchurch remains a place where time is pleasant. We cannot go on building indefinitely. I would ask you, please, to address the planning irregularities outlined above by deleting Policy CN3, Land East of Marsh Lane, from the Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy. No new homes should be built in this location.</p>					
664273	McWardne		CSPS3804	Policy CN 3							<p>Dear Councillor I note that the planning strategy for Christchurch Borough includes the building of 90 homes on Land East of Marsh Lane (Policy CN3). I recognise that a consultation is taking place but in addition to this I would like to point out the following planning problems:- The land East of Marsh Lane is Green Belt land. The land East of Marsh Lane is on a flood plain. Building 90 new homes will make additional demands on water supply. The proposed development is close to the Avon Valley and Dorset Heathland Special Protection areas and Ramsar site. The large influx of people to the 90 new homes is likely to have a detrimental effect on wildlife and there is uncertainty as to whether potential damage to the sensitive areas can be adequately mitigated. Access to the site for vehicles will cause planning difficulties because the heathland and the bungalows already East of Marsh Lane with their gardens etc form a barrier. There will be significant increase in traffic noise. This will have an adverse impact on quality of life in the adjoining area between the Fairmile Road and Marsh Lane. This is a quiet area that so far has remained undisturbed by noise. Planning should seek to preserve tranquillity, not introduce noise. 90 new homes will result in substantial additional traffic on Fairmile Road (B3073), a very busy highway, already severely congested at certain times. Christchurch has the worst traffic congestion in Dorset.</p>				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>Planning should aim to ease this, not add to it. 90 new homes will require new infrastructure and also more services. There is already huge pressure on schools, medical services, policing, social services etc. With services currently strained, it is difficult to envisage future provision being adequate. Restricting building development to brownfield sites will at least not add any more to urban sprawl and will help to ensure that Christchurch remains a place where time is pleasant. We cannot go on building indefinitely.</p> <p>I would be very interested to know what steps you intend to take to acknowledge local feeling and oppose Policy CN3, Land East of Marsh Lane – Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy. No new homes should be built in this location.</p> <p>I look forward to your reply</p>					
664274	W H Pritchard		CSPS3805	Policy CN 3							<p>Dear Councillor</p> <p>I note that the planning strategy for Christchurch Borough includes the building of 90 homes on Land East of Marsh Lane (Policy CN3). I recognise that a consultation is taking place but in addition to this I would like to point out the following planning problems:-</p> <p>The land East of Marsh Lane is Green Belt land and on a flood plain.</p> <p>Building 90 new homes will make additional demands on water supply.</p> <p>The proposed development is close to the Avon Valley and Dorset Heathland Special Protection areas and Ramsar site. The large influx of people to the 90 new homes is likely to have a detrimental effect on wildlife and there is uncertainty as to whether potential damage to the sensitive areas can be adequately mitigated.</p> <p>Access to the site for vehicles will cause planning difficulties because the heathland and the bungalows already East of Marsh Lane with their gardens etc form a barrier.</p> <p>There will be significant increase in traffic noise. This will have an adverse impact on quality of life in the adjoining area between the Fairmile Road and Marsh Lane. This is a quiet area that so far has remained undisturbed by noise. Planning should seek to preserve tranquillity, not introduce noise.</p> <p>90 new homes will result in substantial additional traffic on Fairmile Road (B3073), a very busy highway, already severely congested at certain times.</p> <p>Christchurch has the worst traffic congestion in Dorset. Planning should aim to ease this, not add to it.</p> <p>90 new homes will require new infrastructure and also</p>				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	
											<p>more services. There is already huge pressure on schools, medical services, policing, social services etc. With services currently strained, it is difficult to envisage future provision being adequate. Developments are also planned at Parley Cross and Roeshot Hill. These developments, together with the building East of Marsh Lane, will have a huge impact on the B3073 and other roads. This will not only affect residents, it will also damage tourism. Restricting building development to brownfield sites will at least not add any more to urban sprawl and will help to ensure that Christchurch remains a place where time is pleasant. We cannot go on building indefinitely. I would ask you, please, to address the planning irregularities outlined above by deleting Policy CN3, Land East of Marsh Lane, from the Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy. No new homes should be built in this location.</p>						
664281	C Knight		CSPS3806	Policy CN 3							<p>Dear Councillor I note that the planning strategy for Christchurch Borough includes the building of 90 homes on Land East of Marsh Lane (Policy CN3). I recognise that a consultation is taking place but in addition to this I would like to point out the following planning problems:- The land East of Marsh Lane is Green Belt land. The land East of Marsh Lane is on a flood plain. Building 90 new homes will make additional demands on water supply. The proposed development is close to the Avon Valley and Dorset Heathland Special Protection areas and Ramsar site. The large influx of people to the 90 new homes is likely to have a detrimental effect on wildlife and there is uncertainty as to whether potential damage to the sensitive areas can be adequately mitigated. Access to the site for vehicles will cause planning difficulties because the heathland and the bungalows already East of Marsh Lane with their gardens etc form a barrier. There will be significant increase in traffic noise. This will have an adverse impact on quality of life in the adjoining area between the Fairmile Road and Marsh Lane. This is a quiet area that so far has remained undisturbed by noise. Planning should seek to preserve tranquillity, not introduce noise. 90 new homes will result in substantial additional traffic on Fairmile Road (B3073), a very busy highway, already severely congested at certain times. Christchurch has the worst traffic congestion in Dorset.</p>					317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>Planning should aim to ease this, not add to it. 90 new homes will require new infrastructure and also more services. There is already huge pressure on schools, medical services, policing, social services etc. With services currently strained, it is difficult to envisage future provision being adequate. Restricting building development to brownfield sites will at least not add any more to urban sprawl and will help to ensure that Christchurch remains a place where time is pleasant. We cannot go on building indefinitely.</p> <p>I would be very interested to know what steps you intend to take to acknowledge local feeling and oppose Policy CN3, Land East of Marsh Lane – Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy. No new homes should be built in this location.</p> <p>I look forward to your reply</p>					
664489	Mrs Guen Pritchard		CSPS3817	Policy CN 3							<p>Dear Councillor</p> <p>I note that the planning strategy for Christchurch Borough includes the building of 90 homes on Land East of Marsh Lane (Policy CN3). I recognise that a consultation is taking place but in addition to this I would like to point out the following planning problems:-</p> <p>The land East of Marsh Lane is Green Belt land and on a flood plain.</p> <p>Building 90 new homes will make additional demands on water supply.</p> <p>The proposed development is close to the Avon Valley and Dorset Heathland Special Protection areas and Ramsar site. The large influx of people to the 90 new homes is likely to have a detrimental effect on wildlife and there is uncertainty as to whether potential damage to the sensitive areas can be adequately mitigated.</p> <p>Access to the site for vehicles will cause planning difficulties because the heathland and the bungalows already East of Marsh Lane with their gardens etc form a barrier.</p> <p>There will be significant increase in traffic noise. This will have an adverse impact on quality of life in the adjoining area between the Fairmile Road and Marsh Lane. This is a quiet area that so far has remained undisturbed by noise. Planning should seek to preserve tranquillity, not introduce noise.</p> <p>90 new homes will result in substantial additional traffic on Fairmile Road (B3073), a very busy highway, already severely congested at certain times. Christchurch has the worst traffic congestion in Dorset. Planning should aim to ease this, not add to it.</p> <p>90 new homes will require new infrastructure and also</p>				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>more services. There is already huge pressure on schools, medical services, policing, social services etc. With services currently strained, it is difficult to envisage future provision being adequate. Developments are also planned at Parley Cross and Roeshot Hill. These developments, together with the building East of Marsh Lane, will have a huge impact on the B3073 and other roads. This will not only affect residents, it will also damage tourism. Restricting building development to brownfield sites will at least not add any more to urban sprawl and will help to ensure that Christchurch remains a place where time is pleasant. We cannot go on building indefinitely. I would ask you, please, to address the planning irregularities outlined above by deleting Policy CN3, Land East of Marsh Lane, from the Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy. No new homes should be built in this location.</p>					
664493	M D Stephenson		CSPS3818	Policy CN 3							<p>Dear Councillor I note that the planning strategy for Christchurch Borough includes the building of 90 homes on Land East of Marsh Lane (Policy CN3). I recognise that a consultation is taking place but in addition to this I would like to point out the following planning problems:- The land East of Marsh Lane is Green Belt land and on a flood plain. Building 90 new homes will make additional demands on water supply. The proposed development is close to the Avon Valley and Dorset Heathland Special Protection areas and Ramsar site. The large influx of people to the 90 new homes is likely to have a detrimental effect on wildlife and there is uncertainty as to whether potential damage to the sensitive areas can be adequately mitigated. Access to the site for vehicles will cause planning difficulties because the heathland and the bungalows already East of Marsh Lane with their gardens etc form a barrier. There will be significant increase in traffic noise. This will have an adverse impact on quality of life in the adjoining area between the Fairmile Road and Marsh Lane. This is a quiet area that so far has remained undisturbed by noise. Planning should seek to preserve tranquillity, not introduce noise. 90 new homes will result in substantial additional traffic on Fairmile Road (B3073), a very busy highway, already severely congested at certain times. Christchurch has the worst traffic congestion in Dorset.</p>				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>Planning should aim to ease this, not add to it. 90 new homes will require new infrastructure and also more services. There is already huge pressure on schools, medical services, policing, social services etc. With services currently strained, it is difficult to envisage future provision being adequate. Developments are also planned at Parley Cross and Roeshot Hill. These developments, together with the building East of Marsh Lane, will have a huge impact on the B3073 and other roads. This will not only affect residents, it will also damage tourism. Restricting building development to brownfield sites will at least not add any more to urban sprawl and will help to ensure that Christchurch remains a place where time is pleasant. We cannot go on building indefinitely.</p> <p>I would ask you, please, to address the planning irregularities outlined above by deleting Policy CN3, Land East of Marsh Lane, from the Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy. No new homes should be built in this location.</p>					
664497	Ms Holli Flatley		CSPS3819	Policy CN 3							<p>Dear Councillor</p> <p>I note that the planning strategy for Christchurch Borough includes the building of 90 homes on Land East of Marsh Lane (Policy CN3). I recognise that a consultation is taking place but in addition to this I would like to point out the following planning problems:-</p> <p>The land East of Marsh Lane is Green Belt land and on a flood plain.</p> <p>Building 90 new homes will make additional demands on water supply.</p> <p>The proposed development is close to the Avon Valley and Dorset Heathland Special Protection areas and Ramsar site. The large influx of people to the 90 new homes is likely to have a detrimental effect on wildlife and there is uncertainty as to whether potential damage to the sensitive areas can be adequately mitigated.</p> <p>Access to the site for vehicles will cause planning difficulties because the heathland and the bungalows already East of Marsh Lane with their gardens etc form a barrier.</p> <p>There will be significant increase in traffic noise. This will have an adverse impact on quality of life in the adjoining area between the Fairmile Road and Marsh Lane. This is a quiet area that so far has remained undisturbed by noise. Planning should seek to preserve tranquillity, not introduce noise.</p> <p>90 new homes will result in substantial additional traffic on Fairmile Road (B3073), a very busy highway,</p>				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	
											<p>already severely congested at certain times. Christchurch has the worst traffic congestion in Dorset. Planning should aim to ease this, not add to it. 90 new homes will require new infrastructure and also more services. There is already huge pressure on schools, medical services, policing, social services etc. With services currently strained, it is difficult to envisage future provision being adequate. Developments are also planned at Parley Cross and Roeshot Hill. These developments, together with the building East of Marsh Lane, will have a huge impact on the B3073 and other roads. This will not only affect residents, it will also damage tourism. Restricting building development to brownfield sites will at least not add any more to urban sprawl and will help to ensure that Christchurch remains a place where time is pleasant. We cannot go on building indefinitely. I would ask you, please, to address the planning irregularities outlined above by deleting Policy CN3, Land East of Marsh Lane, from the Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy. No new homes should be built in this location.</p>						
664506	Mr K Branscombe		CSPS3820	Policy CN 3							<p>Dear Councillor I note that the planning strategy for Christchurch Borough includes the building of 90 homes on Land East of Marsh Lane (Policy CN3). I recognise that a consultation is taking place but in addition to this I would like to point out the following planning problems:- The land East of Marsh Lane is Green Belt land. The land East of Marsh Lane is on a flood plain. Building 90 new homes will make additional demands on water supply. The proposed development is close to the Avon Valley and Dorset Heathland Special Protection areas and Ramsar site. The large influx of people to the 90 new homes is likely to have a detrimental effect on wildlife and there is uncertainty as to whether potential damage to the sensitive areas can be adequately mitigated. Access to the site for vehicles will cause planning difficulties because the heathland and the bungalows already East of Marsh Lane with their gardens etc form a barrier. There will be significant increase in traffic noise. This will have an adverse impact on quality of life in the adjoining area between the Fairmile Road and Marsh Lane. This is a quiet area that so far has remained undisturbed by noise. Planning should seek to preserve tranquillity, not introduce noise.</p>					317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	
											<p>90 new homes will result in substantial additional traffic on Fairmile Road (B3073), a very busy highway, already severely congested at certain times. Christchurch has the worst traffic congestion in Dorset. Planning should aim to ease this, not add to it. 90 new homes will require new infrastructure and also more services. There is already huge pressure on schools, medical services, policing, social services etc. With services currently strained, it is difficult to envisage future provision being adequate. Restricting building development to brownfield sites will at least not add any more to urban sprawl and will help to ensure that Christchurch remains a place where time is pleasant. We cannot go on building indefinitely.</p> <p>I would be very interested to know what steps you intend to take to acknowledge local feeling and oppose Policy CN3, Land East of Marsh Lane – Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy. No new homes should be built in this location.</p> <p>I look forward to your reply</p>						
