

responses to pooles core strategy site allocations



contents

1 Consultation Process	5
2 Responses	7
Tables of Representations	
Table 2.1 - Cobbs Quay Marina Responses	7
Table 2.2 - Rydal Mount Site Responses	9



contents



1 Consultation Process

Purpose of this Document

1.1 This document provides a schedule of the representations received to the [Pooles Core Strategy Submission Site Allocations Documents](#) August 2008. As a result of the Pooles Core Strategy Submission Document Consultation two sites were identified as representations for further consultation. These included Cobbs Quay Marina and Rydal Mount, Canford Magna. There were 5 representations made to the two site representations, from 4 organisations and individuals. These representations will be considered by the Inspector at the Public Examination scheduled to commence in November.

Availability and Distribution of the Document

The Core Strategy Submission Site Allocation Documents were made available to view and comment on Friday 1st August to Thursday 11th September 2008, via a downloadable form or online at

www.boroughofpoole.com/Corestrategy

Paper copies of the document were made available at the same time in all of the Borough's 10 public libraries and on request. Notice that the document was made available on the Council's web site.



6

one consultation process



2 Responses

List of Respondents

ID	Title	First Name	Surname	Organisation
1241	Mr	Michael	Holm	Environment Agency
610	Mr	AS	Foster	Resident
1239	Mr	Neal	Whitehead	South West Regional Assembly
1243	Mr	Rohan	Torkildsen	English Heritage

Nature of Responses

2.1 There have been 5 separate representations received from 4 respondents to Poole Core Strategy Submission Site Allocations Document. There were 4 responses received by e-mail, and 1 received by Fax. The tables below set out responses to the Cobbs Quay Marina and Rydal Mount, Canford Magna Site Allocations:

Responses

Cobbs Quay Marina:

ID / Name	ID / Type	Summary
1241 Mr Michael Holm (Environment Agency)	2637 Observations	Flood Risk and Sequential Test: Our understanding of the Central Area for your Core Strategy, from discussions with your Authority, are that Figure 2.1 of your Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Level (SFRA) Level 2 (Flood Modelling Report EX5663) gives a more detailed outline of the Central Area. This would not include Cobbs Quay Marina development as it currently stands. Part of the Cobbs Quay Marina site is currently at risk from tidal flooding (Flood Zones 2 and 3), and this will increase with time given climate change allowances. The current use is



two responses

ID / Name	ID / Type	Summary
		<p>considered Water Compatible under Planning Policy Statement 25 (PPS25), Development and Flood Risk. However, any increase in vulnerability classification would be subject to PPS25 Sequential Test. Exclusion from the central area may impact on your authority's position on how the site is dealt with under the Sequential Test given your latest position. Therefore, you must consider if this site is required within the Central Area boundary.</p>
<p>610 Mr AS Foster</p>	<p>2638 Object</p>	<p>Object to any land adjacent to the Holes Bay SSSI being included in the town centre area and to any further development. Restrictions on development should be introduced similar to that belatedly brought in to safeguard the remnants of the Dorset Heathlands. Packed boat marinas are already a major visual intrusion into the Harbour scene. Both visually and with the inevitable increase in marine craft use no further major developments should be permitted adjacent to the SSSI. I understand MDL withdrew their objection to the Poole Bridge scheme. Why if they want continued development north of the bridges did they not propose or support a scheme which would allow uninterrupted 24 hr road and boat movements such as the coupled swing bridges.</p>

Table 2.1 Cobbs Quay Marina Responses



Rydal Mount, Canford Magna:

ID / Name	ID / Type	Summary
1243 Mr Rohan Torkildsen (English Heritage)	2635 Observations	As we are unsure of the details of the proposals it is difficult to comment. Needless to say, future allocations should be informed by an appropriate response to the sites context. I note there are numerous sensitive historic assets in Canford Magna. Unless there are specific issues that you and your historic environment officers wish to discuss with us about these sites we will assume there are no significant or controversial matters of relevance to English Heritage.
1239 Mr Neal Whitehead (South West Regional Assembly)	2634 Observations	You will recall that the RPB recently commented on the Submitted Core Strategy document. My letter of 8 July 2008 refers. At that time the RPB commented that “ We do note however that the Panel Report (para 4.7.23e-24) was strongly minded that there was a demand for some 85 ha of land with only a supply of 13ha. Furthermore the Panel identified the potential shortage of employment land as a significant issue across the conurbation and recommended in Policy SR7.3, that a search for 110ha of employment land should be conducted across the conurbation. Your document (para 6.2) in contrast considers that some 39 ha of land (or equivalent) is required and would be available to meet the jobs forecast consistent with the RSS. We do note that para 6.2 explains that this estimate is based on recent work, published after the EiP, undertaken by Dorset Strategic Authorities and Grimley GVA. We have no reason to dispute the findings of this later study, but do think that it would be helpful if you were to set out more clearly why the 39ha is now considered to be a robust and realistic assessment of employment land needs compared with the clear recommendations of the Panel Report.” As stated above we do consider that it will be necessary for you to set out clearly why the level of employment land that set out in Submitted Core Strategy is robust and realistic. We note in this context that the Secretary of State’s Proposed Changes to the draft RSS has proposed that the search for 110ha of land



two responses

ID / Name	ID / Type	Summary
		<p>should be increased to 152ha. The representations you are now consulting on are clearly relevant to the discussion of this issue and we look forward to seeing how you address them as part of the consideration for providing an adequate supply of employment land.</p> <p>SWRA Response to Poole Site Allocations.doc</p>
<p>1241 Mr Michael Holm (Environment Agency)</p>	<p>2636 Observations</p>	<p>Flood Risk and Surface Water Drainage: This site is located in Flood Zone 1 (low risk) of our flood zone maps. However, there is a local watercourse that divides the site which may be subject to localized flooding. Therefore, recommend that you liaise with your drainage engineers in regards to local flood risk issues in this area. For your information we consider this site is more desirable, in regards to PPS25 Sequential Test, for residential development than some of the sites within the Central Area that will be subject to higher flood risks. Therefore, you may wish to consider this site for potential residential as well as employment opportunities. Historic Landfill: The site is also within close proximity to historic landfills to the east and west of the site. These would need to be dealt with strategically if there is a risk from the historic landfills. On the 22nd of June 2007 we sent your Authority a CD containing historic landfill data which has all the information which we hold on the historic landfill site within 250m of this development proposal.</p>

Table 2.2 Rydal Mount Site Responses



responses to pooles core strategy site allocations