664520	M F Edwards		CSPS3821	Policy CN 3							<p>Dear Councillor</p> <p>I note that the planning strategy for Christchurch Borough includes the building of 90 homes on Land East of Marsh Lane (Policy CN3). I recognise that a consultation is taking place but in addition to this I would like to point out the following planning problems:-</p> <p>The land East of Marsh Lane is Green Belt land.</p> <p>The land East of Marsh Lane is on a flood plain.</p> <p>Building 90 new homes will make additional demands on water supply.</p> <p>The proposed development is close to the Avon Valley and Dorset Heathland Special Protection areas and Ramsar site. The large influx of people to the 90 new homes is likely to have a detrimental effect on wildlife and there is uncertainty as to whether potential damage to the sensitive areas can be adequately mitigated.</p> <p>Access to the site for vehicles will cause planning difficulties because the heathland and the bungalows already East of Marsh Lane with their gardens etc form a barrier.</p> <p>There will be significant increase in traffic noise. This will have an adverse impact on quality of life in the adjoining area between the Fairmile Road and Marsh Lane. This is a quiet area that so far has remained undisturbed by noise. Planning should seek to preserve tranquillity, not introduce noise.</p> <p>90 new homes will result in substantial additional traffic on Fairmile Road (B3073), a very busy highway,</p>				317		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>already severely congested at certain times. Christchurch has the worst traffic congestion in Dorset. Planning should aim to ease this, not add to it. 90 new homes will require new infrastructure and also more services. There is already huge pressure on schools, medical services, policing, social services etc. With services currently strained, it is difficult to envisage future provision being adequate. Restricting building development to brownfield sites will at least not add any more to urban sprawl and will help to ensure that Christchurch remains a place where time is pleasant. We cannot go on building indefinitely.</p> <p>I would be very interested to know what steps you intend to take to acknowledge local feeling and oppose Policy CN3, Land East of Marsh Lane – Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy. No new homes should be built in this location.</p> <p>I look forward to your reply</p>					
664523	D Miles		CSPS3822	Policy CN 3							<p>Dear Councillor</p> <p>I note that the planning strategy for Christchurch Borough includes the building of 90 homes on Land East of Marsh Lane (Policy CN3). I recognise that a consultation is taking place but in addition to this I would like to point out the following planning problems:-</p> <p>The land East of Marsh Lane is Green Belt land.</p> <p>The land East of Marsh Lane is on a flood plain.</p> <p>Building 90 new homes will make additional demands on water supply.</p> <p>The proposed development is close to the Avon Valley and Dorset Heathland Special Protection areas and Ramsar site. The large influx of people to the 90 new homes is likely to have a detrimental effect on wildlife and there is uncertainty as to whether potential damage to the sensitive areas can be adequately mitigated.</p> <p>Access to the site for vehicles will cause planning difficulties because the heathland and the bungalows already East of Marsh Lane with their gardens etc form a barrier.</p> <p>There will be significant increase in traffic noise. This will have an adverse impact on quality of life in the adjoining area between the Fairmile Road and Marsh Lane. This is a quiet area that so far has remained undisturbed by noise. Planning should seek to preserve tranquillity, not introduce noise.</p> <p>90 new homes will result in substantial additional traffic on Fairmile Road (B3073), a very busy highway, already severely congested at certain times.</p> <p>Christchurch has the worst traffic congestion in Dorset.</p>				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>Planning should aim to ease this, not add to it. 90 new homes will require new infrastructure and also more services. There is already huge pressure on schools, medical services, policing, social services etc. With services currently strained, it is difficult to envisage future provision being adequate. Restricting building development to brownfield sites will at least not add any more to urban sprawl and will help to ensure that Christchurch remains a place where time is pleasant. We cannot go on building indefinitely.</p> <p>I would be very interested to know what steps you intend to take to acknowledge local feeling and oppose Policy CN3, Land East of Marsh Lane – Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy. No new homes should be built in this location.</p> <p>I look forward to your reply</p>					
664526	Mr I Green		CSPS3823	Policy CN 3							<p>Dear Councillor</p> <p>I note that the planning strategy for Christchurch Borough includes the building of 90 homes on Land East of Marsh Lane (Policy CN3). I recognise that a consultation is taking place but in addition to this I would like to point out the following planning problems:-</p> <p>The land East of Marsh Lane is Green Belt land and on a flood plain.</p> <p>Building 90 new homes will make additional demands on water supply.</p> <p>The proposed development is close to the Avon Valley and Dorset Heathland Special Protection areas and Ramsar site. The large influx of people to the 90 new homes is likely to have a detrimental effect on wildlife and there is uncertainty as to whether potential damage to the sensitive areas can be adequately mitigated.</p> <p>Access to the site for vehicles will cause planning difficulties because the heathland and the bungalows already East of Marsh Lane with their gardens etc form a barrier.</p> <p>There will be significant increase in traffic noise. This will have an adverse impact on quality of life in the adjoining area between the Fairmile Road and Marsh Lane. This is a quiet area that so far has remained undisturbed by noise. Planning should seek to preserve tranquillity, not introduce noise.</p> <p>90 new homes will result in substantial additional traffic on Fairmile Road (B3073), a very busy highway, already severely congested at certain times. Christchurch has the worst traffic congestion in Dorset. Planning should aim to ease this, not add to it.</p> <p>90 new homes will require new infrastructure and also</p>				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>more services. There is already huge pressure on schools, medical services, policing, social services etc. With services currently strained, it is difficult to envisage future provision being adequate. Developments are also planned at Parley Cross and Roeshot Hill. These developments, together with the building East of Marsh Lane, will have a huge impact on the B3073 and other roads. This will not only affect residents, it will also damage tourism. Restricting building development to brownfield sites will at least not add any more to urban sprawl and will help to ensure that Christchurch remains a place where time is pleasant. We cannot go on building indefinitely. I would ask you, please, to address the planning irregularities outlined above by deleting Policy CN3, Land East of Marsh Lane, from the Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy. No new homes should be built in this location.</p>					
664542	Mrs Tracey Mondon		CSPS3824	Policy CN 3							<p>Dear Councillor I note that the planning strategy for Christchurch Borough includes the building of 90 homes on Land East of Marsh Lane (Policy CN3). I recognise that a consultation is taking place but in addition to this I would like to point out the following planning problems:- The land East of Marsh Lane is Green Belt land and on a flood plain. Building 90 new homes will make additional demands on water supply. The proposed development is close to the Avon Valley and Dorset Heathland Special Protection areas and Ramsar site. The large influx of people to the 90 new homes is likely to have a detrimental effect on wildlife and there is uncertainty as to whether potential damage to the sensitive areas can be adequately mitigated. Access to the site for vehicles will cause planning difficulties because the heathland and the bungalows already East of Marsh Lane with their gardens etc form a barrier. There will be significant increase in traffic noise. This will have an adverse impact on quality of life in the adjoining area between the Fairmile Road and Marsh Lane. This is a quiet area that so far has remained undisturbed by noise. Planning should seek to preserve tranquillity, not introduce noise. 90 new homes will result in substantial additional traffic on Fairmile Road (B3073), a very busy highway, already severely congested at certain times. Christchurch has the worst traffic congestion in Dorset.</p>				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>Planning should aim to ease this, not add to it. 90 new homes will require new infrastructure and also more services. There is already huge pressure on schools, medical services, policing, social services etc. With services currently strained, it is difficult to envisage future provision being adequate. Developments are also planned at Parley Cross and Roeshot Hill. These developments, together with the building East of Marsh Lane, will have a huge impact on the B3073 and other roads. This will not only affect residents, it will also damage tourism. Restricting building development to brownfield sites will at least not add any more to urban sprawl and will help to ensure that Christchurch remains a place where time is pleasant. We cannot go on building indefinitely.</p> <p>I would ask you, please, to address the planning irregularities outlined above by deleting Policy CN3, Land East of Marsh Lane, from the Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy. No new homes should be built in this location.</p>					
664543	Mrs Dabrlowa Pomroy		CSPS3825	Policy CN 3							<p>Dear Councillor</p> <p>I note that the planning strategy for Christchurch Borough includes the building of 90 homes on Land East of Marsh Lane (Policy CN3). I recognise that a consultation is taking place but in addition to this I would like to point out the following planning problems:-</p> <p>The land East of Marsh Lane is Green Belt land and on a flood plain.</p> <p>Building 90 new homes will make additional demands on water supply.</p> <p>The proposed development is close to the Avon Valley and Dorset Heathland Special Protection areas and Ramsar site. The large influx of people to the 90 new homes is likely to have a detrimental effect on wildlife and there is uncertainty as to whether potential damage to the sensitive areas can be adequately mitigated.</p> <p>Access to the site for vehicles will cause planning difficulties because the heathland and the bungalows already East of Marsh Lane with their gardens etc form a barrier.</p> <p>There will be significant increase in traffic noise. This will have an adverse impact on quality of life in the adjoining area between the Fairmile Road and Marsh Lane. This is a quiet area that so far has remained undisturbed by noise. Planning should seek to preserve tranquillity, not introduce noise.</p> <p>90 new homes will result in substantial additional traffic on Fairmile Road (B3073), a very busy highway,</p>				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	
											<p>already severely congested at certain times. Christchurch has the worst traffic congestion in Dorset. Planning should aim to ease this, not add to it. 90 new homes will require new infrastructure and also more services. There is already huge pressure on schools, medical services, policing, social services etc. With services currently strained, it is difficult to envisage future provision being adequate. Developments are also planned at Parley Cross and Roeshot Hill. These developments, together with the building East of Marsh Lane, will have a huge impact on the B3073 and other roads. This will not only affect residents, it will also damage tourism. Restricting building development to brownfield sites will at least not add any more to urban sprawl and will help to ensure that Christchurch remains a place where time is pleasant. We cannot go on building indefinitely. I would ask you, please, to address the planning irregularities outlined above by deleting Policy CN3, Land East of Marsh Lane, from the Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy. No new homes should be built in this location.</p>						
664546	Mr Terence Pomroy		CSPS3826	Policy CN 3							<p>Dear Councillor I note that the planning strategy for Christchurch Borough includes the building of 90 homes on Land East of Marsh Lane (Policy CN3). I recognise that a consultation is taking place but in addition to this I would like to point out the following planning problems:- The land East of Marsh Lane is Green Belt land and on a flood plain. Building 90 new homes will make additional demands on water supply. The proposed development is close to the Avon Valley and Dorset Heathland Special Protection areas and Ramsar site. The large influx of people to the 90 new homes is likely to have a detrimental effect on wildlife and there is uncertainty as to whether potential damage to the sensitive areas can be adequately mitigated. Access to the site for vehicles will cause planning difficulties because the heathland and the bungalows already East of Marsh Lane with their gardens etc form a barrier. There will be significant increase in traffic noise. This will have an adverse impact on quality of life in the adjoining area between the Fairmile Road and Marsh Lane. This is a quiet area that so far has remained undisturbed by noise. Planning should seek to preserve tranquillity, not introduce noise.</p>					317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>90 new homes will result in substantial additional traffic on Fairmile Road (B3073), a very busy highway, already severely congested at certain times. Christchurch has the worst traffic congestion in Dorset. Planning should aim to ease this, not add to it. 90 new homes will require new infrastructure and also more services. There is already huge pressure on schools, medical services, policing, social services etc. With services currently strained, it is difficult to envisage future provision being adequate. Developments are also planned at Parley Cross and Roeshot Hill. These developments, together with the building East of Marsh Lane, will have a huge impact on the B3073 and other roads. This will not only affect residents, it will also damage tourism. Restricting building development to brownfield sites will at least not add any more to urban sprawl and will help to ensure that Christchurch remains a place where time is pleasant. We cannot go on building indefinitely. I would ask you, please, to address the planning irregularities outlined above by deleting Policy CN3, Land East of Marsh Lane, from the Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy. No new homes should be built in this location.</p>					
664549	S R Taylor		CSPS3827	Policy CN 3							<p>Dear Councillor I note that the planning strategy for Christchurch Borough includes the building of 90 homes on Land East of Marsh Lane (Policy CN3). I recognise that a consultation is taking place but in addition to this I would like to point out the following planning problems:- The land East of Marsh Lane is Green Belt land and on a flood plain. Building 90 new homes will make additional demands on water supply. The proposed development is close to the Avon Valley and Dorset Heathland Special Protection areas and Ramsar site. The large influx of people to the 90 new homes is likely to have a detrimental effect on wildlife and there is uncertainty as to whether potential damage to the sensitive areas can be adequately mitigated. Access to the site for vehicles will cause planning difficulties because the heathland and the bungalows already East of Marsh Lane with their gardens etc form a barrier. There will be significant increase in traffic noise. This will have an adverse impact on quality of life in the adjoining area between the Fairmile Road and Marsh Lane. This is a quiet area that so far has remained</p>				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>undisturbed by noise. Planning should seek to preserve tranquillity, not introduce noise. 90 new homes will result in substantial additional traffic on Fairmile Road (B3073), a very busy highway, already severely congested at certain times. Christchurch has the worst traffic congestion in Dorset. Planning should aim to ease this, not add to it. 90 new homes will require new infrastructure and also more services. There is already huge pressure on schools, medical services, policing, social services etc. With services currently strained, it is difficult to envisage future provision being adequate. Developments are also planned at Parley Cross and Roeshot Hill. These developments, together with the building East of Marsh Lane, will have a huge impact on the B3073 and other roads. This will not only affect residents, it will also damage tourism. Restricting building development to brownfield sites will at least not add any more to urban sprawl and will help to ensure that Christchurch remains a place where time is pleasant. We cannot go on building indefinitely. I would ask you, please, to address the planning irregularities outlined above by deleting Policy CN3, Land East of Marsh Lane, from the Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy. No new homes should be built in this location.</p>					
664913	Mr M J Unsworth		CSPS3849	Policy CN 3		No					<p>Our objections are: Loss of Green Belt, strain on water/utilities, inadequate vehicular access, Traffic congestion, extra strain on services and infrastructure, increased risk of flooding, impact on the SSSI, increased noise, road safety, poor environment for new homes (water beds/flies) Dear Councillor I note that the planning strategy for Christchurch Borough includes the building of 90 homes on Land East of Marsh Lane (Policy CN3). I recognise that a consultation is taking place but in addition to this I would like to point out the following planning problems:- The land East of Marsh Lane is Green Belt land and on a flood plain. Building 90 new homes will make additional demands on water supply. The proposed development is close to the Avon Valley and Dorset Heathland Special Protection areas and Ramsar site. The large influx of people to the 90 new homes is likely to have a detrimental effect on wildlife and there is uncertainty as to whether potential damage to the sensitive areas can be adequately mitigated.</p>				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>Access to the site for vehicles will cause planning difficulties because the heathland and the bungalows already East of Marsh Lane with their gardens etc form a barrier.</p> <p>There will be significant increase in traffic noise. This will have an adverse impact on quality of life in the adjoining area between the Fairmile Road and Marsh Lane. This is a quiet area that so far has remained undisturbed by noise. Planning should seek to preserve tranquillity, not introduce noise.</p> <p>90 new homes will result in substantial additional traffic on Fairmile Road (B3073), a very busy highway, already severely congested at certain times.</p> <p>Christchurch has the worst traffic congestion in Dorset. Planning should aim to ease this, not add to it.</p> <p>90 new homes will require new infrastructure and also more services. There is already huge pressure on schools, medical services, policing, social services etc. With services currently strained, it is difficult to envisage future provision being adequate.</p> <p>Developments are also planned at Parley Cross and Roeshot Hill. These developments, together with the building East of Marsh Lane, will have a huge impact on the B3073 and other roads. This will not only affect residents, it will also damage tourism.</p> <p>Restricting building development to brownfield sites will at least not add any more to urban sprawl and will help to ensure that Christchurch remains a place where time is pleasant. We cannot go on building indefinitely.</p> <p>I would ask you, please, to address the planning irregularities outlined above by deleting Policy CN3, Land East of Marsh Lane, from the Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy. No new homes should be built in this location.</p>					
664924	Mr Mike Roberts		CSPS3851	Policy CN 3							<p>Dear Councillor</p> <p>I note that the planning strategy for Christchurch Borough includes the building of 90 homes on Land East of Marsh Lane (Policy CN3). I recognise that a consultation is taking place but in addition to this I would like to point out the following planning problems:-</p> <p>The land East of Marsh Lane is Green Belt land and on a flood plain.</p> <p>Building 90 new homes will make additional demands on water supply.</p> <p>The proposed development is close to the Avon Valley and Dorset Heathland Special Protection areas and Ramsar site. The large influx of people to the 90 new homes is likely to have a detrimental effect on wildlife and there is uncertainty as to whether potential</p>				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	
											<p>damage to the sensitive areas can be adequately mitigated.</p> <p>Access to the site for vehicles will cause planning difficulties because the heathland and the bungalows already East of Marsh Lane with their gardens etc form a barrier.</p> <p>There will be significant increase in traffic noise. This will have an adverse impact on quality of life in the adjoining area between the Fairmile Road and Marsh Lane. This is a quiet area that so far has remained undisturbed by noise. Planning should seek to preserve tranquillity, not introduce noise.</p> <p>90 new homes will result in substantial additional traffic on Fairmile Road (B3073), a very busy highway, already severely congested at certain times.</p> <p>Christchurch has the worst traffic congestion in Dorset. Planning should aim to ease this, not add to it.</p> <p>90 new homes will require new infrastructure and also more services. There is already huge pressure on schools, medical services, policing, social services etc. With services currently strained, it is difficult to envisage future provision being adequate.</p> <p>Developments are also planned at Parley Cross and Roeshot Hill. These developments, together with the building East of Marsh Lane, will have a huge impact on the B3073 and other roads. This will not only affect residents, it will also damage tourism.</p> <p>Restricting building development to brownfield sites will at least not add any more to urban sprawl and will help to ensure that Christchurch remains a place where time is pleasant. We cannot go on building indefinitely.</p> <p>I would ask you, please, to address the planning irregularities outlined above by deleting Policy CN3, Land East of Marsh Lane, from the Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy. No new homes should be built in this location.</p>						
664934	V Roberts		CSPS3853	Policy CN 3							<p>Dear Councillor</p> <p>I note that the planning strategy for Christchurch Borough includes the building of 90 homes on Land East of Marsh Lane (Policy CN3). I recognise that a consultation is taking place but in addition to this I would like to point out the following planning problems:-</p> <p>The land East of Marsh Lane is Green Belt land and on a flood plain.</p> <p>Building 90 new homes will make additional demands on water supply.</p> <p>The proposed development is close to the Avon Valley and Dorset Heathland Special Protection areas and Ramsar site. The large influx of people to the 90 new</p>					317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	
											<p>homes is likely to have a detrimental effect on wildlife and there is uncertainty as to whether potential damage to the sensitive areas can be adequately mitigated.</p> <p>Access to the site for vehicles will cause planning difficulties because the heathland and the bungalows already East of Marsh Lane with their gardens etc form a barrier.</p> <p>There will be significant increase in traffic noise. This will have an adverse impact on quality of life in the adjoining area between the Fairmile Road and Marsh Lane. This is a quiet area that so far has remained undisturbed by noise. Planning should seek to preserve tranquillity, not introduce noise.</p> <p>90 new homes will result in substantial additional traffic on Fairmile Road (B3073), a very busy highway, already severely congested at certain times. Christchurch has the worst traffic congestion in Dorset. Planning should aim to ease this, not add to it.</p> <p>90 new homes will require new infrastructure and also more services. There is already huge pressure on schools, medical services, policing, social services etc. With services currently strained, it is difficult to envisage future provision being adequate.</p> <p>Developments are also planned at Parley Cross and Roeshot Hill. These developments, together with the building East of Marsh Lane, will have a huge impact on the B3073 and other roads. This will not only affect residents, it will also damage tourism.</p> <p>Restricting building development to brownfield sites will at least not add any more to urban sprawl and will help to ensure that Christchurch remains a place where time is pleasant. We cannot go on building indefinitely.</p> <p>I would ask you, please, to address the planning irregularities outlined above by deleting Policy CN3, Land East of Marsh Lane, from the Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy. No new homes should be built in this location.</p>						
664940	M P Taylor		CSPS3855	Policy CN 3							<p>Dear Councillor</p> <p>I note that the planning strategy for Christchurch Borough includes the building of 90 homes on Land East of Marsh Lane (Policy CN3). I recognise that a consultation is taking place but in addition to this I would like to point out the following planning problems:-</p> <p>The land East of Marsh Lane is Green Belt land and on a flood plain.</p> <p>Building 90 new homes will make additional demands on water supply.</p> <p>The proposed development is close to the Avon Valley</p>					317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>and Dorset Heathland Special Protection areas and Ramsar site. The large influx of people to the 90 new homes is likely to have a detrimental effect on wildlife and there is uncertainty as to whether potential damage to the sensitive areas can be adequately mitigated.</p> <p>Access to the site for vehicles will cause planning difficulties because the heathland and the bungalows already East of Marsh Lane with their gardens etc form a barrier.</p> <p>There will be significant increase in traffic noise. This will have an adverse impact on quality of life in the adjoining area between the Fairmile Road and Marsh Lane. This is a quiet area that so far has remained undisturbed by noise. Planning should seek to preserve tranquillity, not introduce noise.</p> <p>90 new homes will result in substantial additional traffic on Fairmile Road (B3073), a very busy highway, already severely congested at certain times.</p> <p>Christchurch has the worst traffic congestion in Dorset. Planning should aim to ease this, not add to it.</p> <p>90 new homes will require new infrastructure and also more services. There is already huge pressure on schools, medical services, policing, social services etc. With services currently strained, it is difficult to envisage future provision being adequate.</p> <p>Developments are also planned at Parley Cross and Roeshot Hill. These developments, together with the building East of Marsh Lane, will have a huge impact on the B3073 and other roads. This will not only affect residents, it will also damage tourism.</p> <p>Restricting building development to brownfield sites will at least not add any more to urban sprawl and will help to ensure that Christchurch remains a place where time is pleasant. We cannot go on building indefinitely.</p> <p>I would ask you, please, to address the planning irregularities outlined above by deleting Policy CN3, Land East of Marsh Lane, from the Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy. No new homes should be built in this location.</p>					
664956	Ms Linda Simth		CSPS3856	Policy CN 3							<p>Dear Councillor</p> <p>I note that the planning strategy for Christchurch Borough includes the building of 90 homes on Land East of Marsh Lane (Policy CN3). I recognise that a consultation is taking place but in addition to this I would like to point out the following planning problems:-</p> <p>The land East of Marsh Lane is Green Belt land and on a flood plain.</p> <p>Building 90 new homes will make additional demands</p>				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>on water supply.</p> <p>The proposed development is close to the Avon Valley and Dorset Heathland Special Protection areas and Ramsar site. The large influx of people to the 90 new homes is likely to have a detrimental effect on wildlife and there is uncertainty as to whether potential damage to the sensitive areas can be adequately mitigated.</p> <p>Access to the site for vehicles will cause planning difficulties because the heathland and the bungalows already East of Marsh Lane with their gardens etc form a barrier.</p> <p>There will be significant increase in traffic noise. This will have an adverse impact on quality of life in the adjoining area between the Fairmile Road and Marsh Lane. This is a quiet area that so far has remained undisturbed by noise. Planning should seek to preserve tranquillity, not introduce noise.</p> <p>90 new homes will result in substantial additional traffic on Fairmile Road (B3073), a very busy highway, already severely congested at certain times.</p> <p>Christchurch has the worst traffic congestion in Dorset. Planning should aim to ease this, not add to it.</p> <p>90 new homes will require new infrastructure and also more services. There is already huge pressure on schools, medical services, policing, social services etc. With services currently strained, it is difficult to envisage future provision being adequate.</p> <p>Developments are also planned at Parley Cross and Roeshot Hill. These developments, together with the building East of Marsh Lane, will have a huge impact on the B3073 and other roads. This will not only affect residents, it will also damage tourism.</p> <p>Restricting building development to brownfield sites will at least not add any more to urban sprawl and will help to ensure that Christchurch remains a place where time is pleasant. We cannot go on building indefinitely.</p> <p>I would ask you, please, to address the planning irregularities outlined above by deleting Policy CN3, Land East of Marsh Lane, from the Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy. No new homes should be built in this location.</p>					
664975	M Stone		CSPS3857	Policy CN 3							<p>Dear Councillor</p> <p>I note that the planning strategy for Christchurch Borough includes the building of 90 homes on Land East of Marsh Lane (Policy CN3). I recognise that a consultation is taking place but in addition to this I would like to point out the following planning problems:-</p> <p>The land East of Marsh Lane is Green Belt land and</p>				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>on a flood plain. Building 90 new homes will make additional demands on water supply. The proposed development is close to the Avon Valley and Dorset Heathland Special Protection areas and Ramsar site. The large influx of people to the 90 new homes is likely to have a detrimental effect on wildlife and there is uncertainty as to whether potential damage to the sensitive areas can be adequately mitigated. Access to the site for vehicles will cause planning difficulties because the heathland and the bungalows already East of Marsh Lane with their gardens etc form a barrier. There will be significant increase in traffic noise. This will have an adverse impact on quality of life in the adjoining area between the Fairmile Road and Marsh Lane. This is a quiet area that so far has remained undisturbed by noise. Planning should seek to preserve tranquillity, not introduce noise. 90 new homes will result in substantial additional traffic on Fairmile Road (B3073), a very busy highway, already severely congested at certain times. Christchurch has the worst traffic congestion in Dorset. Planning should aim to ease this, not add to it. 90 new homes will require new infrastructure and also more services. There is already huge pressure on schools, medical services, policing, social services etc. With services currently strained, it is difficult to envisage future provision being adequate. Developments are also planned at Parley Cross and Roeshot Hill. These developments, together with the building East of Marsh Lane, will have a huge impact on the B3073 and other roads. This will not only affect residents, it will also damage tourism. Restricting building development to brownfield sites will at least not add any more to urban sprawl and will help to ensure that Christchurch remains a place where time is pleasant. We cannot go on building indefinitely. I would ask you, please, to address the planning irregularities outlined above by deleting Policy CN3, Land East of Marsh Lane, from the Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy. No new homes should be built in this location.</p>					
664984	Mrs Moira Maclean		CSPS3859	Policy CN 3							<p>Dear Councillor I note that the planning strategy for Christchurch Borough includes the building of 90 homes on Land East of Marsh Lane (Policy CN3). I recognise that a consultation is taking place but in addition to this I would like to point out the following planning</p>				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>problems:- The land East of Marsh Lane is Green Belt land and on a flood plain. Building 90 new homes will make additional demands on water supply. The proposed development is close to the Avon Valley and Dorset Heathland Special Protection areas and Ramsar site. The large influx of people to the 90 new homes is likely to have a detrimental effect on wildlife and there is uncertainty as to whether potential damage to the sensitive areas can be adequately mitigated. Access to the site for vehicles will cause planning difficulties because the heathland and the bungalows already East of Marsh Lane with their gardens etc form a barrier. There will be significant increase in traffic noise. This will have an adverse impact on quality of life in the adjoining area between the Fairmile Road and Marsh Lane. This is a quiet area that so far has remained undisturbed by noise. Planning should seek to preserve tranquillity, not introduce noise. 90 new homes will result in substantial additional traffic on Fairmile Road (B3073), a very busy highway, already severely congested at certain times. Christchurch has the worst traffic congestion in Dorset. Planning should aim to ease this, not add to it. 90 new homes will require new infrastructure and also more services. There is already huge pressure on schools, medical services, policing, social services etc. With services currently strained, it is difficult to envisage future provision being adequate. Developments are also planned at Parley Cross and Roeshot Hill. These developments, together with the building East of Marsh Lane, will have a huge impact on the B3073 and other roads. This will not only affect residents, it will also damage tourism. Restricting building development to brownfield sites will at least not add any more to urban sprawl and will help to ensure that Christchurch remains a place where time is pleasant. We cannot go on building indefinitely. I would ask you, please, to address the planning irregularities outlined above by deleting Policy CN3, Land East of Marsh Lane, from the Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy. No new homes should be built in this location.</p>					
664995	Ms H Needham		CSPS3862	Policy CN 3							Dear Councillor I note that the planning strategy for Christchurch Borough includes the building of 90 homes on Land East of Marsh Lane (Policy CN3). I recognise that a				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>consultation is taking place but in addition to this I would like to point out the following planning problems:-</p> <p>The land East of Marsh Lane is Green Belt land and on a flood plain.</p> <p>Building 90 new homes will make additional demands on water supply.</p> <p>The proposed development is close to the Avon Valley and Dorset Heathland Special Protection areas and Ramsar site. The large influx of people to the 90 new homes is likely to have a detrimental effect on wildlife and there is uncertainty as to whether potential damage to the sensitive areas can be adequately mitigated.</p> <p>Access to the site for vehicles will cause planning difficulties because the heathland and the bungalows already East of Marsh Lane with their gardens etc form a barrier.</p> <p>There will be significant increase in traffic noise. This will have an adverse impact on quality of life in the adjoining area between the Fairmile Road and Marsh Lane. This is a quiet area that so far has remained undisturbed by noise. Planning should seek to preserve tranquillity, not introduce noise.</p> <p>90 new homes will result in substantial additional traffic on Fairmile Road (B3073), a very busy highway, already severely congested at certain times.</p> <p>Christchurch has the worst traffic congestion in Dorset. Planning should aim to ease this, not add to it.</p> <p>90 new homes will require new infrastructure and also more services. There is already huge pressure on schools, medical services, policing, social services etc. With services currently strained, it is difficult to envisage future provision being adequate.</p> <p>Developments are also planned at Parley Cross and Roeshot Hill. These developments, together with the building East of Marsh Lane, will have a huge impact on the B3073 and other roads. This will not only affect residents, it will also damage tourism.</p> <p>Restricting building development to brownfield sites will at least not add any more to urban sprawl and will help to ensure that Christchurch remains a place where time is pleasant. We cannot go on building indefinitely.</p> <p>I would ask you, please, to address the planning irregularities outlined above by deleting Policy CN3, Land East of Marsh Lane, from the Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy. No new homes should be built in this location.</p>					
665002	Mrs D Port		CSPS3863	Policy CN 3							Dear Councillor I note that the planning strategy for Christchurch				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>Borough includes the building of 90 homes on Land East of Marsh Lane (Policy CN3). I recognise that a consultation is taking place but in addition to this I would like to point out the following planning problems:-</p> <p>The land East of Marsh Lane is Green Belt land and on a flood plain.</p> <p>Building 90 new homes will make additional demands on water supply.</p> <p>The proposed development is close to the Avon Valley and Dorset Heathland Special Protection areas and Ramsar site. The large influx of people to the 90 new homes is likely to have a detrimental effect on wildlife and there is uncertainty as to whether potential damage to the sensitive areas can be adequately mitigated.</p> <p>Access to the site for vehicles will cause planning difficulties because the heathland and the bungalows already East of Marsh Lane with their gardens etc form a barrier.</p> <p>There will be significant increase in traffic noise. This will have an adverse impact on quality of life in the adjoining area between the Fairmile Road and Marsh Lane. This is a quiet area that so far has remained undisturbed by noise. Planning should seek to preserve tranquillity, not introduce noise.</p> <p>90 new homes will result in substantial additional traffic on Fairmile Road (B3073), a very busy highway, already severely congested at certain times.</p> <p>Christchurch has the worst traffic congestion in Dorset. Planning should aim to ease this, not add to it.</p> <p>90 new homes will require new infrastructure and also more services. There is already huge pressure on schools, medical services, policing, social services etc. With services currently strained, it is difficult to envisage future provision being adequate.</p> <p>Developments are also planned at Parley Cross and Roeshot Hill. These developments, together with the building East of Marsh Lane, will have a huge impact on the B3073 and other roads. This will not only affect residents, it will also damage tourism.</p> <p>Restricting building development to brownfield sites will at least not add any more to urban sprawl and will help to ensure that Christchurch remains a place where time is pleasant. We cannot go on building indefinitely.</p> <p>I would ask you, please, to address the planning irregularities outlined above by deleting Policy CN3, Land East of Marsh Lane, from the Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy. No new homes should be built in this location.</p>					

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	
665119	Mrs Eileen Biggs		CSPS3870	Policy CN 3							<p>Dear Councillor</p> <p>I note that the planning strategy for Christchurch Borough includes the building of 90 homes on Land East of Marsh Lane (Policy CN3). I recognise that a consultation is taking place but in addition to this I would like to point out the following planning problems:-</p> <p>The land East of Marsh Lane is Green Belt land. The land East of Marsh Lane is on a flood plain. Building 90 new homes will make additional demands on water supply. The proposed development is close to the Avon Valley and Dorset Heathland Special Protection areas and Ramsar site. The large influx of people to the 90 new homes is likely to have a detrimental effect on wildlife and there is uncertainty as to whether potential damage to the sensitive areas can be adequately mitigated. Access to the site for vehicles will cause planning difficulties because the heathland and the bungalows already East of Marsh Lane with their gardens etc form a barrier. There will be significant increase in traffic noise. This will have an adverse impact on quality of life in the adjoining area between the Fairmile Road and Marsh Lane. This is a quiet area that so far has remained undisturbed by noise. Planning should seek to preserve tranquillity, not introduce noise. 90 new homes will result in substantial additional traffic on Fairmile Road (B3073), a very busy highway, already severely congested at certain times. Christchurch has the worst traffic congestion in Dorset. Planning should aim to ease this, not add to it. 90 new homes will require new infrastructure and also more services. There is already huge pressure on schools, medical services, policing, social services etc. With services currently strained, it is difficult to envisage future provision being adequate. Restricting building development to brownfield sites will at least not add any more to urban sprawl and will help to ensure that Christchurch remains a place where time is pleasant. We cannot go on building indefinitely. I would be very interested to know what steps you intend to take to acknowledge local feeling and oppose Policy CN3, Land East of Marsh Lane – Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy. No new homes should be built in this location. I look forward to your reply</p>					317	
665124	M Rogers		CSPS3871	Policy CN 3							<p>Dear Councillor</p> <p>I note that the planning strategy for Christchurch</p>					317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>Borough includes the building of 90 homes on Land East of Marsh Lane (Policy CN3). I recognise that a consultation is taking place but in addition to this I would like to point out the following planning problems:-</p> <p>The land East of Marsh Lane is Green Belt land. The land East of Marsh Lane is on a flood plain. Building 90 new homes will make additional demands on water supply. The proposed development is close to the Avon Valley and Dorset Heathland Special Protection areas and Ramsar site. The large influx of people to the 90 new homes is likely to have a detrimental effect on wildlife and there is uncertainty as to whether potential damage to the sensitive areas can be adequately mitigated. Access to the site for vehicles will cause planning difficulties because the heathland and the bungalows already East of Marsh Lane with their gardens etc form a barrier. There will be significant increase in traffic noise. This will have an adverse impact on quality of life in the adjoining area between the Fairmile Road and Marsh Lane. This is a quiet area that so far has remained undisturbed by noise. Planning should seek to preserve tranquillity, not introduce noise. 90 new homes will result in substantial additional traffic on Fairmile Road (B3073), a very busy highway, already severely congested at certain times. Christchurch has the worst traffic congestion in Dorset. Planning should aim to ease this, not add to it. 90 new homes will require new infrastructure and also more services. There is already huge pressure on schools, medical services, policing, social services etc. With services currently strained, it is difficult to envisage future provision being adequate. Restricting building development to brownfield sites will at least not add any more to urban sprawl and will help to ensure that Christchurch remains a place where time is pleasant. We cannot go on building indefinitely. I would be very interested to know what steps you intend to take to acknowledge local feeling and oppose Policy CN3, Land East of Marsh Lane – Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy. No new homes should be built in this location. I look forward to your reply</p>					
665127	Mark Winwood		CSPS3872	Policy CN 3							<p>Dear Councillor I note that the planning strategy for Christchurch Borough includes the building of 90 homes on Land East of Marsh Lane (Policy CN3). I recognise that a</p>				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>consultation is taking place but in addition to this I would like to point out the following planning problems:-</p> <p>The land East of Marsh Lane is Green Belt land. The land East of Marsh Lane is on a flood plain. Building 90 new homes will make additional demands on water supply. The proposed development is close to the Avon Valley and Dorset Heathland Special Protection areas and Ramsar site. The large influx of people to the 90 new homes is likely to have a detrimental effect on wildlife and there is uncertainty as to whether potential damage to the sensitive areas can be adequately mitigated. Access to the site for vehicles will cause planning difficulties because the heathland and the bungalows already East of Marsh Lane with their gardens etc form a barrier. There will be significant increase in traffic noise. This will have an adverse impact on quality of life in the adjoining area between the Fairmile Road and Marsh Lane. This is a quiet area that so far has remained undisturbed by noise. Planning should seek to preserve tranquillity, not introduce noise. 90 new homes will result in substantial additional traffic on Fairmile Road (B3073), a very busy highway, already severely congested at certain times. Christchurch has the worst traffic congestion in Dorset. Planning should aim to ease this, not add to it. 90 new homes will require new infrastructure and also more services. There is already huge pressure on schools, medical services, policing, social services etc. With services currently strained, it is difficult to envisage future provision being adequate. Restricting building development to brownfield sites will at least not add any more to urban sprawl and will help to ensure that Christchurch remains a place where time is pleasant. We cannot go on building indefinitely. I would be very interested to know what steps you intend to take to acknowledge local feeling and oppose Policy CN3, Land East of Marsh Lane – Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy. No new homes should be built in this location. I look forward to your reply</p>					
665137	Karen Fairweather		CSPS3873	Policy CN 3							Dear Councillor I note that the planning strategy for Christchurch Borough includes the building of 90 homes on Land East of Marsh Lane (Policy CN3). I recognise that a consultation is taking place but in addition to this I would like to point out the following planning				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>problems:- The land East of Marsh Lane is Green Belt land. The land East of Marsh Lane is on a flood plain. Building 90 new homes will make additional demands on water supply. The proposed development is close to the Avon Valley and Dorset Heathland Special Protection areas and Ramsar site. The large influx of people to the 90 new homes is likely to have a detrimental effect on wildlife and there is uncertainty as to whether potential damage to the sensitive areas can be adequately mitigated. Access to the site for vehicles will cause planning difficulties because the heathland and the bungalows already East of Marsh Lane with their gardens etc form a barrier. There will be significant increase in traffic noise. This will have an adverse impact on quality of life in the adjoining area between the Fairmile Road and Marsh Lane. This is a quiet area that so far has remained undisturbed by noise. Planning should seek to preserve tranquillity, not introduce noise. 90 new homes will result in substantial additional traffic on Fairmile Road (B3073), a very busy highway, already severely congested at certain times. Christchurch has the worst traffic congestion in Dorset. Planning should aim to ease this, not add to it. 90 new homes will require new infrastructure and also more services. There is already huge pressure on schools, medical services, policing, social services etc. With services currently strained, it is difficult to envisage future provision being adequate. Restricting building development to brownfield sites will at least not add any more to urban sprawl and will help to ensure that Christchurch remains a place where time is pleasant. We cannot go on building indefinitely. I would be very interested to know what steps you intend to take to acknowledge local feeling and oppose Policy CN3, Land East of Marsh Lane – Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy. No new homes should be built in this location. I look forward to your reply</p>					
665150	Linda Smith		CSPS3874	Policy CN 3							<p>Dear Councillor I note that the planning strategy for Christchurch Borough includes the building of 90 homes on Land East of Marsh Lane (Policy CN3). I recognise that a consultation is taking place but in addition to this I would like to point out the following planning problems:- The land East of Marsh Lane is Green Belt land.</p>				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>The land East of Marsh Lane is on a flood plain. Building 90 new homes will make additional demands on water supply.</p> <p>The proposed development is close to the Avon Valley and Dorset Heathland Special Protection areas and Ramsar site. The large influx of people to the 90 new homes is likely to have a detrimental effect on wildlife and there is uncertainty as to whether potential damage to the sensitive areas can be adequately mitigated.</p> <p>Access to the site for vehicles will cause planning difficulties because the heathland and the bungalows already East of Marsh Lane with their gardens etc form a barrier.</p> <p>There will be significant increase in traffic noise. This will have an adverse impact on quality of life in the adjoining area between the Fairmile Road and Marsh Lane. This is a quiet area that so far has remained undisturbed by noise. Planning should seek to preserve tranquillity, not introduce noise.</p> <p>90 new homes will result in substantial additional traffic on Fairmile Road (B3073), a very busy highway, already severely congested at certain times. Christchurch has the worst traffic congestion in Dorset. Planning should aim to ease this, not add to it.</p> <p>90 new homes will require new infrastructure and also more services. There is already huge pressure on schools, medical services, policing, social services etc. With services currently strained, it is difficult to envisage future provision being adequate.</p> <p>Restricting building development to brownfield sites will at least not add any more to urban sprawl and will help to ensure that Christchurch remains a place where time is pleasant. We cannot go on building indefinitely.</p> <p>I would be very interested to know what steps you intend to take to acknowledge local feeling and oppose Policy CN3, Land East of Marsh Lane – Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy. No new homes should be built in this location.</p> <p>I look forward to your reply</p>					
665155	M A Redding		CSPS3875	Policy CN 3							<p>Dear Councillor</p> <p>I note that the planning strategy for Christchurch Borough includes the building of 90 homes on Land East of Marsh Lane (Policy CN3). I recognise that a consultation is taking place but in addition to this I would like to point out the following planning problems:-</p> <p>The land East of Marsh Lane is Green Belt land.</p> <p>The land East of Marsh Lane is on a flood plain.</p> <p>Building 90 new homes will make additional demands</p>				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>on water supply. The proposed development is close to the Avon Valley and Dorset Heathland Special Protection areas and Ramsar site. The large influx of people to the 90 new homes is likely to have a detrimental effect on wildlife and there is uncertainty as to whether potential damage to the sensitive areas can be adequately mitigated. Access to the site for vehicles will cause planning difficulties because the heathland and the bungalows already East of Marsh Lane with their gardens etc form a barrier. There will be significant increase in traffic noise. This will have an adverse impact on quality of life in the adjoining area between the Fairmile Road and Marsh Lane. This is a quiet area that so far has remained undisturbed by noise. Planning should seek to preserve tranquillity, not introduce noise. 90 new homes will result in substantial additional traffic on Fairmile Road (B3073), a very busy highway, already severely congested at certain times. Christchurch has the worst traffic congestion in Dorset. Planning should aim to ease this, not add to it. 90 new homes will require new infrastructure and also more services. There is already huge pressure on schools, medical services, policing, social services etc. With services currently strained, it is difficult to envisage future provision being adequate. Restricting building development to brownfield sites will at least not add any more to urban sprawl and will help to ensure that Christchurch remains a place where time is pleasant. We cannot go on building indefinitely. I would be very interested to know what steps you intend to take to acknowledge local feeling and oppose Policy CN3, Land East of Marsh Lane – Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy. No new homes should be built in this location. I look forward to your reply</p>					
665165	Jemma Standish		CSPS387Z	Policy CN 3							<p>Dear Councillor I note that the planning strategy for Christchurch Borough includes the building of 90 homes on Land East of Marsh Lane (Policy CN3). I recognise that a consultation is taking place but in addition to this I would like to point out the following planning problems:- The land East of Marsh Lane is Green Belt land. The land East of Marsh Lane is on a flood plain. Building 90 new homes will make additional demands on water supply. The proposed development is close to the Avon Valley</p>				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>and Dorset Heathland Special Protection areas and Ramsar site. The large influx of people to the 90 new homes is likely to have a detrimental effect on wildlife and there is uncertainty as to whether potential damage to the sensitive areas can be adequately mitigated.</p> <p>Access to the site for vehicles will cause planning difficulties because the heathland and the bungalows already East of Marsh Lane with their gardens etc form a barrier.</p> <p>There will be significant increase in traffic noise. This will have an adverse impact on quality of life in the adjoining area between the Fairmile Road and Marsh Lane. This is a quiet area that so far has remained undisturbed by noise. Planning should seek to preserve tranquillity, not introduce noise.</p> <p>90 new homes will result in substantial additional traffic on Fairmile Road (B3073), a very busy highway, already severely congested at certain times.</p> <p>Christchurch has the worst traffic congestion in Dorset. Planning should aim to ease this, not add to it.</p> <p>90 new homes will require new infrastructure and also more services. There is already huge pressure on schools, medical services, policing, social services etc. With services currently strained, it is difficult to envisage future provision being adequate.</p> <p>Restricting building development to brownfield sites will at least not add any more to urban sprawl and will help to ensure that Christchurch remains a place where time is pleasant. We cannot go on building indefinitely.</p> <p>I would be very interested to know what steps you intend to take to acknowledge local feeling and oppose Policy CN3, Land East of Marsh Lane – Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy. No new homes should be built in this location.</p> <p>I look forward to your reply</p>					
665170	H Pritchard		CSPS3878	Policy CN 3							<p>Dear Councillor</p> <p>I note that the planning strategy for Christchurch Borough includes the building of 90 homes on Land East of Marsh Lane (Policy CN3). I recognise that a consultation is taking place but in addition to this I would like to point out the following planning problems:-</p> <p>The land East of Marsh Lane is Green Belt land.</p> <p>The land East of Marsh Lane is on a flood plain.</p> <p>Building 90 new homes will make additional demands on water supply.</p> <p>The proposed development is close to the Avon Valley and Dorset Heathland Special Protection areas and Ramsar site. The large influx of people to the 90 new</p>				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	
											<p>homes is likely to have a detrimental effect on wildlife and there is uncertainty as to whether potential damage to the sensitive areas can be adequately mitigated.</p> <p>Access to the site for vehicles will cause planning difficulties because the heathland and the bungalows already East of Marsh Lane with their gardens etc form a barrier.</p> <p>There will be significant increase in traffic noise. This will have an adverse impact on quality of life in the adjoining area between the Fairmile Road and Marsh Lane. This is a quiet area that so far has remained undisturbed by noise. Planning should seek to preserve tranquillity, not introduce noise.</p> <p>90 new homes will result in substantial additional traffic on Fairmile Road (B3073), a very busy highway, already severely congested at certain times. Christchurch has the worst traffic congestion in Dorset. Planning should aim to ease this, not add to it.</p> <p>90 new homes will require new infrastructure and also more services. There is already huge pressure on schools, medical services, policing, social services etc. With services currently strained, it is difficult to envisage future provision being adequate.</p> <p>Restricting building development to brownfield sites will at least not add any more to urban sprawl and will help to ensure that Christchurch remains a place where time is pleasant. We cannot go on building indefinitely.</p> <p>I would be very interested to know what steps you intend to take to acknowledge local feeling and oppose Policy CN3, Land East of Marsh Lane – Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy. No new homes should be built in this location.</p> <p>I look forward to your reply</p>						
665190	Mr John Cox		CSPS3881	Policy CN 3							<p>Dear Councillor</p> <p>I note that the planning strategy for Christchurch Borough includes the building of 90 homes on Land East of Marsh Lane (Policy CN3). I recognise that a consultation is taking place but in addition to this I would like to point out the following planning problems:-</p> <p>The land East of Marsh Lane is Green Belt land.</p> <p>The land East of Marsh Lane is on a flood plain.</p> <p>Building 90 new homes will make additional demands on water supply.</p> <p>The proposed development is close to the Avon Valley and Dorset Heathland Special Protection areas and Ramsar site. The large influx of people to the 90 new homes is likely to have a detrimental effect on wildlife and there is uncertainty as to whether potential</p>					317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>damage to the sensitive areas can be adequately mitigated.</p> <p>Access to the site for vehicles will cause planning difficulties because the heathland and the bungalows already East of Marsh Lane with their gardens etc form a barrier.</p> <p>There will be significant increase in traffic noise. This will have an adverse impact on quality of life in the adjoining area between the Fairmile Road and Marsh Lane. This is a quiet area that so far has remained undisturbed by noise. Planning should seek to preserve tranquillity, not introduce noise.</p> <p>90 new homes will result in substantial additional traffic on Fairmile Road (B3073), a very busy highway, already severely congested at certain times.</p> <p>Christchurch has the worst traffic congestion in Dorset. Planning should aim to ease this, not add to it.</p> <p>90 new homes will require new infrastructure and also more services. There is already huge pressure on schools, medical services, policing, social services etc. With services currently strained, it is difficult to envisage future provision being adequate.</p> <p>Restricting building development to brownfield sites will at least not add any more to urban sprawl and will help to ensure that Christchurch remains a place where time is pleasant. We cannot go on building indefinitely.</p> <p>I would be very interested to know what steps you intend to take to acknowledge local feeling and oppose Policy CN3, Land East of Marsh Lane – Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy. No new homes should be built in this location.</p> <p>I look forward to your reply</p>					
665203	Mr L C Legg		CSPS3882	Policy CN 3							<p>Dear Councillor</p> <p>I note that the planning strategy for Christchurch Borough includes the building of 90 homes on Land East of Marsh Lane (Policy CN3). I recognise that a consultation is taking place but in addition to this I would like to point out the following planning problems:-</p> <p>The land East of Marsh Lane is Green Belt land.</p> <p>The land East of Marsh Lane is on a flood plain.</p> <p>Building 90 new homes will make additional demands on water supply.</p> <p>The proposed development is close to the Avon Valley and Dorset Heathland Special Protection areas and Ramsar site. The large influx of people to the 90 new homes is likely to have a detrimental effect on wildlife and there is uncertainty as to whether potential damage to the sensitive areas can be adequately mitigated.</p>				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>Access to the site for vehicles will cause planning difficulties because the heathland and the bungalows already East of Marsh Lane with their gardens etc form a barrier.</p> <p>There will be significant increase in traffic noise. This will have an adverse impact on quality of life in the adjoining area between the Fairmile Road and Marsh Lane. This is a quiet area that so far has remained undisturbed by noise. Planning should seek to preserve tranquillity, not introduce noise.</p> <p>90 new homes will result in substantial additional traffic on Fairmile Road (B3073), a very busy highway, already severely congested at certain times.</p> <p>Christchurch has the worst traffic congestion in Dorset. Planning should aim to ease this, not add to it.</p> <p>90 new homes will require new infrastructure and also more services. There is already huge pressure on schools, medical services, policing, social services etc. With services currently strained, it is difficult to envisage future provision being adequate.</p> <p>Restricting building development to brownfield sites will at least not add any more to urban sprawl and will help to ensure that Christchurch remains a place where time is pleasant. We cannot go on building indefinitely.</p> <p>I would be very interested to know what steps you intend to take to acknowledge local feeling and oppose Policy CN3, Land East of Marsh Lane – Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy. No new homes should be built in this location.</p> <p>I look forward to your reply</p>					
665211	Mr H Dennis-Parsons		CSPS3883	Policy CN 3							<p>Dear Councillor</p> <p>I note that the planning strategy for Christchurch Borough includes the building of 90 homes on Land East of Marsh Lane (Policy CN3). I recognise that a consultation is taking place but in addition to this I would like to point out the following planning problems:-</p> <p>The land East of Marsh Lane is Green Belt land.</p> <p>The land East of Marsh Lane is on a flood plain.</p> <p>Building 90 new homes will make additional demands on water supply.</p> <p>The proposed development is close to the Avon Valley and Dorset Heathland Special Protection areas and Ramsar site. The large influx of people to the 90 new homes is likely to have a detrimental effect on wildlife and there is uncertainty as to whether potential damage to the sensitive areas can be adequately mitigated.</p> <p>Access to the site for vehicles will cause planning difficulties because the heathland and the bungalows</p>				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>already East of Marsh Lane with their gardens etc form a barrier. There will be significant increase in traffic noise. This will have an adverse impact on quality of life in the adjoining area between the Fairmile Road and Marsh Lane. This is a quiet area that so far has remained undisturbed by noise. Planning should seek to preserve tranquillity, not introduce noise. 90 new homes will result in substantial additional traffic on Fairmile Road (B3073), a very busy highway, already severely congested at certain times. Christchurch has the worst traffic congestion in Dorset. Planning should aim to ease this, not add to it. 90 new homes will require new infrastructure and also more services. There is already huge pressure on schools, medical services, policing, social services etc. With services currently strained, it is difficult to envisage future provision being adequate. Restricting building development to brownfield sites will at least not add any more to urban sprawl and will help to ensure that Christchurch remains a place where time is pleasant. We cannot go on building indefinitely. I would be very interested to know what steps you intend to take to acknowledge local feeling and oppose Policy CN3, Land East of Marsh Lane – Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy. No new homes should be built in this location. I look forward to your reply</p>					
665222	Mr Andrews		CSPS3884	Policy CN 3							<p>Dear Councillor I note that the planning strategy for Christchurch Borough includes the building of 90 homes on Land East of Marsh Lane (Policy CN3). I recognise that a consultation is taking place but in addition to this I would like to point out the following planning problems:- The land East of Marsh Lane is Green Belt land. The land East of Marsh Lane is on a flood plain. Building 90 new homes will make additional demands on water supply. The proposed development is close to the Avon Valley and Dorset Heathland Special Protection areas and Ramsar site. The large influx of people to the 90 new homes is likely to have a detrimental effect on wildlife and there is uncertainty as to whether potential damage to the sensitive areas can be adequately mitigated. Access to the site for vehicles will cause planning difficulties because the heathland and the bungalows already East of Marsh Lane with their gardens etc form a barrier.</p>				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>There will be significant increase in traffic noise. This will have an adverse impact on quality of life in the adjoining area between the Fairmile Road and Marsh Lane. This is a quiet area that so far has remained undisturbed by noise. Planning should seek to preserve tranquillity, not introduce noise.</p> <p>90 new homes will result in substantial additional traffic on Fairmile Road (B3073), a very busy highway, already severely congested at certain times.</p> <p>Christchurch has the worst traffic congestion in Dorset. Planning should aim to ease this, not add to it.</p> <p>90 new homes will require new infrastructure and also more services. There is already huge pressure on schools, medical services, policing, social services etc. With services currently strained, it is difficult to envisage future provision being adequate.</p> <p>Restricting building development to brownfield sites will at least not add any more to urban sprawl and will help to ensure that Christchurch remains a place where time is pleasant. We cannot go on building indefinitely.</p> <p>I would be very interested to know what steps you intend to take to acknowledge local feeling and oppose Policy CN3, Land East of Marsh Lane – Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy. No new homes should be built in this location.</p> <p>I look forward to your reply</p>					
665228	A Hodges		CSPS3885	Policy CN 3							<p>Dear Councillor</p> <p>I note that the planning strategy for Christchurch Borough includes the building of 90 homes on Land East of Marsh Lane (Policy CN3). I recognise that a consultation is taking place but in addition to this I would like to point out the following planning problems:-</p> <p>The land East of Marsh Lane is Green Belt land.</p> <p>The land East of Marsh Lane is on a flood plain.</p> <p>Building 90 new homes will make additional demands on water supply.</p> <p>The proposed development is close to the Avon Valley and Dorset Heathland Special Protection areas and Ramsar site. The large influx of people to the 90 new homes is likely to have a detrimental effect on wildlife and there is uncertainty as to whether potential damage to the sensitive areas can be adequately mitigated.</p> <p>Access to the site for vehicles will cause planning difficulties because the heathland and the bungalows already East of Marsh Lane with their gardens etc form a barrier.</p> <p>There will be significant increase in traffic noise. This will have an adverse impact on quality of life in the</p>				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	
											<p>adjoining area between the Fairmile Road and Marsh Lane. This is a quiet area that so far has remained undisturbed by noise. Planning should seek to preserve tranquillity, not introduce noise.</p> <p>90 new homes will result in substantial additional traffic on Fairmile Road (B3073), a very busy highway, already severely congested at certain times.</p> <p>Christchurch has the worst traffic congestion in Dorset. Planning should aim to ease this, not add to it.</p> <p>90 new homes will require new infrastructure and also more services. There is already huge pressure on schools, medical services, policing, social services etc. With services currently strained, it is difficult to envisage future provision being adequate.</p> <p>Restricting building development to brownfield sites will at least not add any more to urban sprawl and will help to ensure that Christchurch remains a place where time is pleasant. We cannot go on building indefinitely.</p> <p>I would be very interested to know what steps you intend to take to acknowledge local feeling and oppose Policy CN3, Land East of Marsh Lane – Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy. No new homes should be built in this location.</p> <p>I look forward to your reply</p>						
665257	I Hope Ingus		CSPS3887	Policy CN 3							<p>Dear Councillor</p> <p>I note that the planning strategy for Christchurch Borough includes the building of 90 homes on Land East of Marsh Lane (Policy CN3). I recognise that a consultation is taking place but in addition to this I would like to point out the following planning problems:-</p> <p>The land East of Marsh Lane is Green Belt land.</p> <p>The land East of Marsh Lane is on a flood plain.</p> <p>Building 90 new homes will make additional demands on water supply.</p> <p>The proposed development is close to the Avon Valley and Dorset Heathland Special Protection areas and Ramsar site. The large influx of people to the 90 new homes is likely to have a detrimental effect on wildlife and there is uncertainty as to whether potential damage to the sensitive areas can be adequately mitigated.</p> <p>Access to the site for vehicles will cause planning difficulties because the heathland and the bungalows already East of Marsh Lane with their gardens etc form a barrier.</p> <p>There will be significant increase in traffic noise. This will have an adverse impact on quality of life in the adjoining area between the Fairmile Road and Marsh Lane. This is a quiet area that so far has remained</p>					317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>undisturbed by noise. Planning should seek to preserve tranquillity, not introduce noise. 90 new homes will result in substantial additional traffic on Fairmile Road (B3073), a very busy highway, already severely congested at certain times. Christchurch has the worst traffic congestion in Dorset. Planning should aim to ease this, not add to it. 90 new homes will require new infrastructure and also more services. There is already huge pressure on schools, medical services, policing, social services etc. With services currently strained, it is difficult to envisage future provision being adequate. Restricting building development to brownfield sites will at least not add any more to urban sprawl and will help to ensure that Christchurch remains a place where time is pleasant. We cannot go on building indefinitely.</p> <p>I would be very interested to know what steps you intend to take to acknowledge local feeling and oppose Policy CN3, Land East of Marsh Lane – Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy. No new homes should be built in this location.</p> <p>I look forward to your reply Dear Councillor</p> <p>I note that the planning strategy for Christchurch Borough includes the building of 90 homes on Land East of Marsh Lane (Policy CN3). I recognise that a consultation is taking place but in addition to this I would like to point out the following planning problems:-</p> <p>The land East of Marsh Lane is Green Belt land and on a flood plain.</p> <p>Building 90 new homes will make additional demands on water supply.</p> <p>The proposed development is close to the Avon Valley and Dorset Heathland Special Protection areas and Ramsar site. The large influx of people to the 90 new homes is likely to have a detrimental effect on wildlife and there is uncertainty as to whether potential damage to the sensitive areas can be adequately mitigated.</p> <p>Access to the site for vehicles will cause planning difficulties because the heathland and the bungalows already East of Marsh Lane with their gardens etc form a barrier.</p> <p>There will be significant increase in traffic noise. This will have an adverse impact on quality of life in the adjoining area between the Fairmile Road and Marsh Lane. This is a quiet area that so far has remained undisturbed by noise. Planning should seek to preserve tranquillity, not introduce noise. 90 new homes will result in substantial additional traffic</p>					

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>on Fairmile Road (B3073), a very busy highway, already severely congested at certain times. Christchurch has the worst traffic congestion in Dorset. Planning should aim to ease this, not add to it. 90 new homes will require new infrastructure and also more services. There is already huge pressure on schools, medical services, policing, social services etc. With services currently strained, it is difficult to envisage future provision being adequate. Developments are also planned at Parley Cross and Roeshot Hill. These developments, together with the building East of Marsh Lane, will have a huge impact on the B3073 and other roads. This will not only affect residents, it will also damage tourism. Restricting building development to brownfield sites will at least not add any more to urban sprawl and will help to ensure that Christchurch remains a place where time is pleasant. We cannot go on building indefinitely. I would ask you, please, to address the planning irregularities outlined above by deleting Policy CN3, Land East of Marsh Lane, from the Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy. No new homes should be built in this location.</p>					
665263	Mr & Mrs R Motley		CSPS3888	Policy CN 3							<p>Dear Councillor I note that the planning strategy for Christchurch Borough includes the building of 90 homes on Land East of Marsh Lane (Policy CN3). I recognise that a consultation is taking place but in addition to this I would like to point out the following planning problems:- The land East of Marsh Lane is Green Belt land and on a flood plain. Building 90 new homes will make additional demands on water supply. The proposed development is close to the Avon Valley and Dorset Heathland Special Protection areas and Ramsar site. The large influx of people to the 90 new homes is likely to have a detrimental effect on wildlife and there is uncertainty as to whether potential damage to the sensitive areas can be adequately mitigated. Access to the site for vehicles will cause planning difficulties because the heathland and the bungalows already East of Marsh Lane with their gardens etc form a barrier. No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion</p>				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies) There will be significant increase in traffic noise. This will have an adverse impact on quality of life in the adjoining area between the Fairmile Road and Marsh Lane. This is a quiet area that so far has remained undisturbed by noise. Planning should seek to preserve tranquillity, not introduce noise. 90 new homes will result in substantial additional traffic on Fairmile Road (B3073), a very busy highway, already severely congested at certain times. Christchurch has the worst traffic congestion in Dorset. Planning should aim to ease this, not add to it. 90 new homes will require new infrastructure and also more services. There is already huge pressure on schools, medical services, policing, social services etc. With services currently strained, it is difficult to envisage future provision being adequate. Developments are also planned at Parley Cross and Roeshot Hill. These developments, together with the building East of Marsh Lane, will have a huge impact on the B3073 and other roads. This will not only affect residents, it will also damage tourism. Restricting building development to brownfield sites will at least not add any more to urban sprawl and will help to ensure that Christchurch remains a place where time is pleasant. We cannot go on building indefinitely. I would ask you, please, to address the planning irregularities outlined above by deleting Policy CN3, Land East of Marsh Lane, from the Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy. No new homes should be built in this location.</p>					
665269	Mrs Nicola Dancer		CSPS3889	Policy CN 3							<p>Dear Councillor I note that the planning strategy for Christchurch Borough includes the building of 90 homes on Land East of Marsh Lane (Policy CN3). I recognise that a consultation is taking place but in addition to this I would like to point out the following planning problems:- The land East of Marsh Lane is Green Belt land and on a flood plain. Building 90 new homes will make additional demands on water supply. The proposed development is close to the Avon Valley and Dorset Heathland Special Protection areas and Ramsar site. The large influx of people to the 90 new</p>				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>homes is likely to have a detrimental effect on wildlife and there is uncertainty as to whether potential damage to the sensitive areas can be adequately mitigated.</p> <p>Access to the site for vehicles will cause planning difficulties because the heathland and the bungalows already East of Marsh Lane with their gardens etc form a barrier.</p> <p>There will be significant increase in traffic noise. This will have an adverse impact on quality of life in the adjoining area between the Fairmile Road and Marsh Lane. This is a quiet area that so far has remained undisturbed by noise. Planning should seek to preserve tranquillity, not introduce noise.</p> <p>90 new homes will result in substantial additional traffic on Fairmile Road (B3073), a very busy highway, already severely congested at certain times. Christchurch has the worst traffic congestion in Dorset. Planning should aim to ease this, not add to it.</p> <p>90 new homes will require new infrastructure and also more services. There is already huge pressure on schools, medical services, policing, social services etc. With services currently strained, it is difficult to envisage future provision being adequate.</p> <p>Developments are also planned at Parley Cross and Roeshot Hill. These developments, together with the building East of Marsh Lane, will have a huge impact on the B3073 and other roads. This will not only affect residents, it will also damage tourism.</p> <p>Restricting building development to brownfield sites will at least not add any more to urban sprawl and will help to ensure that Christchurch remains a place where time is pleasant. We cannot go on building indefinitely.</p> <p>I would ask you, please, to address the planning irregularities outlined above by deleting Policy CN3, Land East of Marsh Lane, from the Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy. No new homes should be built in this location.</p>					
665270	P Johnson		CSPS3890	Policy CN 3							<p>Dear Councillor</p> <p>I note that the planning strategy for Christchurch Borough includes the building of 90 homes on Land East of Marsh Lane (Policy CN3). I recognise that a consultation is taking place but in addition to this I would like to point out the following planning problems:-</p> <p>The land East of Marsh Lane is Green Belt land.</p> <p>The land East of Marsh Lane is on a flood plain.</p> <p>Building 90 new homes will make additional demands on water supply.</p> <p>The proposed development is close to the Avon Valley</p>				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	
											<p>and Dorset Heathland Special Protection areas and Ramsar site. The large influx of people to the 90 new homes is likely to have a detrimental effect on wildlife and there is uncertainty as to whether potential damage to the sensitive areas can be adequately mitigated.</p> <p>Access to the site for vehicles will cause planning difficulties because the heathland and the bungalows already East of Marsh Lane with their gardens etc form a barrier.</p> <p>There will be significant increase in traffic noise. This will have an adverse impact on quality of life in the adjoining area between the Fairmile Road and Marsh Lane. This is a quiet area that so far has remained undisturbed by noise. Planning should seek to preserve tranquillity, not introduce noise.</p> <p>90 new homes will result in substantial additional traffic on Fairmile Road (B3073), a very busy highway, already severely congested at certain times.</p> <p>Christchurch has the worst traffic congestion in Dorset. Planning should aim to ease this, not add to it.</p> <p>90 new homes will require new infrastructure and also more services. There is already huge pressure on schools, medical services, policing, social services etc. With services currently strained, it is difficult to envisage future provision being adequate.</p> <p>Restricting building development to brownfield sites will at least not add any more to urban sprawl and will help to ensure that Christchurch remains a place where time is pleasant. We cannot go on building indefinitely.</p> <p>I would be very interested to know what steps you intend to take to acknowledge local feeling and oppose Policy CN3, Land East of Marsh Lane – Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy. No new homes should be built in this location.</p> <p>I look forward to your reply</p>						
665272	K Ramsier		CSPS3891	Policy CN 3							<p>Dear Councillor</p> <p>I note that the planning strategy for Christchurch Borough includes the building of 90 homes on Land East of Marsh Lane (Policy CN3). I recognise that a consultation is taking place but in addition to this I would like to point out the following planning problems:-</p> <p>The land East of Marsh Lane is Green Belt land and on a flood plain.</p> <p>Building 90 new homes will make additional demands on water supply.</p> <p>The proposed development is close to the Avon Valley and Dorset Heathland Special Protection areas and Ramsar site. The large influx of people to the 90 new</p>					317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>homes is likely to have a detrimental effect on wildlife and there is uncertainty as to whether potential damage to the sensitive areas can be adequately mitigated.</p> <p>Access to the site for vehicles will cause planning difficulties because the heathland and the bungalows already East of Marsh Lane with their gardens etc form a barrier.</p> <p>There will be significant increase in traffic noise. This will have an adverse impact on quality of life in the adjoining area between the Fairmile Road and Marsh Lane. This is a quiet area that so far has remained undisturbed by noise. Planning should seek to preserve tranquillity, not introduce noise.</p> <p>90 new homes will result in substantial additional traffic on Fairmile Road (B3073), a very busy highway, already severely congested at certain times. Christchurch has the worst traffic congestion in Dorset. Planning should aim to ease this, not add to it.</p> <p>90 new homes will require new infrastructure and also more services. There is already huge pressure on schools, medical services, policing, social services etc. With services currently strained, it is difficult to envisage future provision being adequate.</p> <p>Developments are also planned at Parley Cross and Roeshot Hill. These developments, together with the building East of Marsh Lane, will have a huge impact on the B3073 and other roads. This will not only affect residents, it will also damage tourism.</p> <p>Restricting building development to brownfield sites will at least not add any more to urban sprawl and will help to ensure that Christchurch remains a place where time is pleasant. We cannot go on building indefinitely.</p> <p>I would ask you, please, to address the planning irregularities outlined above by deleting Policy CN3, Land East of Marsh Lane, from the Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy. No new homes should be built in this location.</p>					
665276	P J O'Brien		CSPS3892	Policy CN 3							<p>Dear Councillor</p> <p>I note that the planning strategy for Christchurch Borough includes the building of 90 homes on Land East of Marsh Lane (Policy CN3). I recognise that a consultation is taking place but in addition to this I would like to point out the following planning problems:-</p> <p>The land East of Marsh Lane is Green Belt land.</p> <p>The land East of Marsh Lane is on a flood plain.</p> <p>Building 90 new homes will make additional demands on water supply.</p> <p>The proposed development is close to the Avon Valley</p>				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>and Dorset Heathland Special Protection areas and Ramsar site. The large influx of people to the 90 new homes is likely to have a detrimental effect on wildlife and there is uncertainty as to whether potential damage to the sensitive areas can be adequately mitigated.</p> <p>Access to the site for vehicles will cause planning difficulties because the heathland and the bungalows already East of Marsh Lane with their gardens etc form a barrier.</p> <p>There will be significant increase in traffic noise. This will have an adverse impact on quality of life in the adjoining area between the Fairmile Road and Marsh Lane. This is a quiet area that so far has remained undisturbed by noise. Planning should seek to preserve tranquillity, not introduce noise.</p> <p>90 new homes will result in substantial additional traffic on Fairmile Road (B3073), a very busy highway, already severely congested at certain times.</p> <p>Christchurch has the worst traffic congestion in Dorset. Planning should aim to ease this, not add to it.</p> <p>90 new homes will require new infrastructure and also more services. There is already huge pressure on schools, medical services, policing, social services etc. With services currently strained, it is difficult to envisage future provision being adequate.</p> <p>Restricting building development to brownfield sites will at least not add any more to urban sprawl and will help to ensure that Christchurch remains a place where time is pleasant. We cannot go on building indefinitely.</p> <p>I would be very interested to know what steps you intend to take to acknowledge local feeling and oppose Policy CN3, Land East of Marsh Lane – Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy. No new homes should be built in this location.</p> <p>I look forward to your reply</p>					
665277	Mr Noel Ramsier		CSPS3893	Policy CN 3							<p>Dear Councillor</p> <p>I note that the planning strategy for Christchurch Borough includes the building of 90 homes on Land East of Marsh Lane (Policy CN3). I recognise that a consultation is taking place but in addition to this I would like to point out the following planning problems:-</p> <p>The land East of Marsh Lane is Green Belt land and on a flood plain.</p> <p>Building 90 new homes will make additional demands on water supply.</p> <p>The proposed development is close to the Avon Valley and Dorset Heathland Special Protection areas and Ramsar site. The large influx of people to the 90 new</p>				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>homes is likely to have a detrimental effect on wildlife and there is uncertainty as to whether potential damage to the sensitive areas can be adequately mitigated.</p> <p>Access to the site for vehicles will cause planning difficulties because the heathland and the bungalows already East of Marsh Lane with their gardens etc form a barrier.</p> <p>There will be significant increase in traffic noise. This will have an adverse impact on quality of life in the adjoining area between the Fairmile Road and Marsh Lane. This is a quiet area that so far has remained undisturbed by noise. Planning should seek to preserve tranquillity, not introduce noise.</p> <p>90 new homes will result in substantial additional traffic on Fairmile Road (B3073), a very busy highway, already severely congested at certain times. Christchurch has the worst traffic congestion in Dorset. Planning should aim to ease this, not add to it.</p> <p>90 new homes will require new infrastructure and also more services. There is already huge pressure on schools, medical services, policing, social services etc. With services currently strained, it is difficult to envisage future provision being adequate.</p> <p>Developments are also planned at Parley Cross and Roeshot Hill. These developments, together with the building East of Marsh Lane, will have a huge impact on the B3073 and other roads. This will not only affect residents, it will also damage tourism.</p> <p>Restricting building development to brownfield sites will at least not add any more to urban sprawl and will help to ensure that Christchurch remains a place where time is pleasant. We cannot go on building indefinitely.</p> <p>I would ask you, please, to address the planning irregularities outlined above by deleting Policy CN3, Land East of Marsh Lane, from the Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy. No new homes should be built in this location.</p>					
665287	Mr J Melvin		CSPS3895	Policy CN 3							<p>Dear Councillor</p> <p>I note that the planning strategy for Christchurch Borough includes the building of 90 homes on Land East of Marsh Lane (Policy CN3). I recognise that a consultation is taking place but in addition to this I would like to point out the following planning problems:-</p> <p>The land East of Marsh Lane is Green Belt land and on a flood plain.</p> <p>Building 90 new homes will make additional demands on water supply.</p> <p>The proposed development is close to the Avon Valley</p>				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>and Dorset Heathland Special Protection areas and Ramsar site. The large influx of people to the 90 new homes is likely to have a detrimental effect on wildlife and there is uncertainty as to whether potential damage to the sensitive areas can be adequately mitigated.</p> <p>Access to the site for vehicles will cause planning difficulties because the heathland and the bungalows already East of Marsh Lane with their gardens etc form a barrier.</p> <p>There will be significant increase in traffic noise. This will have an adverse impact on quality of life in the adjoining area between the Fairmile Road and Marsh Lane. This is a quiet area that so far has remained undisturbed by noise. Planning should seek to preserve tranquillity, not introduce noise.</p> <p>90 new homes will result in substantial additional traffic on Fairmile Road (B3073), a very busy highway, already severely congested at certain times.</p> <p>Christchurch has the worst traffic congestion in Dorset. Planning should aim to ease this, not add to it.</p> <p>90 new homes will require new infrastructure and also more services. There is already huge pressure on schools, medical services, policing, social services etc. With services currently strained, it is difficult to envisage future provision being adequate.</p> <p>Developments are also planned at Parley Cross and Roeshot Hill. These developments, together with the building East of Marsh Lane, will have a huge impact on the B3073 and other roads. This will not only affect residents, it will also damage tourism.</p> <p>Restricting building development to brownfield sites will at least not add any more to urban sprawl and will help to ensure that Christchurch remains a place where time is pleasant. We cannot go on building indefinitely.</p> <p>I would ask you, please, to address the planning irregularities outlined above by deleting Policy CN3, Land East of Marsh Lane, from the Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy. No new homes should be built in this location.</p>					
665296	C Dalton		CSPS3896	Policy CN 3							<p>Dear Councillor</p> <p>I note that the planning strategy for Christchurch Borough includes the building of 90 homes on Land East of Marsh Lane (Policy CN3). I recognise that a consultation is taking place but in addition to this I would like to point out the following planning problems:-</p> <p>The land East of Marsh Lane is Green Belt land.</p> <p>The land East of Marsh Lane is on a flood plain.</p> <p>Building 90 new homes will make additional demands</p>				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>on water supply.</p> <p>The proposed development is close to the Avon Valley and Dorset Heathland Special Protection areas and Ramsar site. The large influx of people to the 90 new homes is likely to have a detrimental effect on wildlife and there is uncertainty as to whether potential damage to the sensitive areas can be adequately mitigated.</p> <p>Access to the site for vehicles will cause planning difficulties because the heathland and the bungalows already East of Marsh Lane with their gardens etc form a barrier.</p> <p>There will be significant increase in traffic noise. This will have an adverse impact on quality of life in the adjoining area between the Fairmile Road and Marsh Lane. This is a quiet area that so far has remained undisturbed by noise. Planning should seek to preserve tranquillity, not introduce noise.</p> <p>90 new homes will result in substantial additional traffic on Fairmile Road (B3073), a very busy highway, already severely congested at certain times.</p> <p>Christchurch has the worst traffic congestion in Dorset. Planning should aim to ease this, not add to it.</p> <p>90 new homes will require new infrastructure and also more services. There is already huge pressure on schools, medical services, policing, social services etc. With services currently strained, it is difficult to envisage future provision being adequate.</p> <p>Restricting building development to brownfield sites will at least not add any more to urban sprawl and will help to ensure that Christchurch remains a place where time is pleasant. We cannot go on building indefinitely.</p> <p>I would be very interested to know what steps you intend to take to acknowledge local feeling and oppose Policy CN3, Land East of Marsh Lane – Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy. No new homes should be built in this location.</p> <p>I look forward to your reply</p>					
665300	A Roberts		CSPS389Z	Policy CN 3							<p>Dear Councillor</p> <p>I note that the planning strategy for Christchurch Borough includes the building of 90 homes on Land East of Marsh Lane (Policy CN3). I recognise that a consultation is taking place but in addition to this I would like to point out the following planning problems:-</p> <p>The land East of Marsh Lane is Green Belt land and on a flood plain.</p> <p>Building 90 new homes will make additional demands on water supply.</p> <p>The proposed development is close to the Avon Valley</p>				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>and Dorset Heathland Special Protection areas and Ramsar site. The large influx of people to the 90 new homes is likely to have a detrimental effect on wildlife and there is uncertainty as to whether potential damage to the sensitive areas can be adequately mitigated.</p> <p>Access to the site for vehicles will cause planning difficulties because the heathland and the bungalows already East of Marsh Lane with their gardens etc form a barrier.</p> <p>There will be significant increase in traffic noise. This will have an adverse impact on quality of life in the adjoining area between the Fairmile Road and Marsh Lane. This is a quiet area that so far has remained undisturbed by noise. Planning should seek to preserve tranquillity, not introduce noise.</p> <p>90 new homes will result in substantial additional traffic on Fairmile Road (B3073), a very busy highway, already severely congested at certain times.</p> <p>Christchurch has the worst traffic congestion in Dorset. Planning should aim to ease this, not add to it.</p> <p>90 new homes will require new infrastructure and also more services. There is already huge pressure on schools, medical services, policing, social services etc. With services currently strained, it is difficult to envisage future provision being adequate.</p> <p>Developments are also planned at Parley Cross and Roeshot Hill. These developments, together with the building East of Marsh Lane, will have a huge impact on the B3073 and other roads. This will not only affect residents, it will also damage tourism.</p> <p>Restricting building development to brownfield sites will at least not add any more to urban sprawl and will help to ensure that Christchurch remains a place where time is pleasant. We cannot go on building indefinitely.</p> <p>I would ask you, please, to address the planning irregularities outlined above by deleting Policy CN3, Land East of Marsh Lane, from the Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy. No new homes should be built in this location.</p>					
665319	J Perry		CSPS3898	Policy CN 3							<p>Dear Councillor</p> <p>I note that the planning strategy for Christchurch Borough includes the building of 90 homes on Land East of Marsh Lane (Policy CN3). I recognise that a consultation is taking place but in addition to this I would like to point out the following planning problems:-</p> <p>The land East of Marsh Lane is Green Belt land.</p> <p>The land East of Marsh Lane is on a flood plain.</p> <p>Building 90 new homes will make additional demands</p>				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>on water supply. The proposed development is close to the Avon Valley and Dorset Heathland Special Protection areas and Ramsar site. The large influx of people to the 90 new homes is likely to have a detrimental effect on wildlife and there is uncertainty as to whether potential damage to the sensitive areas can be adequately mitigated. Access to the site for vehicles will cause planning difficulties because the heathland and the bungalows already East of Marsh Lane with their gardens etc form a barrier. There will be significant increase in traffic noise. This will have an adverse impact on quality of life in the adjoining area between the Fairmile Road and Marsh Lane. This is a quiet area that so far has remained undisturbed by noise. Planning should seek to preserve tranquillity, not introduce noise. 90 new homes will result in substantial additional traffic on Fairmile Road (B3073), a very busy highway, already severely congested at certain times. Christchurch has the worst traffic congestion in Dorset. Planning should aim to ease this, not add to it. 90 new homes will require new infrastructure and also more services. There is already huge pressure on schools, medical services, policing, social services etc. With services currently strained, it is difficult to envisage future provision being adequate. Restricting building development to brownfield sites will at least not add any more to urban sprawl and will help to ensure that Christchurch remains a place where time is pleasant. We cannot go on building indefinitely. I would be very interested to know what steps you intend to take to acknowledge local feeling and oppose Policy CN3, Land East of Marsh Lane – Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy. No new homes should be built in this location. I look forward to your reply</p>					
665320	Mr A Ludlow		CSPS3900	Policy CN 3							<p>Dear Councillor I note that the planning strategy for Christchurch Borough includes the building of 90 homes on Land East of Marsh Lane (Policy CN3). I recognise that a consultation is taking place but in addition to this I would like to point out the following planning problems:- The land East of Marsh Lane is Green Belt land and on a flood plain. Building 90 new homes will make additional demands on water supply. The proposed development is close to the Avon Valley</p>				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>and Dorset Heathland Special Protection areas and Ramsar site. The large influx of people to the 90 new homes is likely to have a detrimental effect on wildlife and there is uncertainty as to whether potential damage to the sensitive areas can be adequately mitigated.</p> <p>Access to the site for vehicles will cause planning difficulties because the heathland and the bungalows already East of Marsh Lane with their gardens etc form a barrier.</p> <p>There will be significant increase in traffic noise. This will have an adverse impact on quality of life in the adjoining area between the Fairmile Road and Marsh Lane. This is a quiet area that so far has remained undisturbed by noise. Planning should seek to preserve tranquillity, not introduce noise.</p> <p>90 new homes will result in substantial additional traffic on Fairmile Road (B3073), a very busy highway, already severely congested at certain times.</p> <p>Christchurch has the worst traffic congestion in Dorset. Planning should aim to ease this, not add to it.</p> <p>90 new homes will require new infrastructure and also more services. There is already huge pressure on schools, medical services, policing, social services etc. With services currently strained, it is difficult to envisage future provision being adequate.</p> <p>Developments are also planned at Parley Cross and Roeshot Hill. These developments, together with the building East of Marsh Lane, will have a huge impact on the B3073 and other roads. This will not only affect residents, it will also damage tourism.</p> <p>Restricting building development to brownfield sites will at least not add any more to urban sprawl and will help to ensure that Christchurch remains a place where time is pleasant. We cannot go on building indefinitely.</p> <p>I would ask you, please, to address the planning irregularities outlined above by deleting Policy CN3, Land East of Marsh Lane, from the Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy. No new homes should be built in this location.</p>					
665354	Ms Julie Mills		CSPS3903	Policy CN 3							<p>Dear Councillor</p> <p>I note that the planning strategy for Christchurch Borough includes the building of 90 homes on Land East of Marsh Lane (Policy CN3). I recognise that a consultation is taking place but in addition to this I would like to point out the following planning problems:-</p> <p>The land East of Marsh Lane is Green Belt land and on a flood plain.</p> <p>Building 90 new homes will make additional demands</p>				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>on water supply.</p> <p>The proposed development is close to the Avon Valley and Dorset Heathland Special Protection areas and Ramsar site. The large influx of people to the 90 new homes is likely to have a detrimental effect on wildlife and there is uncertainty as to whether potential damage to the sensitive areas can be adequately mitigated.</p> <p>Access to the site for vehicles will cause planning difficulties because the heathland and the bungalows already East of Marsh Lane with their gardens etc form a barrier.</p> <p>There will be significant increase in traffic noise. This will have an adverse impact on quality of life in the adjoining area between the Fairmile Road and Marsh Lane. This is a quiet area that so far has remained undisturbed by noise. Planning should seek to preserve tranquillity, not introduce noise.</p> <p>90 new homes will result in substantial additional traffic on Fairmile Road (B3073), a very busy highway, already severely congested at certain times.</p> <p>Christchurch has the worst traffic congestion in Dorset. Planning should aim to ease this, not add to it.</p> <p>90 new homes will require new infrastructure and also more services. There is already huge pressure on schools, medical services, policing, social services etc. With services currently strained, it is difficult to envisage future provision being adequate.</p> <p>Developments are also planned at Parley Cross and Roeshot Hill. These developments, together with the building East of Marsh Lane, will have a huge impact on the B3073 and other roads. This will not only affect residents, it will also damage tourism.</p> <p>Restricting building development to brownfield sites will at least not add any more to urban sprawl and will help to ensure that Christchurch remains a place where time is pleasant. We cannot go on building indefinitely.</p> <p>I would ask you, please, to address the planning irregularities outlined above by deleting Policy CN3, Land East of Marsh Lane, from the Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy. No new homes should be built in this location.</p>					
665357	Mr McHannon		CSPS3904	Policy CN 3							<p>Dear Councillor</p> <p>I note that the planning strategy for Christchurch Borough includes the building of 90 homes on Land East of Marsh Lane (Policy CN3). I recognise that a consultation is taking place but in addition to this I would like to point out the following planning problems:-</p> <p>The land East of Marsh Lane is Green Belt land.</p>				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>The land East of Marsh Lane is on a flood plain. Building 90 new homes will make additional demands on water supply.</p> <p>The proposed development is close to the Avon Valley and Dorset Heathland Special Protection areas and Ramsar site. The large influx of people to the 90 new homes is likely to have a detrimental effect on wildlife and there is uncertainty as to whether potential damage to the sensitive areas can be adequately mitigated.</p> <p>Access to the site for vehicles will cause planning difficulties because the heathland and the bungalows already East of Marsh Lane with their gardens etc form a barrier.</p> <p>There will be significant increase in traffic noise. This will have an adverse impact on quality of life in the adjoining area between the Fairmile Road and Marsh Lane. This is a quiet area that so far has remained undisturbed by noise. Planning should seek to preserve tranquillity, not introduce noise.</p> <p>90 new homes will result in substantial additional traffic on Fairmile Road (B3073), a very busy highway, already severely congested at certain times. Christchurch has the worst traffic congestion in Dorset. Planning should aim to ease this, not add to it.</p> <p>90 new homes will require new infrastructure and also more services. There is already huge pressure on schools, medical services, policing, social services etc. With services currently strained, it is difficult to envisage future provision being adequate.</p> <p>Restricting building development to brownfield sites will at least not add any more to urban sprawl and will help to ensure that Christchurch remains a place where time is pleasant. We cannot go on building indefinitely.</p> <p>I would be very interested to know what steps you intend to take to acknowledge local feeling and oppose Policy CN3, Land East of Marsh Lane – Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy. No new homes should be built in this location.</p> <p>I look forward to your reply</p>					
665359	Mr S Dawson		CSPS3905	Policy CN 3							<p>Dear Councillor</p> <p>I note that the planning strategy for Christchurch Borough includes the building of 90 homes on Land East of Marsh Lane (Policy CN3). I recognise that a consultation is taking place but in addition to this I would like to point out the following planning problems:-</p> <p>The land East of Marsh Lane is Green Belt land and on a flood plain.</p> <p>Building 90 new homes will make additional demands</p>				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>on water supply.</p> <p>The proposed development is close to the Avon Valley and Dorset Heathland Special Protection areas and Ramsar site. The large influx of people to the 90 new homes is likely to have a detrimental effect on wildlife and there is uncertainty as to whether potential damage to the sensitive areas can be adequately mitigated.</p> <p>Access to the site for vehicles will cause planning difficulties because the heathland and the bungalows already East of Marsh Lane with their gardens etc form a barrier.</p> <p>There will be significant increase in traffic noise. This will have an adverse impact on quality of life in the adjoining area between the Fairmile Road and Marsh Lane. This is a quiet area that so far has remained undisturbed by noise. Planning should seek to preserve tranquillity, not introduce noise.</p> <p>90 new homes will result in substantial additional traffic on Fairmile Road (B3073), a very busy highway, already severely congested at certain times.</p> <p>Christchurch has the worst traffic congestion in Dorset. Planning should aim to ease this, not add to it.</p> <p>90 new homes will require new infrastructure and also more services. There is already huge pressure on schools, medical services, policing, social services etc. With services currently strained, it is difficult to envisage future provision being adequate.</p> <p>Developments are also planned at Parley Cross and Roeshot Hill. These developments, together with the building East of Marsh Lane, will have a huge impact on the B3073 and other roads. This will not only affect residents, it will also damage tourism.</p> <p>Restricting building development to brownfield sites will at least not add any more to urban sprawl and will help to ensure that Christchurch remains a place where time is pleasant. We cannot go on building indefinitely.</p> <p>I would ask you, please, to address the planning irregularities outlined above by deleting Policy CN3, Land East of Marsh Lane, from the Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy. No new homes should be built in this location.</p>					
665362	Ms Laura Futcher		CSPS3906	Policy CN 3							<p>Dear Councillor</p> <p>I note that the planning strategy for Christchurch Borough includes the building of 90 homes on Land East of Marsh Lane (Policy CN3). I recognise that a consultation is taking place but in addition to this I would like to point out the following planning problems:-</p> <p>The land East of Marsh Lane is Green Belt land and</p>				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>on a flood plain. Building 90 new homes will make additional demands on water supply. The proposed development is close to the Avon Valley and Dorset Heathland Special Protection areas and Ramsar site. The large influx of people to the 90 new homes is likely to have a detrimental effect on wildlife and there is uncertainty as to whether potential damage to the sensitive areas can be adequately mitigated. Access to the site for vehicles will cause planning difficulties because the heathland and the bungalows already East of Marsh Lane with their gardens etc form a barrier. There will be significant increase in traffic noise. This will have an adverse impact on quality of life in the adjoining area between the Fairmile Road and Marsh Lane. This is a quiet area that so far has remained undisturbed by noise. Planning should seek to preserve tranquillity, not introduce noise. 90 new homes will result in substantial additional traffic on Fairmile Road (B3073), a very busy highway, already severely congested at certain times. Christchurch has the worst traffic congestion in Dorset. Planning should aim to ease this, not add to it. 90 new homes will require new infrastructure and also more services. There is already huge pressure on schools, medical services, policing, social services etc. With services currently strained, it is difficult to envisage future provision being adequate. Developments are also planned at Parley Cross and Roeshot Hill. These developments, together with the building East of Marsh Lane, will have a huge impact on the B3073 and other roads. This will not only affect residents, it will also damage tourism. Restricting building development to brownfield sites will at least not add any more to urban sprawl and will help to ensure that Christchurch remains a place where time is pleasant. We cannot go on building indefinitely. I would ask you, please, to address the planning irregularities outlined above by deleting Policy CN3, Land East of Marsh Lane, from the Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy. No new homes should be built in this location.</p>					
665365	Ms L London		CSPS3907	Policy CN 3							<p>Dear Councillor I note that the planning strategy for Christchurch Borough includes the building of 90 homes on Land East of Marsh Lane (Policy CN3). I recognise that a consultation is taking place but in addition to this I would like to point out the following planning</p>				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>problems:- The land East of Marsh Lane is Green Belt land and on a flood plain. Building 90 new homes will make additional demands on water supply. The proposed development is close to the Avon Valley and Dorset Heathland Special Protection areas and Ramsar site. The large influx of people to the 90 new homes is likely to have a detrimental effect on wildlife and there is uncertainty as to whether potential damage to the sensitive areas can be adequately mitigated. Access to the site for vehicles will cause planning difficulties because the heathland and the bungalows already East of Marsh Lane with their gardens etc form a barrier. There will be significant increase in traffic noise. This will have an adverse impact on quality of life in the adjoining area between the Fairmile Road and Marsh Lane. This is a quiet area that so far has remained undisturbed by noise. Planning should seek to preserve tranquillity, not introduce noise. 90 new homes will result in substantial additional traffic on Fairmile Road (B3073), a very busy highway, already severely congested at certain times. Christchurch has the worst traffic congestion in Dorset. Planning should aim to ease this, not add to it. 90 new homes will require new infrastructure and also more services. There is already huge pressure on schools, medical services, policing, social services etc. With services currently strained, it is difficult to envisage future provision being adequate. Developments are also planned at Parley Cross and Roeshot Hill. These developments, together with the building East of Marsh Lane, will have a huge impact on the B3073 and other roads. This will not only affect residents, it will also damage tourism. Restricting building development to brownfield sites will at least not add any more to urban sprawl and will help to ensure that Christchurch remains a place where time is pleasant. We cannot go on building indefinitely. I would ask you, please, to address the planning irregularities outlined above by deleting Policy CN3, Land East of Marsh Lane, from the Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy. No new homes should be built in this location.</p>					
665367	Mr Alex Brandon-Smith		CSPS3908	Policy CN 3							Dear Councillor I note that the planning strategy for Christchurch Borough includes the building of 90 homes on Land East of Marsh Lane (Policy CN3). I recognise that a				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>consultation is taking place but in addition to this I would like to point out the following planning problems:-</p> <p>The land East of Marsh Lane is Green Belt land and on a flood plain.</p> <p>Building 90 new homes will make additional demands on water supply.</p> <p>The proposed development is close to the Avon Valley and Dorset Heathland Special Protection areas and Ramsar site. The large influx of people to the 90 homes is likely to have a detrimental effect on wildlife and there is uncertainty as to whether potential damage to the sensitive areas can be adequately mitigated.</p> <p>Access to the site for vehicles will cause planning difficulties because the heathland and the bungalows already East of Marsh Lane with their gardens etc form a barrier.</p> <p>There will be significant increase in traffic noise. This will have an adverse impact on quality of life in the adjoining area between the Fairmile Road and Marsh Lane. This is a quiet area that so far has remained undisturbed by noise. Planning should seek to preserve tranquillity, not introduce noise.</p> <p>90 new homes will result in substantial additional traffic on Fairmile Road (B3073), a very busy highway, already severely congested at certain times.</p> <p>Christchurch has the worst traffic congestion in Dorset. Planning should aim to ease this, not add to it.</p> <p>90 new homes will require new infrastructure and also more services. There is already huge pressure on schools, medical services, policing, social services etc. With services currently strained, it is difficult to envisage future provision being adequate.</p> <p>Developments are also planned at Parley Cross and Roeshot Hill. These developments, together with the building East of Marsh Lane, will have a huge impact on the B3073 and other roads. This will not only affect residents, it will also damage tourism.</p> <p>Restricting building development to brownfield sites will at least not add any more to urban sprawl and will help to ensure that Christchurch remains a place where time is pleasant. We cannot go on building indefinitely.</p> <p>I would ask you, please, to address the planning irregularities outlined above by deleting Policy CN3, Land East of Marsh Lane, from the Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy. No new homes should be built in this location.</p> <p>No – Our Objections Are: Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities</p>					

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	
											<p>Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies)</p>						
665368	Mrs Ginette Brandon-Smith		CSPS3909	Policy CN 3							<p>Dear Councillor I note that the planning strategy for Christchurch Borough includes the building of 90 homes on Land East of Marsh Lane (Policy CN3). I recognise that a consultation is taking place but in addition to this I would like to point out the following planning problems:- The land East of Marsh Lane is Green Belt land and on a flood plain. Building 90 new homes will make additional demands on water supply. The proposed development is close to the Avon Valley and Dorset Heathland Special Protection areas and Ramsar site. The large influx of people to the 90 new homes is likely to have a detrimental effect on wildlife and there is uncertainty as to whether potential damage to the sensitive areas can be adequately mitigated. Access to the site for vehicles will cause planning difficulties because the heathland and the bungalows already East of Marsh Lane with their gardens etc form a barrier. There will be significant increase in traffic noise. This will have an adverse impact on quality of life in the adjoining area between the Fairmile Road and Marsh Lane. This is a quiet area that so far has remained undisturbed by noise. Planning should seek to preserve tranquillity, not introduce noise. 90 new homes will result in substantial additional traffic on Fairmile Road (B3073), a very busy highway, already severely congested at certain times. Christchurch has the worst traffic congestion in Dorset. Planning should aim to ease this, not add to it. 90 new homes will require new infrastructure and also more services. There is already huge pressure on schools, medical services, policing, social services etc. With services currently strained, it is difficult to envisage future provision being adequate. Developments are also planned at Parley Cross and Roeshot Hill. These developments, together with the building East of Marsh Lane, will have a huge impact on the B3073 and other roads. This will not only affect residents, it will also damage tourism.</p>					317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	
											<p>Restricting building development to brownfield sites will at least not add any more to urban sprawl and will help to ensure that Christchurch remains a place where time is pleasant. We cannot go on building indefinitely.</p> <p>I would ask you, please, to address the planning irregularities outlined above by deleting Policy CN3, Land East of Marsh Lane, from the Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy. No new homes should be built in this location.</p> <p>No – Our Objections Are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Loss of Green Belt Strain on water / utilities Inadequate vehicular access Traffic congestion Extra strain on services and infrastructure Increased risk of flooding Impact on the SSSI Increased noise Road safety Poor environment for new homes (water beds / flies) 						
665370	Laura Farquhar		CSPS3910	Policy CN 3							<p>Dear Councillor</p> <p>I note that the planning strategy for Christchurch Borough includes the building of 90 homes on Land East of Marsh Lane (Policy CN3). I recognise that a consultation is taking place but in addition to this I would like to point out the following planning problems:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The land East of Marsh Lane is Green Belt land. The land East of Marsh Lane is on a flood plain. Building 90 new homes will make additional demands on water supply. The proposed development is close to the Avon Valley and Dorset Heathland Special Protection areas and Ramsar site. The large influx of people to the 90 new homes is likely to have a detrimental effect on wildlife and there is uncertainty as to whether potential damage to the sensitive areas can be adequately mitigated. Access to the site for vehicles will cause planning difficulties because the heathland and the bungalows already East of Marsh Lane with their gardens etc form a barrier. There will be significant increase in traffic noise. This will have an adverse impact on quality of life in the adjoining area between the Fairmile Road and Marsh Lane. This is a quiet area that so far has remained undisturbed by noise. Planning should seek to preserve tranquillity, not introduce noise. 90 new homes will result in substantial additional traffic on Fairmile Road (B3073), a very busy highway, 					317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>already severely congested at certain times. Christchurch has the worst traffic congestion in Dorset. Planning should aim to ease this, not add to it. 90 new homes will require new infrastructure and also more services. There is already huge pressure on schools, medical services, policing, social services etc. With services currently strained, it is difficult to envisage future provision being adequate. Restricting building development to brownfield sites will at least not add any more to urban sprawl and will help to ensure that Christchurch remains a place where time is pleasant. We cannot go on building indefinitely.</p> <p>I would be very interested to know what steps you intend to take to acknowledge local feeling and oppose Policy CN3, Land East of Marsh Lane – Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy. No new homes should be built in this location.</p> <p>I look forward to your reply</p>					
668580		Bronte Park Management Committee Ltd.	CSPS3960	Policy CN 3							<p>Bronte Park Estate (Bronte Park Limited) is comprised of 39 Bungalows situated in Marsh Lane / Bronte Avenue. BH23 2NH and BH23 2ND and borders 2/3rds of proposed development. It is run to support the elderly, private, residents who have purchased their bungalows, having taken into account the relative seclusion and quietness of the location enabling them to spend their latter years in peace. The proposed CN3 development is immeditalely at the rear of the Estate. 90 houses will mean at least 90 cars, it could be 180 as cars are, nowadays, considered essential rather than a luxury. Cars / lorries are not quiet. Access to the area requires serious consideration, not only for traffic but, also for pedestrians and more improtantly, children.</p> <p>Has sufficient regard been given to the proposed housing site at the entrance of Bronte Avenue, off of Fairmile, which will seriously add to the traffic congestion in the area and further deter public transport improvements.</p> <p>Affordable housing will attract young families. School placement for children is limited as of now. Are more school placements being made available?</p> <p>Marsh Lane is so called for a reason. At the rear is a flood plain and with the recent heavy downfalls of rain some parts have been flooded. One consequence of the wide marsh area is the proliferation of mosquitoes. Presumably, the Development Plans would include a fully equipped play area for children. Ones does not expect children to be quiet, but not in an area of predominantly elderly people. In a marshy, mosquito ridden region with, also, adders inhabiting the area,</p>				317	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>Health and Safety must be of paramount importance. Wildlife in general would be decimated. This would, also, be essential for the reason of the proximity to St. Catherine's Hill - a highly designated SSSI site that could easily be adversely affected, as children would head for the Reserve seeing it an an adventure. Presumably, a detailed impact assessment would be carried out with the aid of Christchurch Countryside Service, Reptile Conservation Trust and other bodies representing St. Catherine's Hill and Town Common Management Plan.</p> <p>What thought has been given to brown field sites at a time when so many compaines have gone into liquidation and their sites not been taken on? Why is such a cavalier attitude being taken to Green Belt land that it can be amended so that land is identified for new housing?</p> <p>However well intentioned, element CN3 of the Core Strategy cannot be considered as sound for the following reasons:-</p> <p>It is clear that the evidence base for such a development can be neither 'robust' nor credible when taking the Core Strategy Vision into account. The natural environment "the most important assest for the area" is clearly at risk from CN3. Climate change and the intention to reduce the risk of flooding makes CN3 inappropriate. Green Belt. According to the vision, is only protected if it is not needed for housing and for CN3, this includes being adjacent to a highly designated area, which is unsupportable.</p> <p>The aformentioned makes this part of the Core Strategy undeliverable and hence CN3 does not comply with the requirement for it being effective, in addition to not being justified. This element of the local Development Framework must be dropped.</p>					
653852	Mrs Susan Newman-Crane		CSPS593	Map 6.2	Yes	No		Yes			Ambury Lane is ancient and charming and the map indicates it will be removed.	Retain Ambury Lane with its rural character.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		300	
654026	Ms Bev Miller		CSPS623	Map 6.2		No		Yes	Yes		Where has Ambury Lane gone ? Ambury Lane is ancient and ideal for walking and cycling and the map indicates it will be removed. Retain Ambury Lane with its rural character.		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		300	
654026	Ms Bev Miller		CSPS628	Map 6.4		No		No	No	No	PPG2 Green Belts states there are five purposes of including land in Green Belts: 1. To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas; 2. To prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another;		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		318	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											3. To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment; 4. To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and 5. To assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. STOP ERODING OUR GREEN BELTS...					