

Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment ID	Question 1 - The draft SPD provides an approach to planning for the future of the seafront. Please let us know your views on this approach.	Key Points
Mrs J Prett		62	I have just discovered the council's seafront plan by chance & am surprised it has not been made more readily available to the people of Poole nor has it made people aware of what is planned? How many more people do not know about this? Whilst I realise we have to 'move with the times' I think that much of our beach and coastal areas are beautifully natural and by erecting ultra modern buildings in various places mentioned in the draft - will detract from the character of the residential and quiet beach areas. Do they all have to be made busy and noisy with loads of activity areas?	Not well publicised. Appreciate the need to move with the times but not all the beaches should be made busy and noisy with activity areas.
Professor John Newton	Committee Member Sandbanks Association	293	2013 July Discussion Paper from The Sandbanks Association for the Borough of Poole: following receipt of the SPS document, June 2013 version. 'Maintain high quality of a blue flag family beach: Often one hears from families of their experiences of Sandbanks One Grandfather recounted the following - "I was brought here to the beach as a child and my wife and I brought our children. Then, they in turn brought their children for the classic and unforgettable family beach holiday.' Long may it continue to provide that wonderful experience" It is essential that we maintain the blue flag status of Sandbanks Beach and other associated beaches. 1. We support the general aims as set out in the SPS document: i. Conserve the natural environment ii. Improve the range of facilities to encourage visitors all the year round iii. Invest in the ageing infrastructure, such as electrical supply, drainage and new toilets, to ensure the preservation of core services. 2. We note and support, but with the reservations listed below, the 3 key themes of: i.To deliver high quality design and construction to any development ii.To maintain, respect and enhance the natural environment iii.To improve connections between the seafront beaches, the town centre and the wider surrounding conurbation. However we do not support the over commercialisation of the Sandbanks Beach area, which in the present SPS document (June 2013) does not develop this area in harmony with the Sand Dune nature of this part of the overall beach seafront. This type of over commercialisation was discussed at our Sandbanks Association meeting in February 2013, and was unanimously rejected. 3. THE 1986 POOLE BOROUGH COUNCIL ACT OF PARLIAMENT This is an important Act in relation to the Sandbanks Beach area, as listed in the SPS. The restrictions imposed by this act severely limit any proposed development on the Sandbanks Recreation Ground Site as set out in the current version of the SPS. It is unrealistic in our opinion to continue with meaningless developments on this area with this Act in place. So much can be done without infringing this Act, that would develop in harmony with the Sand Dune character of this beach. It is our opinion, and that of the 98 people who attended the Sandbanks Association Coffee Morning in February, that this current plan should be rejected in its entirety. It is a gross overdevelopment of the Sandbanks Beach area. One of the key elements of any objection appears to be the Poole Borough Council Act 1986 (copies have been made of this Act, but the significant issues are listed below). We cannot understand why the head of the group presenting this plan to the Councillors and the Public should have been unaware of this Act, until we reminded them in February 2013, and its restrictions on development, prior to spending all this council money on this development exercise. Had the people on the Committee developing this proposal used due diligence and investigation they would have found this and the related Acts that have influence on any proposed development. Summary of key Issues in the 1986 Poole Borough Council Act of Parliament, as it relates to the Recreation Ground Car Park Sandbanks. These key issues are: 1. a restriction in height of any building on this site of no more than two storeys. Many of the proposed buildings are at least three storeys. 2. specific no build areas' at either end of the car park area and along its northern and southern boundaries. 3. specific restrictions on the type of building: i.e. only beach huts and tents, not brick or concrete buildings as proposed in the present plan. In detail these are set out in the act as follows [s - section of the act; brackets are specific and refer to a section or subsection -e.g. 3(7)(a)] This and further notes relate to the powers in relation to the Sandbanks Recreation Ground Car Park (SRGCP). 3(7) page 3 Size of car park not to exceed in the whole 1.5 hectares' This is the present size of the car park. The proposed plan intends to remove the bund sand dune at the western end and the sand dune at the eastern end. This is illegal. 3(7)(a) page 3 limit to the power of the Council to erect beach and other huts shops tents and booths conferred in subsection (4) but with exclusions listed below 3(7)(b) No erection whatsoever shall be placed by the Council upon the SRGCP within - (i) 22 metres of the western boundary thereof; or [this is the present bund sand dune] (ii) 54 metres of the eastern boundary thereof; or [this is the present sand dune to the east]. (iii) This section delineates the metre boundaries of the SRGCP. The eastern boundary is the marker (and we will need to look at this section with a map). 3(7) (d) no erection placed under the powers of	Essential to retain blue flag status. Support SPS general aims, but not over-commercialisation of Sandbanks Beach which is contrary to the provisions of Poole Borough Council Act 1986, i.e. in terms of position of development, height, building type. Hotel unnecessary and query over viability. Number/ position of beach huts is questioned. Needs to be more research on water taxi service, and there should be no reduction in parking. SUGGESTIONS: More beach huts and overnight pods, double storey huts beyond Shore Road only, provide more showers, segregated bike lane on prom and bike hire, safety in the sun display boards and lotion and hats for sale, solar panel lighting, increase parking including for Surf Schools, support Banks Road echelon parking if safe, provide cultural area e.g. bandstand, provide traction water-ski area, support dog facilities, more seating at Harbour frontage and behind Beach Cafe, entrance info and sculpture at Shore Road/Banks Road junction, beach zoning, restore pavilion with glass roof, increase buses, create a PROW to west of

Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment ID	Question 1 - The draft SPD provides an approach to planning for the future of the seafront. Please let us know your views on this approach.	Key Points
			<p>this section shall exceed in height 10 metres. Many of the proposed buildings of more than two storeys exceed the height maximum. Provided that subject to the provisions of paragraphs (a)(b) and (c) of this subsection the Council may build the following listed below, on any part of the SRCGCP (remembering the excluded areas listed above - which they have not taken account of) (i) Beach and other huts not exceeding two storeys in height; and (ii) A cafe the highest point of which is not more than 14.5 metres above ordnance datum 4. Areas of concern with the present version of the SPS, which is little different from the previous versions. 1. Sandbanks Beach - a dune landscape': As set out on pages 38 and 39 in the SPS this does not maintain this beach area as a dune landscape and a family friendly beach. The proposals are a deliberate attempt to over commercialise this area with no attempt to maintain and care for the very distinct nature of this area. The SPS says ...'any change must respect the historic origins and the landscape'... balance between buildings and open space must be carefully controlled'... The present SPS does not address this but seeks to change the area and its character doing away with the concepts suggested in the opening sections of the SPS and what the local Residents Association wish to see maintained. 2. Restrictions of the 1986 Act: The one paragraph on page 38 does not address all the issues surrounding this act which prohibits many of the proposed developments in their present location in the SPS document in addition to height. The Sandbanks Association supports this Act and rejects any proposal to build buildings, flats, additional shops etc on this area of the Beach. 3. Hotel: This is not necessary, it could not be built due to the height restrictions. There are adequate Hotels already provided at the Beach, we have two large Hotels in Sandbanks, and they are not always full. Recently two hotel applications have been found to be non viable, so we question the wisdom of persisting with this concept. 4. Beach Huts: The number and position of these will need careful further discussion, both due to the location, as set in the present SPS, and the effect that this will have if beach studios are introduced, and on the overall number of beach huts when they are in great demand and there is always a waiting list. 5. Car Parking: We cannot reduce the number of spaces. While echelon parking on Banks Road is mentioned, the reduction of spaces in the recreation Ground Car park should not occur. Later in the document we have again indicated a way in which these can be increased. We also question the use of car parking without additional charges when windsurfing/kite surfing vans plus trailers use more than one car park space. 6. The Harbour Side: Not enough attention has been paid to the development of this asset. It is underprovided in seating and jetties for the proposed water taxi. You cannot use a private Yacht Club as the terminal for the Water Taxi, as is proposed in the SPS. Greater use by the public of this area must recognise the range of activities that go on. 5. WE HAVE THE FOLLOWING SUGGESTIONS, IN NO SPECIFIC ORDER FOR FURTHER DISCUSSION: 1. An increase in the number of beach huts: It is difficult to see how the proposed development of beach huts on the Sandbanks Beach can go ahead, with the restrictions in place (see section 3). There is always a waiting list for beach huts, and for many years this list has been closed. Looking at the total of all beaches, to remove the present 2 storey huts at Sandbanks would compound this problem. In addition we would support the development of modern beach huts or pods' suitable for overnight accommodation, and fitted with cooking facilities and running water. But this would have to occur at appropriate sites and needs further discussion. Double storey huts beyond Shore Road Beach where there are at present only single storey huts is in our opinion a better concept. 2. Review of beach toilets/shower facilities and changing facilities: To match these with the individual beaches and consider a new facility at the eastern end of the Pavilion at Sandbanks, and better facilities at Shore Road. Also install new shower facility at the beach end of Middleway (Midway) path. In addition to review the number of drinking water outlets and to increase these whenever possible. 3. Cyclists: consider the rationalisation of cycle lanes on the promenade to separate walkers, those in wheel chairs and cyclists by clearly marked lanes. As people sit on the edge of the promenade beach wall the cycle lane may have to be towards the back of the promenade.(see Whitecliff Park path segregation). But this produces a conflict when there are beach huts. 4. Bicycle Hire: An excellent idea. Explore both bike hire adjacent to the beach and ride and bike' facilities from the more distant car parks. Similar to the free bicycle hire system used in Scandinavia & other countries. 5. Safety in the Sun: Consider display boards on Beach entrances to indicate safety in the sun and the use of sun block, hats for children etc. In addition the beach kiosk outlets will need to provide sun block etc. 6. Install fixed exercise stands: along the beaches and promenades as in Poole Park, where this has been a success. 7. Increase the solar panel powered</p>	<p>car park, maintain RNLI presence and Beach Office, fixed gym exercise points along prom.</p>

Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment ID	Question 1 - The draft SPD provides an approach to planning for the future of the seafront. Please let us know your views on this approach.	Key Points
			<p>promenade lights: at least to the end of the Pavilion on Sandbanks Beach. Consider solar power on all new buildings and beach huts. 8. Car Parking: consider ways of increasing car parking spaces at Sandbanks but without removal of the Western and Eastern Sand dune areas. Start with the plan which was submitted 2 years ago to utilise the wasted space beyond the Poole Storage facility up to the Beach huts in the middle section of the car park. This would allow disabled parking adjacent to the beach. Consider a feasibility study to increase car parking by installing a carefully designed one storey car park which is all that could be installed without blocking the excellent bay views at present available. Due to the lie of the land this would probably be only possible over one third of the present car park area. The Sandbanks Association would wish to be involved at an early stage of the design process if this was considered a feasible project. We support echelon parking along Banks Road, where there is available space. 9. Cultural area: consider the feasibility of installing an area similar to a 'Victorian Style Bandstand' in front of the pavilion. To provide a new area for music and art, for Poole eg: open air sculpture displays. 10. Traction Skiing Area: as discussed with leisure services in 2011. Purpose built water area with side to side mechanically driven single board water ski. 11. Dog facilities: maintain the present arrangements with an all year round dog beach and the present summer ban of dogs in front of the Sandbanks Promenade. 12. Hold consultation with residents and dog owners: concerning a 'dogs on lead' policy for the summer months on the dog friendly beach area. 13. Harbour Bay side: Increase facilities for sitting along the walk way on the harbour beach area. In addition the area immediately in front of the Sandbanks Hotel is an ideal area for families and wind surfers. Increase seating, picnic facilities and waste disposal in this area. 14. Increase the fixed seating behind the Beach Cafe: this has proved popular and there is room to install 3 further fixed seating bench/table combinations. 15. Wind Surfing/Kite Surfing schools: At present there are two schools which need purpose built additional parking areas developed in the extra wide portion of the grass verge to facilitate teaching and training. Increase in seating as stated above will help spectators and participants. 16. Educational Information and Entrance (Gateway to Sandbanks Beaches): to increase the information boards about educational information on the Beaches, bird life (migratory birds) and geology of the area. In addition place metal entrance sculpture, similar to the Jurassic Coast marker on the Studland side of the chain ferry. Suggested location at the junction of Shore Road and Banks Road. 17. Beach Zoning: At present the part of Sandbanks beach directly in front of the Beach Office and promenade is zoned for the safe pursuit of different activities. The other part of Sandbanks beach towards the Haven Hotel is not zoned. During the summer months there is no control over jet skis and small motor boats coming onto the various segments of this part of the beach, an accident waiting to happen. Safe management of this beach would zone swimming, children and these jet skis. 18. Restore roof of the pavilion to its original function: we support the concept of a glassed in second storey. 19. Increase in Bus frequency to serve Sandbanks and Shore Road Beach, for services to and from Bournemouth and Poole and to Studland and beyond: This is essential to support the beaches. 20. Designation of the footpath at the western end of the car park as a PROW. 21. Maintain the Beach Office and RNLI Summer support, increase safety of children. Appendix: Further comments on the SPS document: In addition in the SPS there are listed several 'identities' for each of the Beaches. We have the following comments about Sandbanks and Shore Road Beaches. Sandbanks Beach : Sand dune landscape: this is the widest beach and is family friendly. Let us keep this character. Rockery at car park entrance - this is an excellent feature please retain this, but in future concentrate on drought resistant plant types. This would reduce water need and reduce maintenance and give a more ecologically sustainable display. Add educational board with information on 'how to make a drought resistant garden'. Improved Transport links - we support this. Bike hire - we support this. Better signage - we support this. Classical pavilion - we have suggested ways to improve this area. Commercial activity near the harbour - we can not see how this can be arranged except for simple kiosk facilities. Water Taxi from Poole Quay - we support this, but wonder where the landing site would be? It cannot be at the NHYC as proposed. This is a private sailing club. It will need a purpose built jetty opposite the pavilion (as marked on the map) if this is to be the centre of the beach facilities. Shops and a pub - there are already adequate outlets to purchase alcohol, we do not need more. There is also a surfeit of food outlets, 2 in bay view shops. Plus take away food and drink at Sandbanks Stores, The Beach Cafe and associated kiosks, Jazz Cafe at Shore Road beach plus the Sandbanks Hotel, and now a TESCO Express. Visitor Accommodation - There are already two hotels in Sandbanks - The</p>	

Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment ID	Question 1 - The draft SPD provides an approach to planning for the future of the seafront. Please let us know your views on this approach.	Key Points
			<p>Haven and Sandbanks Hotel, plus others at Canford Cliffs. There is no requirement for more Hotels, recent attempts to open two new Hotels to serve the beach area have failed. If low cost accommodation (holiday lets) is needed in addition to the extensive portfolio of Rumsey and Rumsey and other letting agents, then further discussion will be needed. Weddings - difficult to see how this could be improved as Cafe Shore already has a licence. However if beach weddings were needed then an additional licence would be required, unless the Branksome Dene Chine room is to be used. Shore Road: This needs an 'entrance' marking the arrival at the beach area perhaps a Landmark arrival sculpture, as for the Jurassic Coast (see this at the west side of the ferry). Harbour Side: Shell Fish Huts - difficult to see how these could be included without disturbing a major bird feeding area that exists at the Shore Road end on the harbour. A good venue for viewing the many migratory birds visiting the harbour and Brownsea Island. More Parking - difficult to see how to do this unless part of the grass verge is removed and diagonal parking (nose in) introduced. Beach Side: Overnight Accommodation pods - we support this. Increase number of Kiosks along the promenade towards Canford Cliffs. Bike Hire - we support this. Children's play spaces - if there was room then we would support additional play areas. Beach side gym - we have already suggested fixed exercise stands along the whole promenade.</p>	
Mr Martin Heath		175	<p>A plan for the seafront is long overdue, but many of the ideas presented are ill-conceived and impractical. There appears to have been too little 'groundwork' and insufficient thought given to potential drawbacks. For instance: will the small sand dunes at Sandbanks survive with beach huts amongst them; will echelon parking on Banks Road impede traffic flow; can apartments be built on top of the underground pumping station in the Shore Road car park; how can an all-ages play space be built on the site of a recently constructed private beach hut at the bottom of Flaghead Chine; is car parking feasible along Pinecliff Road? These are just a few of the many questions that can be asked.</p>	<p>Overdue plan but ideas are ill conceived and impractical. Will sand dunes survive with beach huts there, echelon parking will impede traffic flow, Shore Road apartments on top of pumping station, play space near private beach huts, parking of Pinecliff Road feasible?</p>
Mr Philip Crocker		129	<p>A reasonable approach, although not well advertised - hence this late response.</p>	<p>Reasonable approach but not well advertised.</p>

Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment ID	Question 1 - The draft SPD provides an approach to planning for the future of the seafront. Please let us know your views on this approach.	Key Points
Mr Terry Stewart	Chairman Southern Poole Chairmens' Liaison Group	295	<p>A. General Principles 1. Aims of the Plan We totally support the overall objectives of the Plan and the need to upgrade the infrastructure of the seafront while protecting the Quality and the Natural Environment. But we are very concerned at the proposed over-commercialisation and urbanisation which breaches the objective of enhancing the natural environment. The balance between tourists and residents is very one-sided. Most of the proposals seem geared to attracting more tourists without anything like enough regard to local residents, who are the most frequent users of the seafront as well as the local taxpayers who sustain it. 2. Method of Financing We do not believe that the £7 million cost needs to be achieved by building the 2 hotels, the commercial development opposite the Sandbanks shops, the Shore Road apartments and the 5 storey building at the Shore Road beach. The SPS Plan covers 25 years, and you have agreed that the CIL payments can be used for this purpose. Since the CIL levies for Canford Cliffs and Lilliput are twice the level compared to other residential part of the Borough, this will generate large sums over 25 years. You are also proposing to build some 383 additional beachhuts. The rental from this income flow of over £500,000 per annum will make a major contribution. The SPS needs to include the financial assumptions for all the developments and breakout the £7 million cost. Cllr. Judy Butt agreed to provide the financial figures at our meeting. 3. Hotels We are not convinced of the financial viability of the proposed hotels. The FJB Hotel Group has experienced difficulties for their 3 hotels in the area. The Norfolk Lodge hotel on Haven Road has been for sale for 3 years and has had no takers, the New Beehive Hotel has decided to develop their hotel rooms into apartments. In addition, the Core Strategy assumes that 3 additional hotels will be built in the centre of the town and that the Thistle Hotel will be doubled in size. We do not think that there is a viable market demand for all these hotels. 4. Crime Historically the Branksome Park, Canford Cliffs and Sandbanks Neighbourhood Watch has received regular reports from the Police of vandalism and burglary of Poole's beachhuts. Some years have had over 100 beachhuts attacked, and it costs the Council some £30,000 each year to repair their huts. I have been pressing for the installation of CCTV cameras along the front for 15 years when the Home Office was offering subsidies. Bournemouth has very successful cameras and has very few attacks. These must be installed. 5. Residential Studios We have 2 concerns for these proposals. In the light of the prevalent vandalism of the beachhuts, the studios will be more vulnerable since they will contain more valuable contents. Location and monitoring will need close study. Allowing overnight stays would change the character of the area. Also no studios must be allowed in Conservation Areas and where there is Access to Nature Reserves. It is vital to protect the valuable natural environment of the Chines. The Chines should be designated as SANGs. B. Sandbanks Beach 1. Sandbanks Association The submission to this consultation by the Sandbanks Association, which we strongly support has given very practical thought to the realities of this environmentally valuable zone. 2. Over Commercialisation Specifically we strongly oppose the proposed Boutique Hotel, additional residential units, extended commercial area with shops, and any Beach Studios in the dunes. All of which will deteriorate the character of this vital area. The Poole Corporation Act 1986 does not permit more commercial development in this area. However we do support the development of the Sandbanks Pavilion with a second storey. 3. Tourist Access The number of parking spaces should not be reduced, and could be increased while taking account of the restrictions of the Poole Borough Council Act. While we are in favour of the Water Taxi access, this will mean a long custom built jetty to allow for the shallow Bay at this point. We are dubious about dredging the access to this jetty to allow for frequent taxi deliveries. We strongly support an early and more frequent bus service to help reduce car journeys to Sandbanks. The Haven Hotel already has great difficulty in getting staff to the hotel in time for breakfast. 4. Recreation Facilities Further thought needs to be given to facilities on the Bay side of the peninsular. Windsurfing of several kinds has become a major asset for Poole and attracts younger tourists. More seating, equipment lockers and other ideas from the windsurfing schools must be explored. C. Beach Road Zone 1. Mini Complex We strongly oppose the scale of the 4 or 5 storey proposed complex which will dominate this key social area. It must not be built across the sand/shore. We do not object to the additional beachhuts, as long as they are on the promenade, and no more than 2 storeys high. However Cllr. May Haines pointed out that planning permission was refused for App 06/08792/013/F for 12 beachhuts on 01/02/2007 due to unstable land. 2. Tourist Access We oppose the proposal to reduce the car parking spaces by 41 since these are essential to bring tourists to this particular zone. This would strongly question the new apartments, since they would need their own parking, and 3 years on there are flats unsold next to</p>	<p>Support Plan principles, but concerned that over-commercialisation breaches enhancing natural environment objective. There is more regard to tourists than locals. Not convinced £7M required, other revenue streams over 25 year period should be explored. New hotels, harm to character and no evidence they would be viable concerns. Install CCTV to reduce crime. Overnight studios will attract crime, change character and disturb nature. Chines should be designated as SANGs. Loss of parking, Shore Road complex, Sky cafe, additional dwelling off Cliff Drive, hotels and Go Ape course are not supported. More lockers and seating required. Residents Associations should have been consulted earlier.</p>

Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment ID	Question 1 - The draft SPD provides an approach to planning for the future of the seafront. Please let us know your views on this approach.	Key Points
			<p>the car park. The underground pump is still in use and should be retained. D. Flaghead Beach Zone We support the proposals for this area in maintaining its character. There may be an opportunity for creating a bus stop at the top of the Chine path to reduce car access on Haven Road. We do not understand the proposed "cheap park and ride would improve access to the beach" - please explain. We question whether there is adequate space for the All Ages Play Space. E. Canford Cliffs Beach Zone We object to the loss of public amenity and cliff views by the building of a private house in Cliff Road on the cliff. There are already concerns about slippage for Cliff Road. We would also object to residential studios in the Chine. We challenge the idea of public car parking on page 61 near the beach - see Note Number 33. We question the viability of the increased car parking spaces on Cliff Drive, since in 1926 the Canford Cliffs Land Society gave the land to the Borough, but still holds Covenants over it. Parking on the grass verges is restricted. The additional 119 proposed beach huts are not allowed to be cut into the cliff. F. Branksome Beach Zone There should be no reduction in car parking spaces which are essential for resident and tourist access to the beach. It is essential that the commercial hub should be no more than 2 storeys high - not 3. We object to the Sky Cafe as damaging the cliff appearance and the local environment. We question the stability of the clifftop if the cafe is cantilevered over the cliff. We question whether Pinecliff and Beach roads are wide enough to take on road car parking when there is a problem of visibility round the corner. G. Branksome Dene Beach Zone The Community Building is well used and is a valuable Community amenity which should be protected under the Core Strategy protection. It does need upgrading however with new inside toilets. We would object to this site being used as a hotel, but there is an opportunity for this to incorporate an imaginative tourist facility. The building must be no higher than 2 storeys. The access road needs to be widened. We would object to the 5 proposed beach studios in the Chine as impacting the natural SCNI environment. The tree walks are an exceedingly dangerous project given the age and fragility of the pine trees. The unique character of this area is its woodland beauty, which would be harmed irreparably by the proposed rope tree walks and the extent of the development proposed. There is some concern that not all Residents' Associations were consulted in the 2012 Consultation. So we hope that a summary of all consultation conclusions will be published, then a series of exhibitions and public meetings are held with the next stage of proposals.</p>	

Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment ID	Question 1 - The draft SPD provides an approach to planning for the future of the seafront. Please let us know your views on this approach.	Key Points
Mr Gerald Rigler	Planning Sub-committee Society of Poole Men	290	<p>A: Generally 1: These comments have been prepared upon the basis of salient points arising from a 'page-by-page' examination of the document concerned. 2: In view of the above our comments are not in order of importance and are therefore as repetitive as the source document. 3: It is noted that the relevant source document is substantial (no doubt very costly) and likely to mislead if not read in conjunction with the Core Strategy also the subject of public consultation. In this connection it is not expected that the facilities required by the Borough should all be sited at or near the seafront. 4: Much of the draft document appears to concentrate on accommodating visitors at or near the beach overnight rather than seeking to improve transport facilities to and from remoter car parks. 5: The draft document envisages investing cash. Securing a credible financial basis for an affordable investment loan would be assisted, if necessary, if more beach huts were on annual lets to resident Council Tax payers. 6: Securing greater usage of the beach huts (creating more 'year-round surveillance', improved public relations concerning beach hut usage and possibly increased spending at commercial seafront outlets) would be achieved by revising the unduly restrictive tenancy conditions that limit sub-letting. 7: We would welcome any 'feedback' on these comments so that the eventual finalised document can be accepted as broadly consensual. B: Fly sheet 1: The published quotation confirms that our seafront 'doesn't offer much else than the environment'. This is considered to be the USP (Unique Selling Point) of our seafront and should not be discarded by the construction of cafes, shops and bars however well designed. C: Page ii 1: Encouragement of more seafront visitors for longer periods in the year may be desirable but no mention is made of the costs of lifeguard duties outside the 'normal' holiday periods (when relevant people may be hard to recruit for such duties) or of the increased need for 'beach wardens' to foster good behaviour. 2: It is disturbing to note that no 'sinking fund' has been used to create a means of maintaining the beach estate and infrastructure. It suggests that our Borough may have very severe problems if all of the 'fixed capital investments' within the Borough have been similarly deprived of funds for foreseeable maintenance expenditure. No doubt such dereliction of medium/long term management issues could warrant, amongst other things, a loan to be serviced by a possible increase in the local taxes, if necessary to ensure the above-mentioned USP is preserved. It is expected that appropriate lessons will be taken by Council. 3: It is accepted that the seafront facilities need to be made reliable, safe and sanitary by actually implementing an acceptable strategy sooner rather than later relevant productive time will not be used by simply producing more reports (and reports about reports) with associated delays to effective action. 4: It is assumed that the reference to consultations will become accurate after completion of the process involved with converting the draft into the finalised document that Cllr Judy Butt is prepared to present to Council. D: Pages iv to vi 1: Since these pages are summaries of later pages in the source document see our comments about such pages that follow. E: Page 1 1: The first paragraph is supported completely. 2: The seafront must be properly supported by facilities elsewhere within the Borough. The impending Maritime event adds even more urgency to this issue and therefore places like Dolphin Quays need attention now together with improvements to transport. It is assumed that the restaurant and hotel facilities (that are already under considerable pressure) should not be further pressurised by facilities at the seafront. 3: A statement is made that 'resources are being cut' without clarifying the role of investment. "Cutting" as a result of critical examination of 'value-for-money' aspects makes sense at any time but not pursuing sensible investments (when interest rates are so low) seems perverse and should be challenged vigorously. It is understood that the EU has many funds available to support sensible investments: funds which may not exist for much longer. F: Page 4 1: It is noted that the Core Strategy 2009 is mentioned but not the implications of its associated review. 2: It is noted that there is a need 'to review how efficiently we run the service': our earlier comments about maintenance may assist. G: Page 7 1: It is noted that the utilities infrastructure and public facilities are reported as having not been maintained. H: Page 8 1: The subtitles to the pictures make suggestions that are unclear. The potential of Canford Cliffs, the updating of beach huts and the extent of assets worth keeping being significant. I: Page 14 1: The second paragraph refers to 'even essential works are being squeezed' as though such work is a kind of exception to due scrutiny. Any work (ie reports, services, utilities or construction) should be subjected to 'value-for-money' examination and therefore will be subject to the pressure known as 'squeeze': it allows the Borough to make the best use of limited resources and should be encouraged. J: Page 15 1: The car park picture does not specifically mention the overdue introduction of 'Park and Ride' facilities. Our seafront car parks could usefully be</p>	<p>Document concentrates on overnight visitors rather than improving transport links. Environment is unique selling point, shouldn't be lost to cafes, shops and bars. Increasing all year round beach use needs enhanced lifeguard duties and previous consideration of a 'sinking fund'. Future Maritime event needs to be planned in conjunction with SPS. 'Essential works are being squeezed' is good, implies due scrutiny lacking before. Park and Ride and increased bike use is encouraged. Places to barbeque, eat and drink, sit and dispose of litter are supported. No need for new hotels and beach studios unsafe and harmful to dunes. Road signage required in land as well as advance warning to motorists. Poole should be aspiring to be a centre of Water Sports Excellence but not part of SPS. Income from visitors is dependent upon improved toilets and core infrastructure. BoP cuts recognised but not fully understood in the SPS. Glass pavilion roof might work. Any new swimming pool should be somewhere else, like Upper Parkstone. At Canford Cliffs 2 storey huts and studios are not favoured, but house off Cliff Drive may be useful in raising finance. Loss of sand space to the public not favoured (beach</p>

Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment ID	Question 1 - The draft SPD provides an approach to planning for the future of the seafront. Please let us know your views on this approach.	Key Points
			<p>adjusted to allow buses to take their time for unloading beach visitors safely and near the beach. K: Page 16 1: The role of buses, in servicing the seafront, could be usefully amplified to include 'Park and Ride' run for a month or so (when the school buses are not required). It is agreed that the role of buses and cycles should be fostered. 2: It is hoped that the mention of more places to eat and drink includes better facilities for picnics and BBQs. 3: More seating would be welcome especially on hills used for approaching beaches. 4: All locations where people are likely to linger on the promenades and their approaches (especially where there are seats) should have easy access to litter bins, pending a change in public behaviour. L: Page 17 1: The need for additional hotels at the seafront is not demonstrated, even if one were thought capable of being sited appropriately. It is understood that our existing hotels across the Borough are not fully utilised. M: Page 21 1: Mention is made of 'public transport' without reference to high frequency 'Park and Ride' facilities during the summer period (no doubt only when the weather is set fine!!) 2: Mention is made of 'identifying key vistas'. Perhaps this will have some impact upon the current aspirations for Navitus Bay. 3: Mention is made of new developments but no mention is made to any preference for refurbishment(s). 4: It is not clear that the document fully reports the significance of special protection and conservation issues. N: Page 23 1: It is not clear that the report fully appreciates the significance of special protection and conservation issues - rather that it is to be clarified by 'others'. O: Page 25 1: It is appreciated that the restoration of a Water Bus service is suggested. Hopefully involving shallow draught vessels and pick-up points at various harbour side car parks such as at Baiter. P: Page 28 1: The indications of 'key' signing locations excludes the more important locations that are further inland where motorists have to start to make their approach decisions. Q: Page 30 1: The need for additional bed spaces at the seafront is not demonstrated, even if they were thought capable of being sited appropriately. It is understood that our existing hotels across the Borough are not fully utilised. 2: The concept of Beach Studios is likely to be unacceptable upon the grounds of safety from the usual hazards that the police could have advised the producers of the document. 3: It is assumed that the restrictions on overnight use of our beach huts is not to be changed for similar reasons to those mentioned at '2' above. 4: It is assumed that 'affordable accommodation' is not to be provided by beach huts or beach studios. 5: It is assumed that beach studios will occupy more space than a beach hut and therefore reduce beach hut related income. 6: The suggestion that a potential hotel could have a privileged relationship with the beach is of concern if the public lose access rights. 7: The pictures showing a library on the beach and schools on the beach reminded us that Poole should be aspiring to be a centre of Water Sports Excellence and consequently the scope of the seafront document is too limited for any such ambition. Review of the Core Strategy may be relevant. R: Page 36 1: In improving beach access for all it is hoped that improved drop-off points for 'Park and Ride' buses will be introduced. 2: In creating an active security regime it is expected that careful siting of structures will occur. The quasi 'Bay Watch' facilities recently introduced are not compliant with the report's statement about respecting key vistas. 3: The need to improve toilets and 'core infrastructure' is essential if Poole is to have any income from visitors, as distinct from long-suffering residents. S: Page 37 1: The mention of 'overnight accommodation' implies the need for health and safety precautions that comply with police advice and guidance. T: Page 38 1: It is re-assuring to note that the Poole Act is recognised, if not fully understood. 2: 'Sand dune' beach huts would adversely affect the existence of any sand dune(s). 3: The introduction of 'over priced' restaurants (with or without rooms) is not a welcome addition to the facilities of Poole since the existing providers of good food (with or without rooms) are currently operating with difficulty. In future it may be considered appropriate but certainly not at the expense of facilities elsewhere within the Borough - particularly if the natural environment of the seafront is not enhanced. 4: The re-use of the roof of the pavilion (with a glass second storey) is worthy of examination - perhaps, if appropriate, for its original purpose. U: Page 39 1: The suggestion of extra car parking areas may be appropriate if 'Park and Ride' facilities are not introduced. In this connection limited land reclamation (on the harbour side of the isthmus) might allow for stronger sand bar reinforcement in addition to providing more hard-standing areas for parking and marquees, etc. 2: Reduction in car parking spaces (and associated revenue) seems perverse. 3: References to 'beach studios' imply the creation of health and safety challenges that may be difficult to manage. V: Page 40 1: Reinstatement of sand dunes (without stones!!) may prove expensive now that the natural supply of sand has been stopped by the coastal promenades to the East. The concept is admirable. W: Page 41 1: Some of the pictures illustrate ways of using space that</p>	<p>marquees, sports pitches). Sky cafe might work. A pedestrian and gateway destination for Branksome is supported. Tree top trail must protect nature in the long term. Current natural attractiveness must not be lost.</p>

Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment ID	Question 1 - The draft SPD provides an approach to planning for the future of the seafront. Please let us know your views on this approach.	Key Points
			<p>imply loss of publicly accessible land: a matter that we do not support. 2: The introduction of a swimming pool on the seafront is surprising since such facilities are notorious for their loss-making abilities! Should the introduction of an additional swimming pool for the Borough be possible then perhaps a location in Upper Parkstone should be found for such a health-inducing investment. X: Page 45 1: References to 'overnight accommodation' could imply the creation of health and safety challenges that may be difficult to manage. 2: The introduction of water taxis would be welcomed, especially if they did not only leave from the Quay. 3: The references to 'eating places' is, it is assumed, to supplement sitting on the sand or existing seats. No doubt better temporary facilities could be provided for picnics and BBQs during the 'season' that could be removed to restore the off-season grandeur of the natural environment. 4: Whilst more toilets are considered to be appropriate, it is recognised that maintaining them without regular inspection is difficult. Y: Pages 46 & 47 1: References to 'overnight accommodation' and 'beach studios' could imply the creation of health and safety challenges that may be difficult to manage. 2: The introduction of a revenue-producing landmark building and private apartments might be feasible if suitably compliant with relevant restrictions and designed to complement other facilities within the Borough. Any repetition of the Dolphin Quay's legacy (of empty / poorly maintained premises) must not occur on our sea front. Z: Page 51 1: Some of the pictures illustrate ways of using space that imply loss of publicly accessible land: a matter that we do not support. AA: Page 57 1: The reference to a 'cheap' Park and Ride system is not supported: a better reference would be an 'economic' Park and Ride system - ie economic for all parties concerned and 'time on the beach' (rather than 'time in a traffic queue') being an important element to be evaluated! 2: The introduction of a Park and Ride system is supported for all of our beaches - not just the beach mentioned by this page. In this connection a seasonal service (when the school buses are not required for our children) seems feasible now. AB: Page 58 1: The introduction of a second level of beach huts and overnight beach studios would destroy the valued 'village ambience' and conflict with conservation status. Therefore it is not supported. 2: References to 'overnight accommodation' and 'studios on the beach and amongst the trees' could imply the creation of health and safety challenges that may be very difficult to manage. 3: The sale of a house site with suitably conditioned planning approval seems useful, if raising finance requires the 'sale of family silver' / assets! In this connection it is appreciated that the compilers of the draft report may have no access to knowledge about the 'loan generating' potential of the fees for annual beach hut tenancies. AC: Page 59 1: Reference to 'beach studios' could imply the creation of health and safety challenges that may be difficult to manage. 2: The introduction of timber decking over the sand implies public loss of 'sand space' since such space would be controlled by some organisation. The chine does not require 'marking'. 3: The reference to the 'creation of a coherent landscape' implies the loss of desirable variety - a matter that is not supported. AD: Page 61 1: Reference to 'beach studios' could imply the creation of health and safety challenges that may be difficult to manage. 2: The suggestion of sites for beach marquees and beach sports pitches implies public loss of 'sand space' since such space would be controlled by some organisation. The matter may be acceptable if the facilities were suitably managed as temporary facilities but marquees in front of beach huts does not suggest much thought about fostering the viewing of vistas. AE: Page 63 1: Some of the pictures illustrate ways of using space that imply loss of publicly accessible land: a matter that we do not support. AF: Page 65 1: The concept of a 'sky cafe' should be developed only if it does not conflict with the other facilities within the Borough seeking to cater for visitors to our seafront. In particular, it might have been an attractive idea if the sun set in the East! AG: Page 66 1: Reference to 'beach studios' could imply the creation of health and safety challenges that may be difficult to manage. 2: The concept of a 'sky cafe' should be developed only if it does not conflict with the other facilities within the Borough seeking to cater for visitors to our seafront: some of them fairly close to the proposed site indicated by a circled '3'. 3: The concept of Branksome Beach being the "primary gateway to the sand, sea and the views" is supported. As such it should be given priority for any phased implementation of the finalised seafront report. AH: Page 67 1: The concept of pedestrian domination at Branksome Chine is endorsed. 2: We would query the alleged popularity of the existing beach cafe. It may be busy but just a place where visitors go once and then do not return very often because of value-for-money comparisons with other facilities within the Borough. Consequently decisions to foster further such cafes are expected to be taken with due regard for the 'fair trading' reputation of our locality. 3: The reference to the appearance of the mooted sky cafe implies that good and careful design may not be</p>	

Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment ID	Question 1 - The draft SPD provides an approach to planning for the future of the seafront. Please let us know your views on this approach.	Key Points
			<p>used elsewhere. We would trust that such an implication is not intended. AI: Page 71 1: Some of the pictures illustrate ways of using space that imply loss of publicly accessible land: a matter that we do not support. AJ: Page 72 1: References to 'overnight beach studios' and 'small scale accommodation' in a re-made community building could imply the creation of health and safety challenges that may be difficult to manage. 2: The need for additional bed spaces at the seafront is not demonstrated, even if they were thought capable of being sited appropriately. It is understood that our existing hotels across the Borough are not fully utilised. AK: Page 73 1: Reference to 'cabins on the cliff tops' could imply the creation of health and safety challenges that may be difficult to manage - but not so difficult as those mooted for the beach or woodland locations. AL: Page 75 1: References to 'overnight accommodation' and 'beach studios' could imply the creation of health and safety challenges that may be difficult to manage. 2: The reference to the 'creation of a coherent landscape' implies the loss of desirable variety - a matter that is not supported. 3: It is trusted that the introduction of additional food and drink outlets will not preclude the provision of picnic and BBQ facilities. AM: Page 76 1: It is suggested that before any tree top walk way and nature experience is implemented that due regard will be given to ensure the long-term protection of the 'nature' to be experienced. AN: Page 77 1: Some of the pictures illustrate ways of using space that imply loss of publicly accessible land: a matter that we do not support. AO: Page 79 1: In seeking to 'deliver the full potential of Poole's sea front', it is considered that due regard must be given to the other facilities within the Borough whilst ensuring that the current attractiveness (of the natural environment) is not lost. 2: The important factors to consider should include ensuring that the neglect of adequate maintenance (as has occurred at our seafront) is not also occurring elsewhere within the estate owned by the Borough. 3: The comment about infrastructure investment to be delivered at the same rate as commercial development may not be realistic. It may have to be delivered more quickly, depending upon the ingenuity of BoP staff and more vigorous fund raising - either through better value-for-money scrutinies (to release money) or by seeking extra money. Obviously, it is not acceptable to lose visitors that support so much of our local economy. 4: Whilst the report seems to suggest that Sandbanks should be developed first, it could be sensible to develop the 'gateway' first (at Branksome) so as to try to reduce the pressures on Sandbanks and thereby ease the subsequent development of Sandbanks. AP: Page 80 1: It is noted that the report refers to consultations 'so far'. It is trusted that these comments will be reflected in any final version of the current draft document. 2: It is noted that integration with all the policies for planning Poole is necessary. We would hope that this can be achieved quickly and will try to assist in the matter. 3: We entirely endorse the concluding sentiment in the draft document: 'nothing should detract from the simple pleasures to be had in such a spectacular setting' - our seafront and the seafront for future generations.</p>	
Dr Roger Turner		136	A plan is needed, but needs to include diverse elements to avoid an overwhelming commercial development of the seafront.	Plan needed but avoid overwhelming commercial development.
Mr Thorwald Jensen		101	All that is done to improve and make Poole/Sandbanks a better place to live and attract visitors must be welcomed. Having lived, worked and now retired, a Licensee for over 35 years, I still love to see improvements and investments made. New beach bar/cafe's, restaurants, hotel and beach studios to stay, fantastic. But for me the icing on the cake would be a contemporary new indoor Swimming Pool combined with an outdoor Pool, so you can swim from inside to outside in the same pool and feel the atmosphere of summer and winter, when swimming, superb. (Germany has them) Seawater would be fantastic, there is enough of it. Perfect, what a revenue, swim, sauna, warm drink and healthy lunch after, in a nice new cafe' bar restaurant, and all that with that view out on to the fabulous Poole beaches and sea. Priceless.	Welcome improvements. Particularly favour an indoor pool with adjoining outdoor one. Revenue stream and priceless views.

Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment ID	Question 1 - The draft SPD provides an approach to planning for the future of the seafront. Please let us know your views on this approach.	Key Points
Miss Claire Harris		53	Although officially a Bournemouth resident I live a few feet from the Poole boundary at Branksome Dene Chine so your proposed plans for this area will affect me significantly and I find it quite upsetting to only hear of your plans through strong objectors canvassing on the beachfront, rather than through Poole Council's own efforts to advertise its intentions, particularly when the changes are so significant. Having now read the document, it is stated that your first aim is to conserve the beautiful natural environment - but the proposed plans will only serve to destroy this. Eg How would a GoApe style facility at Branksome Dene preserve this beautiful woodland area? I am all for enhancing, maintaining and repairing existing facilities as stated in aims 2 & 3, but this document is a proposal to over commercialise the seafront, add totally unnecessary facilities and in reality cause traffic chaos. If you add extra attractions to encourage more people it is only logic you need to increase car parking and there is simply no scope to do this.	Insufficient advertisement of Plan. It will destroy not conserve natural environment, e.g. Go Ape. Plan will over-commercialise and add unnecessary facilities incurring extra traffic.
Mr Alan Trickett		150	An overall integrated plan is badly needed for Poole's beaches, but this is not one for Poole . Tourists liked Poole to be the less commercially biased town out of Bournemouth and Poole and some have already voted with their feet by not visiting as often as they used to before the Town Quay was remodelled , surely still the most talked about bad decision ever made in the Borough's history. That decision will be dwarfed by the horrendous proposals made in this survey. Visitors to Poole choose Poole over B'mouth or Blackpool etc because it is relatively quiet and less commercialised . This plan will surpass B'mth and even Benidorm with commercialisation.	Horrendous proposals because of over-commercialisation.
Mr Colin Hession		47	Appalling	Appalling
Mr Mark Berridge		217	As a frequent visitor and long time lover of the Sandbanks Peninsula I would like to make some comments regarding the proposed new plans. The redevelopment of the large car park area is a first class idea and can only improve the amenities there for the benefit of visitors. Shore Road is a different story however and notably the proposed monster of a building to replace the toilet block. This is not only an eyesore, out of the building line and would be totally unacceptable - particularly for those like myself and family who often use the Sandbanks Hotel or rent a house behind it in, but also for all of those who like to enjoy that especially charming and modest part of Sandbanks. There are already good cafe's and restaurant facilities there and the traffic congestion would be exacerbated by any more commercial activity. A small ground floor RNLI bureau should be the only thing considered there to retain this much cherished corner of the beach. I hope you will take note of these comments which are widely felt in the area and amongst visitors and will secure you support for the largely wise and aesthetically sound other ideas you have - but please don't destroy the essential spirit and look of Shore Rd, Chaddesley Wood Rd and Sandbanks Hotel area with something which will be strongly objected to and much regretted if implemented.	Redevelopment of Sandbanks car park is a good idea to improve amenity. Unacceptable building proposal at Shore Road, too big and commercial.

Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment ID	Question 1 - The draft SPD provides an approach to planning for the future of the seafront. Please let us know your views on this approach.	Key Points
Miss Teresa Alvarez-Cascos		244	<p>As a frequent visitor to Sandbanks I am most concerned to read about the proposed regeneration to the beach front, specifically the Shore Road proposals, and would like to record my opposition to the plans in their current form. The option proposed shows a dramatic increase in scale and height from what there is currently. There is absolutely no need or demand for a three to five storey restaurant and visitor centre. People visit this area to enjoy the beach and hence the area is busy when sunny and not at other times. In terms of facilities, the area is already well served by the Jazz Cafe, the Sandbanks Beach Club and the new Tesco. Again these venues only thrive with good weather, and there appears to be a mistaken conclusion that Shore Road is, or could become, some kind of cool Ibiza type destination. It is not, and to over-develop this with a high rise building when it is such a lovely part of the beach is simply a big mistake. You only have to see what has been done (to their eternal regret) in Spain to realise that over-development on the coast in the way that is planned would be a huge mistake. Indeed, in Spain, beachfront development is now completely forbidden. Do you think they built on the beach at Bondi in Sydney, on the Amalfi coast in Italy, in the Maldiv Islands and others of an equivalent ilk? No, of course not, and they haven't done it either on the beaches in Cornwall or on those in Devon. They haven't because they want to preserve the beauty of what is a natural place and not over-develop it for short term gain (and long term regret). If we want Blackpool or Dubai in Sandbanks, then the proposal should go forward, but of course we don't, so it shouldn't. Additionally there have historically been issues with unruly behaviour at night with drinking, partying and vandalism and therefore beach huts with overnight accommodation are not right for this area. This proposal might seem attractive in the summer months but there will be no demand in winter. The area was originally designed for summer day beach huts and should remain that way. I agree that there is a need to modernise the current beach huts, the public loos, beach office and swimming club changing areas. This is a result of years of underinvestment and regeneration could be achieved with relatively minimal expenditure while maintaining the character of a very special place. This proposed development will also lead to extensive obstruction and negative impact on the views for the houses on the hill behind (not just those immediately behind but many houses beyond these), and of considerable concern also, apart from the considerable obstruction to views, will be the creating of a significant increase in the parking problem that already exists, and will cause problems for emergency access. This is just not appropriate for this quiet and beautiful area. I feel that the council will end up permanently damaging this area purely for commercial gain, and will spend a fortune of residents' money in doing so. It would be a completely misguided use of council funds. I do hope you take my view and others with similar views on board and rethink the proposals accordingly.</p>	<p>Too great an increase in scale and height at Shore Road, and no need. Overnight accommodation on the beach would not be appropriate here, and no demand in winter. Minimal expenditure on upgrading of toilets beach office, changing space and beach huts is required.</p>
Mr Ray Smith MBE	Honorary Carers' Champion	188	<p>As a long resident in this Borough I have always been aware of progress, but these proposals I believe, will be completely out of character within the surrounding area of our seafront. Originally, the Poole Plan has always confirmed to be of low profile along our beach area and it was a known fact that we never wished to compete with the high rise situation that exists in Bournemouth. People come to Poole for its beauty and unspoilt harbour and beach. I realise some facilities could be improved, but this Plan lacks imagination, thought to suit these areas natural and precious location. "Poole is a Beautiful Place", lets keep it that way.</p>	<p>Proposals are out of character. Poole should be low key.</p>

Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment ID	Question 1 - The draft SPD provides an approach to planning for the future of the seafront. Please let us know your views on this approach.	Key Points
Mrs Sally Lucas		257	As a regular user of the beaches, particularly Sandbanks and Branksome Dene Chine, I would object to the following issues as I feel these affect not just me and my family but many of my friends, neighbours and associates also. Key objections are: Losing any of the current car parking amenities with immediate access onto the beach is not acceptable. As water sports enthusiasts, we drive a van to transport all of our necessary gear down to and onto the beach. Branksome Dene has always been our preferred beach for this purpose and to lose car parking opportunities here will be a major problem. As above, it is not going to be relevant to our family to use public transport when we want to do watersports. Cars/vans are a necessary evil which need to be well catered for. I already feel we pay for the privilege of parking at the beaches as we invest in a beach parking permit every year. I hope this option continues for residents and that the price does not 'sky-rocket' due to the developments. The price has already risen in two years from £65 to £78 which is a massive hike. We are regular visitors at friends beach huts (numbers 199 and 82) and we are all concerned that development will intrude on everyone's year round enjoyment of 'beach hut life' or indeed, take it away completely. Your plans are unclear about which huts might be destroyed in favour of other plans. As a parent, I recognise the need for well maintained children's play areas. The Sandbanks offering has always been a favourite with my children and we do not want to lose that or the brilliant crazy golf that currently exists. Its well used and well loved. Your plans are not clear on the provision of creating other child friendly spaces. The Hotel ideas for Sandbanks and Bransome Dene Chine concern me for many reasons, including: a community space will be lost; hotels require parking which takes opportunity away from other beach users; they are imposing on the available space; and beach huts may be destroyed. I believe you should be prioritising the needs of Poole's residents first and foremost - collectively, we are the tax payers; the beach hut 'owners' and the year round users of the beaches for multiple purposes...this is our home. Tourism, should be secondary.	Object to loss of parking near the beach (especially at B Dene Chine) as public transport not always suitable. Keep crazy golf facility. Tourism should be secondary with focus on residents needs. Hotels are a concern because they will incur loss of parking and community space.
Mr Liam Davey		211	As a regular visitor to Sandbanks I am incredibly disappointed and horrified that you would be even considering developing the seafront area, in particular at the end of Shore Road. Not only would it be a complete blight on the landscape but also create chaos with car parking in an already congested area.	Shore Road proposal a blight on the landscape and chaos with parking.
J Wonnacott		193	As a resident of Poole and a beach hut owner, I am concerned by the proposed alterations to the seafront and surrounding areas. At Branksome Dene Chine, a forty bed hotel would not be used by local people and surely that would mean loss of car park to the public. The community room, with its superb views and easy access, is greatly used and appreciated by many worth-while clubs of disabled and elderly folk. The approach road down through the Chine has a natural charm and appeal. Some of the suggestions proffered may be beneficial. An eating place and perhaps lockers for families enjoying a day on the beach and perhaps some 'cycle security', and of course improvements to the toilets. As for retail outlets along the promenade, a big no. We do not need to resemble Spain.	Loss of car park, community room and charm of access road at B Dene a concern. Lockers, cycle security, eatery and improved toilets favoured, but not retail outlets.
Miss Emily Bradbury		184	As a resident of Poole and regular user of the beach I object to the proposed changes to beach huts and amenities at end of the promenade at Sandbanks between The Sandbanks Hotel and Jazz's Cafe. The Amenities block will be an eyesore and change the nature of the area into a busy, noisy place. The amenities are adequate as they are in terms of size. The beach huts at single storey are adequate as they exist currently. I strongly object to your proposals.	Object to proposals, particularly Shore Road. Beach huts should be single storey.

Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment ID	Question 1 - The draft SPD provides an approach to planning for the future of the seafront. Please let us know your views on this approach.	Key Points
Miss Jacquelyn Foley		276	<p>As a resident permanently living right at the entrance of Shore Road beach, I wish to make strong objection to some of the proposals contained in the detailed plans intended for the Shore Road beach, promenade and surrounding area. I am very familiar with the flow of visitors to the beach and to Jazz Cafe since my house is directly opposite and feel that the profile of visitors in the report is inaccurate in its description. There is a tremendous mix of visitors, the most prevalent being young families, frequently extended families with grand parents and young children and couples of all ages. This includes the clientele of Jazzies where on holidays and sunny days parents and children enjoy breakfast, lunch or snacks there and particularly at the weekends with Sunday mornings and the Jazz afternoons being a favourite for all ages. However to say that this is a normal occurrence is over-stating the case since in non-holiday time both Jazzies and the Sandbanks hotel are relatively quiet. The over-riding problem facing this part of the beach at busy times is the constant flow of cars down Shore Road to the beach entrance. Three out of four of them expect to be able to park there and instead are faced with dropping off passengers and then turning round to go and search for parking spaces elsewhere. The small car park in Shore Road is always full on busy days and this creates tremendous congestion and queues for visitors and local residents. To suggest that the car park in Shore Road be removed to make way for an apartment block would aggravate this problem even more. There is a requirement for more parking rather than less on that site and if it could be enlarged it would go some way to relieving the problem. At the same time it could generate extra funds for the council to improve the general amenities, ie. toilets and washrooms which are in dire need of updating and enlarging. Turning to the appearance and style of any additional amenities here many visitors return as adults with their children because they have fond memories of the beach and ambiance when they themselves were children. They appreciate the natural appearance of the beach, the beautiful sand and the safe waters in which their children can play. I have talked to many visitors and these are the pleasures they look forward to. The addition of enormous glass structures housing additional cafes would ruin the very atmosphere that visitors are looking for on this stretch of beach and outside holiday and sunny weekends it would be difficult to imagine what business they would generate since the existing ones have a difficult time outside these periods as it is. Finally on the subject of beach huts, given the number which are actually used in and out of season, which appears to be a small proportion, my personal view is that if they could be enhanced in appearance so that they are more attractive - such as those at Hensbury Head for example - they would be a more welcome attraction and better utilised. As it is, many of them sit closed for most of the year and to add further double storey huts when those we have are under used seems to be a waste of resources which requires further thought and perhaps a new system of allocation rather than adding to those already there.</p>	<p>Mix of visitors at Shore Road. Car park is full and turning vehicles is dangerous already, apartments here would make it worse. Charges from more parking could generate funds for improvements to general amenities. New building at Shore Road would detract from natural setting. Beach huts could be smarted up, question addition of more when so many are empty.</p>
Miss Alice Murgatroyd		113	<p>As noted in the document itself, the very first aim of the entire project is to 'conserve the beautiful natural environment.' However, a number of the new buildings planned will drastically and irresponsibly destroy the already scarce natural environment. Particularly, the plans for extra beach huts near Shore Road (p.48) will clearly devastate the precious little natural vegetation that remains in the area an invaluable habitat for protected animals such as sloe worms and lizards. The plans for Branksome Dene Beach (p. vi) will also obliterate a precious area of nature. I disagree with the statement that there is space for thirteen new beach huts/chalets as well as scope for additional food and drink outlets, preferring to keep this area uncluttered an oasis of nature in an already built up area of the country. Similarly, a key aspect of the areas appeal, as noted on p.8, are the wide golden sands stretching to Sandbanks. I completely agree that this truly is a breathtaking feature of the beach area. And yet the plan for a distinctive building (p.5) of up to 5 storeys high, stretching out over the very golden sand itself, will without question blight this iconic view. I am astonished that after the disaster of the iconic Imax in Bournemouth, the council is contemplating such an eye-sore on their own beach. The sands, and the sweeping view around from Sandbanks to Branksome Beach, to Bournemouth, Boscombe and beyond, are a major draw for tourists from across the country and, indeed, across the world. This building, of any size, would be a blemish upon the beachfront. It would be eye-catching in the most devastatingly detrimental fashion and block this stunning view that brings holidaymakers back year upon year. [1] Pdf, Borough of Poole: Sustaining Pooles Seafront: Supplementary Planning Document Consultation Draft, Summer 2013 , Available from <http://www.poole.gov.uk/planning-and-buildings/planning/ldp/supplementary-planning-documents/sustaining-pooles-seafront-draft-spd/> [Accessed 30/8/13] (p.ii) (all further pages noted are in reference to this document)</p>	<p>New buildings will destroy scarce natural environment. Extra beach huts at Shore Road would reduce precious remaining vegetation here and Branksome Dene plans would obliterate nature. Vast high and eyesore building at Shore Road would blight iconic view of beach and sea.</p>

Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment ID	Question 1 - The draft SPD provides an approach to planning for the future of the seafront. Please let us know your views on this approach.	Key Points
Mrs Anna Robinson		18	As you rightly say Poole seafront is a magnificent place, I would therefore suggest that more time & effort should be focussed on the infrastructure which would hopefully eliminate some of the huge parking problems Bournemouth/Poole experience every summer.	Infrastructure to eliminate huge parking problems required.
Mr Malcolm Harrison		60	Branksome Dene Chine is a calm and natural oasis between the manicness of Bournemouth and the brashness of Sandbanks - how can a hotel/concert bowl/Go Ape combo be seen as anything but the destruction of what is a unique seafront nature reserve. I assume that these plans have been kept deliberately low profile as negative feedback was anticipated - and seems to be overwhelmingly so.	Plans for Branksome Dene would destruct unique seafront nature reserve here.
Mr Nick Kendall		2	Broadly speaking I acknowledge that the council has to do something to make good the situation. Some of the plan looks exciting, dynamic and progressive. Sadly, however, if you look at why these proposals are being made at all, you can only conclude that it is as a consequence of your lack of responsible management, investment, and foresight. If I were asked who should sort out this mess, the last people I'd suggest would be those responsible for it. It is a huge shame that you allowed such extraordinary under investment to continue for so long, but if you do everything threatened in your plan you will over develop, and ruin Sandbanks for ever. I quite understand the financial benefits of what is proposed, but I think scale of the proposals is a major issue. For example - why increase the number of beach huts? - why not keep to the existing number but charge more for them once they are refurbished.	Plans are progressive but are necessary because of lack of previous foresight and management. Scale of development too much, beach huts could be refurbished, then higher charges instead of more huts.
Mrs Claire Dixon	Visitor Services and Enterprises Manager National Trust Brownsea Island	17	Brownsea Island is very interested in this planning and would be very keen to be involved in any steering or liaison groups that are required as part of this process, with particular regard to the Sandbanks beach area. We also note the new plans for a water bus service seem to suggest the use of the National Trust jetty at Sandbanks, which we are very interested in and would therefore look forward to being involved in any discussions or plans as soon as possible.	Brownsea Island and NT interested in being involved, and particularly in the water bus idea.
Darley		75	Canford Cliffs area. I think that the plans for Canford Cliffs beach area would be over commercialising it and turn a beauty spot into just another commercial beach which I believe would not gain anything for anybody. It would ruin a very beautiful beach area.	Canford Cliffs would be over-commercialised, ruining a beauty spot.
Mr & Mrs R & H West		265	Canford Cliffs Beach (the "Village Beach") Second floor additions to beach huts should be severely restricted to ensure a coherent landscape and take full account of the Local Plan. The Art Deco building should be conserved as a single storey building to preserve the existing coherent landscape. A cafe would be more in keeping with the "Village Beach" ambience and should be alcohol free. There should be no extensions whether timber or otherwise over the beach sand, or its promenade, to ensure it remains a coherent landscape. Overnight beach hut studios are not appropriate for this "quiet family focussed" beach. BoP will need to have the expertise and the money to administer and regulate them efficiently; other beach hut tenants will not wish to fund that unnecessary expense nor sample the real risk of dossers etc.	2nd floor additions to beach huts should be restricted. Café should be alcohol free. Overnight studios are inappropriate and extension over the sand is not favoured.
Mrs June Westcott		202	Cliff Drive is exactly what it says it is a road on the cliff top. We all know that throughout the British Isles we have cliff erosion, do we want to put our cliff into extra danger by increasing the parking ie inserting diagonal lines thus increasing the weight with additional vehicles. I am minded of the slippage of some 20 years ago when a dramatic slippage occurred on Cliff Drive having to be repaired at great cost. Do we want to risk a repeat of this near disaster? Any additional weight on the cliff is tantamount to madness. For the same reasons as above any development on land adjacent to 24 Cliff Drive is irresponsible. The removal of the grass verge and the destruction of an undefined number of beautiful trees, most of which have deep and enormous roots, thus stabilising the cliff top, is beyond belief. Cliff Drive is a beautiful part of Poole and is an area of outstanding natural beauty the very reason why visitors come here in the first place an amenity used 24/7. This type of area is becoming a rare commodity and should be preserved at all cost. If the cliff were to be examined it would be found that there are very vulnerable and unstable pockets contained therein and any alteration is tempting fate. Again putting any extra load on the cliff top should be avoided. I would like to make comments on the rest of the overall plan but having known about this for only 36 hours I cannot make comments without looking into it further.	Threat to cliff stability at Cliff Drive from additional parking.

Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment ID	Question 1 - The draft SPD provides an approach to planning for the future of the seafront. Please let us know your views on this approach.	Key Points
Miss Juanita Byrne-Quinn		203	<p>COMMENTS SPECIFIC TO SHORE ROAD. The suggested cafe/restaurant/bar, beach facilities and visitor centre, is an admiral goal. However toilet facilities need to be immediately brought up to at least motorway standards. They have not been radically altered since their construction at the end of the 1950s/60s. Waiting for investment in the whole centre is not an option, and may have repercussions on the Blue Flag status. Public investment will be delayed as long as the problem of traffic to the beach remains unsolved. A cafe/restaurant/bar would need to generate sufficient income to repay the capital costs of building and maintaining the centre. From mid Sept. darkness falls from 8.00pm earlier and earlier day by day to mid winter at around 4.00pm. It takes till mid March to reach light at 8.00pm. With inclement weather dominating that period few people will choose to struggle on foot from neighbourhood streets for an evening out, no matter how glamorous the location. A reduction in the already meagre car parking provision is not acceptable. Rather should there be plans to extend the current car park by adding levels above and below. Many neighbouring buildings have already provided themselves with basement parking. (For some further suggestions, please see note 7 under General Comments. GENERAL COMMENTS. Beaches are attractive simply because of their natural beauty. Poole beaches are rare examples of these, with just enough development to encourage al fresco activity without detracting from its beauty. Intrusion on this natural environment needs to be made with great sympathetic care. Currently Poole beaches are lined with a traditional promenade and traditional style beach huts. The more 1960s blocks demonstrate the difficulty of incorporating modern standards in keeping with the traditional style. Much needed additional huts, particularly to complete the promenade area, between Canford Cliffs and Branksome Chine should reflect the traditional style. The introduction of modern pods would be out of keeping along the beach line. Overnight accommodation is a matter for the long term future on cost and safety considerations, and needs to be within the chine areas so as not to intrude on this special sweep of gently sloping sandy beaches. People of all ages and backgrounds naturally use the beach for walking, running, swimming, lazing, gazing, and playing. Once arrived, this is free. Additional sports appropriate to the beach and water environment should be encouraged and accommodated with due consideration for core beach users. The sea now-a-days attracts a wide range of sports e.g. snorkelling, diving, boating, sailing, boarding, surfing, kiting, skiing. These have not so far been well incorporated into the area - yet they have strong ties with the beaches, and need to be encouraged. Current designated areas and facilities are only just beginning to make an impact. Launching sites for sail and powered boats have been non-existent along the bay since the 1970s. Users are forced to launch in the harbour and make the fuel costly trip through the busy ferry entrance to the bay. Good accessible launch sites, with appropriate parking, adjacent to the beaches should be considered, maybe at Sandbanks and Branksome Dene? Sea areas for these sports should be well designated and facilities for storing equipment, changing and showering provided. Their provision at the moment is low-key and appears grudging. Yet encouraging responsible sporting groups and clubs adds to the safety and indeed rescue services of Poole. Watching activity at sea is also popular among those just gazing! All users of the beach and sea need good standard toilet facilities and many need good clean changing and showering facilities All buildings should be built to blend in with the naturally developing environment. Poole beaches are "laid back" and that is their attractiveness. Leave stylish, controversial design to areas that have little else to recommend them. Keep public facilities in keeping with the core beach and sea users. More small cafes, such as that along the Shore Rd. to Flaghead promenade, should be introduced, serving basic hot and cold drinks and simple hot and cold snacks, ice creams and sweets etc at family affordable prices. The restaurants at Branksome Chine and Shore Rd. already accommodate those prepared to pay to eat out and just chat and gaze. Accessibility to the beaches, especially at peak times needs addressing, and first time visitors are frequently dismayed by the distance they need to travel from Poole centre to reach them. Some ideas that could be considered are: i. a well-developed sand and rock landscaped car park, similar to the one at Sandbanks, could be feasible within the curve of the harbour at the Shore Rd. area. Due regard to the traditional pursuits of cockling bait digging, skim-boarding, paddling and bird watching should be taken, as well as encouraging the already established water sports of canoeing, wind surfing, powerkiting etc.. ii. Shuttle-buses, designed to take people loaded with beach paraphernalia, could operate between the beach and inland car parks. Suggested bike hire stations, similar to the London scheme, hardly caters for all the sporting and beach equipment that people find necessary. iii. A cliff lift, similar to the Bournemouth one</p>	<p>Shore Road - toilets need immediate attention, cannot wait for further investment. Loss of parking a mistake, upper and lower tiers provided instead? Additional huts needed but not overnight pods. Additional beach sports and launch areas are encouraged. Storing, changing and showering facilities are required. New buildings should blend in, no controversial designs. More small cafes needed. Need to improve accessibility, suggest: new car park near Shore Road, encourage traditional and new beach activities, shuttle buses, bike hire stations, cliff lift.</p>

Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment ID	Question 1 - The draft SPD provides an approach to planning for the future of the seafront. Please let us know your views on this approach.	Key Points
			would be really useful at Canford Cliffs, especially if additional beach huts are erected along the now completed stretch of promenade between there and Branksome Chine. iv. Designated sports pitches on the beaches should be reserved for off-peak times, such as early morning and evenings, to ensure general beach safety and particularly that of small children playing. They also need to be relatively close to car parks as sports usually involve a fair amount of equipment.	
Rev David Butcher	Chairman Poole Harbour Watch	102	Consultation is needed and while I read the Echo every day to keep in touch with local events, this seems to have slipped through my net (so to speak). The period of consultation is short and lacking in publicity when compared to the excellent consultation, over about 18 months by the Harbour Commissioners, for the proposed Marine extention.	Poor consultation.
Mr Lester Smith		79	Didn't know you had any plans for the seafront. Why didnt you set up areas on the promenade for public who use the seafront? All consultations are only effective if lots of people are aware. Good idea though to smarten up the seafront.	Plan a good idea but poor knowledge of consultation.
Mr John Brameld		39	Do not agree with approach as it does not seem to address traffic congestion,in fact it makes it worse	Poor approach as doesn't address traffic congestion.
McNally		165	Document is large and difficult to download. Also, I feel that a consultation by council officers/beach staff at Sandbanks in the middle of the summer was disingenuous and discourteous to those of us who use other beaches - could a display not also have been held in the Community beach hut @ Branksome Dene for beach users in the east of the borough?	Consultation didn't consider other beach others (other than Sandbanks) and document difficult to download.
Mr Ronald Stracey		152	Extremely long document. I have seen people give up when faced with so many pages. A local resident has distilled the main areas into the relevant pages of particular concern.	Document too long.
Mrs Patti Hegarty		105	First I am actually horrified that residents have not been informed of this plan. I was not aware of this plan and neither were my neighbours. Why weren't all Poole residents written to in order to allow them to contemplate and comment? This isn't public consultation if the public don't know about it. I think it is too ambitious and there is too much over development for this area. It appears you want to turn it into another Bournemouth.	Poor consultation. Plan overdevelopment and too ambitious.
Unknown		294	Firstly I would like to know why the plan was put out to consultants when the Council is strapped for cash and we have a planning department which should have been able with local knowledge to devise a plan in house as it were. Mainly my objections are relatively simple. The Sandbanks peninsular has only one way in and one way out and the only route to the ferry, if the Council's plan is to increase the visitor footfall then as far as I can see there is no provision for extra parking that this would entail. As for creating a more pleasant "experience" for visitors I would suggest that more people means more litter, destruction of the habitat and pleasant gardens that are already there and destruction of the dune beach landscape that the Council are trying to conserve. All ready the proliferation of van type commercial enterprises along Shore Road are cluttering the walkway for pedestrians and as surfing is now all year round the shoreline marginal landscape is being eroded as it has no chance to re-grow. As for the suggested hotel and more bar and catering facilities I foresee this will create more urban sprawl along what is the beach's best attraction, that is it relatively undeveloped save for the architecturally mediocre ribbon development along the harbour side. Unfortunately when a Council gets involved with projects like these they end up costing more than the budget estimates and visually un-attractive municipal architecture, as visualised for the plans for the beach area now known as Jazzys cafe. I can see some sympathetic improvement needed for Branksome Dene chine and an upgrade of the catering and toilet facilities between the Borough boundary and Sandbanks but overall more development means more people more litter more lighting (unnecessary in my view) more cars and this will spoil the area for the reasons people come in the first place a bit of relative peace and quiet. I could go into each part of the plan but I think you get the main point of my objections.	Increasing visitor footfall but no provision for extra parking. Additional people will erode character not enhance it. Hotels and cafes will be urban sprawl. Some improvement needed at Branksome Dene and Sandbanks. More lighting is unnecessary.

Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment ID	Question 1 - The draft SPD provides an approach to planning for the future of the seafront. Please let us know your views on this approach.	Key Points
Mr & Mrs Philip & Karen George		208	<p>Firstly may we say that my wife and I applaud the councils aim to improve the facilities and look of Sandbanks. However we do not support the specific plans for Shore Road. As we understand it you are planning to allow a 3 or 5 storey building to be erected next to Jazz Cafe. This will severely impact on the views that people in Shore Road and Chaddesley Glen currently enjoy (and purchased) and is not in keeping with the rest of the location. It will be an eyesore in what is now a fairly consistent set of buildings. We agree the toilet block should be rebuilt and other facilities added but there is no need for additional restaurants in this location. Furthermore the current height of buildings in that vicinity should be restricted to 2 floors, to remain consistent with the rest of the area. The second grave concern we have is the plan to build residential beach huts on the cliff around the area. This will do nothing to enhance the attraction of the area but will inevitably encourage undesirable people renting or using these beach huts for drinking, drugs, partying and other antisocial activity. Already today there has been some bad disturbances in the area from the beach, police have often been called and residents have had gardens and their houses trespassed. This will get significantly worse if people are allowed to stay overnight in beach huts in the area and will definitely detract from the family environment you are so keen to encourage. Indeed crime will increase, police will be more involved and the whole attraction of Sandbanks will be destroyed for ever. Thirdly there is insufficient parking now to accommodate those that want to visit the area. Shore Road car parking is very limited and on sunny days the whole of Sandbanks grinds to a halt as the traffic is excessive and parking limited. Finally there is some lovely wildlife in the cliffs and any plans to build more beach huts in the cliffs will affect this permanently. We are sure you will take account of all comments and recommendations but overall Sandbanks is a unique, safe and wonderful area for nice families to enjoy peaceful holidays at the most beautiful seafront in the UK. Any plans to commercialise the area will destroy this forever and the area could go the way of so many well blighted sea fronts due to a desire to change what works!</p>	<p>Improving Sandbanks is good but plans for Shore Road would create an eyesore and block views. Additional overnight beach huts would encourage crime and detract from family environment. Insufficient parking now, this will get worse. Commercialisation will destroy areas character.</p>

Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment ID	Question 1 - The draft SPD provides an approach to planning for the future of the seafront. Please let us know your views on this approach.	Key Points
Mr Ian Woodland		240	<p>Firstly we thought that we were well aware of developments in or around the beach being regular uses (>30 times/year) however this planning proposal has only just been made aware to us. We talk to many others at Branksome Dene Chine and NONE of these people were aware of these proposals. I would love to know who did your consultation and where and with whom the public consultation was completed. Onto the main topics of the proposals. We routinely use Branksome Dene because of the very reason you have stated i.e. "a hidden green gem". We don't go to Sandbanks very often because it is busy, impersonal and sometimes 'dirty'. In contrast the Dene is small, local, friendly, clean and a hidden gem. Most of your proposals for the Dene will change this. Better toilets would make a difference however the current ones are OK. Only been caught out once I think. Main topics worth comment are: Access Access to the Dene is fine if you can drive. The majority of families have beach equipment/accessories to deliver requiring some vehicular access. One can cycle down if you only need a towel, but for most families this is not an option for an entire day at the beach. "Access to the beach for water sports is apparently awkward". We have kayaks, surfboards and the rest and do not find it so. ??? Beach huts A very large percentage of beach huts do not appear to be used. Even on busy days > 75% of huts are closed. Why is this? Rent too low? Lease too long? Better use and increased revenue could be gained if this was addressed. We know of many that are sub-leased, leased between families, or passed on from generation to generation. Better turnover would ensure that those who are going to use them, use them! Car parking charges Said to be costly but if you buy a season ticket it is very reasonable. We do but you could increase hourly rates and annual pass charges and gain from increased revenue here. Also on very busy days parking wardens should make an absolute killing as there are cars parked illegally everywhere - even blocking junctions - where are the police and wardens when you need them? Road layout - Sandbanks The proposals for an integration of dunes into the car park area sounds good but I can see litter and tidiness being a real problem. Sounds great on the CAD schematic but in reality would take some effort to maintain. As for the road layout, Sandbanks is a mess now with horrendous jams and waiting times. Further parking on the road is going to choke the peninsula on all but the quietest of days. Not really an issue for us as mentioned previously. Dog owners Feel sorry for them with regard to beach but dog fouling is a real blight and I wish that the council would do something to back up the signage and threats of fines. Most dog owners who use the beach appear to be responsible owners who clear up after their animals. Lights One of the attractions of the Dene is its closeness to nature compared to other areas. Lighting the entire beach path would detract from this and appears negative. If you could put motion sensors on the lights so that they are only on when required that might be a good compromise? Selling off of land The selling off of assets along the beach front is especially detrimental. Once control of the locality is lost then 'change of use' can and will take place once the 'hotel' owners realise that the two current hotels only remain partially full even during busy periods. It is not expensive hotels that are required locally but cheaper B&B type accommodation that normal people can use. `24hr' beach huts might fit the bill but with them must come restaurants and other facilities - great in the summer but what about the winter when, if not careful, they will be vandalised and might be taken over by travellers/down and outs! Toilets Could be improved however keeping them open during the winter at weekends would be an improvement. The toilets are basic but OK - what is needed on a beach front? The showers are also OK. Cleanliness The beach at the Dene is nearly always clean - even at the end of a busy day. A great contrast to that of Sandbanks, Bournemouth, and even Branksome. Why?...because locals use this beach. Its 'our' beach and we look after it! Bike Hire Would be great, but for 2 months of the year access along the beach front is very limited!! so not such a great idea hey! A large proportion of people would still need to drive to the beach so vehicular access and parking still an issue for them. Some of us cycle to beach so access is the only problem during the summer. Children's play areas There are many children's play areas along the beach front. What is wrong with balls, frisbees, sandcastles, skipping stones, swimming, snorkelling, surfing, boating and all the other things that you go to the beach for? Surely play areas are for localities that do not have these natural attractions? (these areas are nearly always associated with pubs where the parents can sit and drink without worrying that little Brook or Jay is going to drown in the sea). We look forward to the revised proposals.</p>	<p>Proposals for B Dene Chine could change it from a 'hidden green gem'. Needs better toilets and improved access is fine for the car but awkward otherwise. Better use of the existing beach huts should be explored. Increase in parking charges could increase revenue. Litter and tidiness issues would result with the integration of dunes into the car park, and access to Sandbanks is already horrendously congested. Dog fouling needs to be addressed without banning dogs. Motion sensor lights would be better than permanent lights that destroy natural feel, especially at Branksome Dene. The council should not sell off its assets. Cheaper (B and B) accommodation required, not hotels, and overnight beach huts need to be supported by restaurants and cafes but only seasonal use. Bike Hire is a good idea but limited access to prom in the summer! The beach is a playground, less need for play areas.</p>

Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment ID	Question 1 - The draft SPD provides an approach to planning for the future of the seafront. Please let us know your views on this approach.	Key Points
Miss Portia Cousins		239	<p>From my address I am mostly concerned about the Shore Road area but, as a resident of Poole, I am also concerned about issues covering the entire seafront area. There is a strong undercurrent in your Draft that infers that "improvements" to the seafront must be revenue producing as the Council is unable to fund such works themselves. There is a hint that infrastructure works such as flood defences, erosion prevention, drainage repairs and water supply would be included amongst improvements which must be the full responsibility of the local council or its agents. Revenue would seem to be expected from property development and much of what you intend will only damage our unique environment. All these "improvements" will have an injurious effect on our wildlife and vegetation. No doubt environmental experts will be consulted but as a resident and admirer of the area I am shocked that all the recent works undertaken to try and retain the sand will now be ignored. There are many creatures who make this area their home, none of which afford any mention in the document. Of paramount importance is the sand lizard whose habitat will be affected. Car parking and public transport problems are not considered properly. Parking provision seems to be being curtailed (from 97 spaces to only 56 - page 47) and what will your Variable Message Signs (page 24) say when there are no spaces available? No mention is made of Park & Ride which ought to be considered. Parking in Shore Road is already a huge problem with many visitors not recognising the location of the small car park and continuing to the end of the road when they realise that the only available spaces are reserved for disabled access only. They then either ignore this and park anyway, park over driveways in Chaddesley Wood Road or simply use Chaddesley Wood Road as a turning point creating congestion, confusion and numerous close call incidents with the many pedestrians and cyclists using the area to access the beach. Encouraging more visitors to this area is simply not a good idea. Looking at the difficulty of access to the Prom that your proposals offer, it is clear that vehicles essential to maintaining the Blue Flag status of the beach as well as emergency vehicles will suffer which is negligence. It will also create problems for Beach Hut occupiers. Encouraging more businesses, providing the same goods and services, will only detrimentally affect the current suppliers in the area and should not be allowed. Independent and larger tradesmen are working in difficult economic times and should be supported by the Council rather than deserted in place of unsecured revenue. These proposals will also increase parking and vehicle pressures as outlined above. Surely any such venture would be better placed at Sandbanks beach, where there is more scope for car parking, room for new buildings and less intrusion for existing occupiers. I am sure all residents in the Shore Road area would be appalled to be told they were living in an area with the strap line "The Social Beach". This conjures up images of bacchanalian nights with multitudes of revellers, having absolutely no thought for the residents or guests of The Sandbanks Hotel. Shore Beach is not "urban" (page 50) and none of the residents or visitors to the area that I have canvassed over the summer would ever describe it as so. Your document suggests a ghastly excrescence planned for the western end of the Promenade (page 50) which seems to protrude onto the sand. A three storey building here is unacceptable and will not be in keeping with any of the surrounding buildings. The suggestion of a four or five storey building (page 47) is laughable. The current two storey beach huts towards Flaghead Beach were developed where it was suitable to have buildings of this height. It is not acceptable to build two storey buildings in front of current properties at Shore Road. There is no reason why these could not be located further up towards Canford Cliffs and Branksome, or towards Sandbanks, thereby spreading the usage of the beach and other facilities more evenly along the promenade. Page 47 talks about existing properties retaining more than one oblique view to the sea which has worrying connotations; I presume you will be safeguarding the panoramic views enjoyed by all the residents. Providing a bicycle hire facility is nonsensical when bicycles cannot use the Prom during the summer! The Sandbanks Hotel provide cycle hire from their frontage to the harbour so again this would be taking away custom from a local business. In conclusion, the general intensification of use for the Shore Road area is not appropriate and will severely affect what is known as a family friendly and peaceful area of our shoreline.</p>	<p>Improvements would have an injurious effect upon wildlife and vegetation. Parking and traffic problems have not been addressed fully, more visitors and businesses will make this worse. The urban 'Social Beach' is not an appropriate tag for Shore Road. Cycle hire is nonsense, already provided by Sandbanks Hotel. New building illustrated for Shore Road is too tall, and eyesore and in an inappropriate location. Loss of character from family friendly and quiet beach that it is currently.</p>
Mr Geoffrey Fairman		52	Generally agree with ideas.	Agree with ideas
Mrs Diane Vincent		173	Good that there is forward planning.	Forward planning is good

Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment ID	Question 1 - The draft SPD provides an approach to planning for the future of the seafront. Please let us know your views on this approach.	Key Points
Mr Jason Falconer	Schools Officer for Bournemouth & Poole FERIA Sport	15	Have contributed to the beachfront consultation exercise and just read the draft plans. Brilliant stuff, there are some really interesting ideas on there that look like they can bring Poole up to date. For the record, many of the improvements seem to me to be entirely appropriate, gauging the volume of visitors correctly and suggesting changes in respect of this. Go ahead with ones that meet approval please. Obviously all views will be taken into account, may I say that Canford Cliffs is my local beach, the ideas for there are great - it would be my suggestion to bring those in, whilst at the same time keeping the fantastic 1930s main building as an absolute piece of delightful period architecture - Poole Borough does treasure these (poole park etc etc) - so whilst improving, adding cafe etc, they reflect a unique British style that shouldn't be lost.	Interesting ideas to bring Poole up to date. Bring forward ones that need approval now. Canford Cliffs blue building should be kept as a piece of valued 1930s British architecture.
Miss Margaret Allard-Grove		192	Having just learned of the seafront proposals to change the local structure, I do feel concerned regarding the loss of some of the present amenities if such a proposal goes through. The large Beach Hut does a wonderful service for the disabled and the thought of a forty bed hotel being erected, how long before they will want to have some of the beach for private use only!!! I use Branksome Dene Chine on a regular basis and love the natural resources it offers. We are England and we don't want to be turned into a mini Spain etc.	Resist loss of Community Room to a hotel and keep character here English.
Miss Sue Ward		213	Having looked through the proposal for improvements to Poole's seafront we would be very happy for all the ideas to go ahead as we desperately need to make the seafront as welcome and friendly as Bournemouth and at the moment they are way ahead of us. The most important thing in our view would be to put lighting along the promenade to enable us to use the huts into the evening, something which Bournemouth hut owners have been able to do for a long time now. Friday fireworks nights along the prom in Bournemouth is a delight with so many families and friends enjoying supper in their huts. The Purbeck stone break-waters are fabulous - now let's make the rest of the area just as great!	Support all ideas that are to improve Poole seafront to bring it up to par with Bournemouth. Lighting on the prom is welcomed.
Mrs R Barnett		284	Having only just been advised of your Beach Plans for Poole, Branksome Chine and Sandbanks. I am horrified as to what you are planning to do to an area of charm and some natural beauty which has already been partially spoilt by buildings, beach huts and additional buildings. I totally object to the plan of removing 100 car parking facilities in Sandbanks in order to build a restaurant and bar on the site and more beach huts. The only people that will benefit from this is the developer and the council. The idea of parking more cars at a slant on the Shore Road will make the road narrower, mobile homes and large cars will certainly make it difficult in the summer months for traffic and there will be grid lock. Making it more cycle friendly will only make it more dangerous for people on the promenade and it will only lead to serious accidents.	Objection to loss of charm and beauty, loss of parking at Sandbanks for new facilities, angled parking, and increasing cycle friendliness.
Mr & Mrs Les & Liz Long		250	Having read the proposed changes to Poole's Seafronts we would like to make the following comments: We agree with the proposal to: improve toilet facilities complete lighting along the whole promenade We realise that much of what is planned is revenue gathering, but Poole beaches are an asset of natural beauty and they should not be spoilt by making them a Blackpool / Southend' scenario. Therefore we strongly dismiss the ideas of: zip slides tree walks Our concerns are: there appears to be less parking (not more as is suggested) with the plans to build hotels at Sandbanks and Branksome Dene Chine. insufficient parking already at weekends, Bank Holidays and 'special events'. location of a 'Park and Ride' but where?, and if the site is available, the loss of parking due to bus terminal. Health & Safety issues with the insertion of water sport activities on family blue flag' beaches, such as Branksome Chine. prohibition of dogs on the beaches during May to September inclusive prohibition of bicycles on the promenade during May to September inclusive. alcohol problems if bars are located on the beach.	Support improved toilets and prom lighting. Object to zip wire/tree walks, hotels, loss of parking, H & S issues with water sports and conflict with dogs and bikes. Resultant alcohol problems. Where would park and ride go?

Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment ID	Question 1 - The draft SPD provides an approach to planning for the future of the seafront. Please let us know your views on this approach.	Key Points
Mr & Mrs Alan & Dawn Bennett		232	<p>Having read the SPD I have the following comments. Note that I live in Cliff Drive, Canford Cliffs hence my focus of attention in the surrounding area and the plans tabled. Overall I do believe that the beach we have is unparalleled in the UK and we must protect it but equally we must move with the times. The seafront is very tired and needs investment. Flaghead Chine and Canford Cliffs Chine are the most unspoilt Chines along the whole beach and great care must be taken to preserve this. I object to any additional beach huts between Flaghead and Branscombe Chine. The cliff face is beautiful to see and the vegetation is home to such precious wildlife. Our property backs on to Flaghead Chine and even on dark nights rowdy youths can be heard walking the path. Therefore I object to putting light up this Chine and Branksome Chine and along the promenade as it will attract problems of crime, create lighting pollution. Again the wildlife in these Chines is valuable to our environment. Two species are evident Owls and Bats surely we cant destroy their habitat. The proposal to create additional parking near the cliff front at Canford Cliffs is not worth the cost for a few extra parking spaces and destroying natural vegetation grass and trees. As a resident the traffic problem is very serious. Attracting more visitors will make this worse. We need very good park and rides to get more people in to the area. I support the need for better facilities on the beach front e.g toilet easy access, restaurants etc but please no more beach huts. I object to the additional house on the cliff front at Cliff Drive. The cliff front is eroding and activity such as this will disturb the Cliff integrity. In addition it will destroy the wildlife habitat. I wish to raise a point on Council Tax. Any development must not load the maintenance and management costs on the the residents. A final point - the proposed Wind Farm will have a significant negative effect on our investment on the seafront so this should be stopped. There is about to be a glut of natural gas for the next 50 years and Wind Farms will be even more uneconomic.</p>	<p>Seafront is tired and needs investment but needs protection too. No lights in Flaghead Chine or beach huts between Flaghead and Branksome. No extra parking or dwelling on Cliff Drive. More people would exacerbate existing problems. Funding should not be from Council Tax. Wind Farm would have a negative impact upon the seafront.</p>
Mr Darrel Vincent		270	<p>Having reviewed the proposals I am strongly averse to the idea of hotels being sited in such a beautiful area in this indiscriminate manner. Unsurprisingly if you ask a developer for ideas on a 'sustainable' development they would reply accordingly that would deliver revenue streams and profits to their businesses. However, all at the expense of the unsurpassed magnificence of our beaches. Please do not commercialise this unique asset in a transparently fiscal manner.</p>	<p>Do not commercialise beaches, hotels are not a good idea.</p>
Mrs Una Reid		108	<p>Having spent the weekend there, I think to increase facilities by as much as you are proposing would create major congestion both on the entry and exit roads as well as the actual car parking. Facilities need to be updated especially the toilets that had 2 out of 4 not working during all of the airshow.</p>	<p>The level of new facilities would lead to congestion, in and out of town and to parking. Toilets do need updating.</p>

Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment ID	Question 1 - The draft SPD provides an approach to planning for the future of the seafront. Please let us know your views on this approach.	Key Points
Mr Eric Baylis		291	<p>height of development proposals not in keeping with surrounding area local area already unable to cope with the number of visiting cars, so increasing the volume of traffic makes no sense, particularly as the number of public car parking spaces is to be reduced the area is already well served by the Sandbanks Hotel and Jazzies. Increasing the restaurant and bar space in the area will only lead to the decline of these businesses. Indeed very often they are underused already offering overnight beach-side studio accommodation is going to increase the existing problems with night-time partying and noise etc damaging the environment in pursuit of commercial gain (it seems that the grass bank between the houses and the beach huts, which we imagine is home to some wildlife, will be swallowed up) some misrepresentations as to the current nature of the vicinity - is Shore Road as busy, bustling and youthful as the Council suggests? there is no justification for extending the promenade onto the beach, or public buildings onto the prom or the beach the new multi-storey cafe/restaurant/bar/visitor centre will be visually extremely intrusive for visitors, as well as local residents and businesses the double height beach huts similarly will be out of scale and lead to a completely disproportionate loss of outlook and amenity. Retaining some "oblique views" to the sea is not acceptable if there is a need for more beach huts, and studio accommodation, there is no reason why most of them could not be located further up towards Canford Cliffs and Branksome, or towards Sandbanks, thereby spreading the usage of the beach and other facilities more evenly along the promenade there is a far better case, in any event, for concentrating the new commercial and leisure developments at Sandbanks beach, where there is more scope for car parking, room for new buildings and less intrusion for existing occupiers we agree that the large, often unused triangular area in front of the beach huts by the Shore Road beach office, as well as the office itself and the WC's, are badly in need of upgrading and reconfiguration. This should be in priority to new facilities on presently open areas the bike hire facility, although not particularly objectionable in itself, seems misconceived as bicycles are not allowed to use the promenade in peak summer hours. No doubt there are lots more valid comments to be made. I am not an expert, but I think the most powerful points in terms of planning objections are likely to be the unwarranted change in character of the area (for visitors particularly); the detriment to existing businesses; and the increased congestion from lack of car parking. Unfortunately the loss of views for residents, and certainly drop in house values, are secondary if not irrelevant.</p>	<p>Commercial and leisure development should be concentrated at Sandbanks. Objection to: Shore Road building height, increase in traffic, loss of parking, miss-description of Shore Road character, loss of views and beach nature and character, bike hire seasonal restriction, loss of views, harm to existing businesses. Beach office and toilets do need upgrading.</p>
Mr Ray Smart		251	<p>How can YOU judge "improving the quality of life for the residents" if you do not ... ask THEM or advise THEM of your thoughts/proposals. As a Ratepayer I am absolutely astonished and furious that we were not advised about this document I realise costs must be watched but surely a leaflet telling us what to watch out for June/Sep could have been put in our Rates Info. Not one neighbour/friend /local paper knew of this "document" until word was spread a few days ago..... My first comment is that some ideas may be acceptable eventually, but the most cost effective thing to do may be to change nothing just upgrade facilities. Look after "garden areas " and brighten up PROM surfacing (i.e. NOT car park grey tarmac, depressing) 2.2. The Natural Environment - cannot be enhanced by ANYTHING unnatural! Clean gathered deposits of garbage out of beautiful Poole Harbour VERY regularly...or tell whosoever is responsible to do so. Pointless providing a lot more cycling facilities as in peak Summer time cycling is very restricted. We do use bikes on the Prom but would be happier if they were restricted/say not between 10 a.m. and 5 p.m EVERY day, making it more relaxing for all pedestrians, who are in the greater majority... say from Easter to end Sep. Motor Caravans suggest NO on street parking from 7p.m. until 9a.m. Certainly No Beach Pods/Huts for 24 hour use. Will the area be regularly patrolled, or will the area become blighted by music, parties litter, fireworks etc. Could comment that as sun disappears very early behind the cliff beaches, so the beach areas are more often pretty chilly not conducive to the proposed outdoor dining; lovely as it seems. I can remember vastly more days of empty beachside restaurants and kiosks due to our unfavourable climate ... do the present facilities think there is room for more facilities like that. Parking. Please do not destroy the nice Green area on cliff tops ... has anyone seen how many people, many who are unable to get down to the beach, sit there ... not a spare seat. Therefore no room for more cars. Try a Park and Ride scheme throughout the area the Parking Fees would support this system. As a regular pedestrian in SHORE ROAD area ... I cannot agree that this is a young person's area. There have been a much higher percentage of mixed age families using that area. There is a new, well used play area at Canford Cliffs why suggest one at tiny, quiet, Flaghead not needed as children enjoy playing on the beach in good weather, in</p>	<p>Upgrade facilities first. Restrict bike use, pedestrians are the majority. No motor caravans on street, no overnight pods, no additional Cliff Drive parking, Shore Road has mixed ages not just youth, no paly area, no demand for hotel (Norfolk Lodge empty). Parking fees could support revenue and a park and ride facility is encouraged.</p>

Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment ID	Question 1 - The draft SPD provides an approach to planning for the future of the seafront. Please let us know your views on this approach.	Key Points
Mrs Beryl Clifford		191	I am concerned regarding the alterations to Branksome Dene seafront of which I oppose to. It will affect local residents, especially those who rent beach huts. If it includes a hotel we will lose the car park. The community room is greatly used, especially by disabled organisations. This is just a few of the objections.	Objection to hotel and loss of community room at B Dene.
Mr John McNutt		88	I am concerned that the proposal for diagonal parking along the length of Banks Road will destroy some of the natural beauty of the harbour. I think it is a mistake to spread the parking along Banks Road for the following reasons:- Why edge a much visited area of natural beauty with more cars when there is already a more discrete designated carpark area. The whole area will take on an aspect of 'carpark' and car domination, most other planning authorities are trying to limit the impact of cars. In winter the extra acres of tarmac parking bay will look very bleak indeed. We should be aiming to soften/landscape the harbour edge. This stretch of Banks Road is famous for being natural, not providing carparking spaces. The proposal for interspersed islands of 'landscape' are not enough to alleviate the endless bank of parks cars in summer and empty spaces in winter - the whole length of Banks Road. In the three summer months even twice as much carparking would not suffice for the potential number of visitors, for eight months of the year the existing parking is already very much underused. I don't see how this proposal extends the season. This proposal does not place enough emphasis on landscape quality along the edge of the harbour. And a plea. If more tree planting is proposed please let it be indigenous type planting that thrives well. Palms trees do not do well and look impoverished/sad most of the year. Pines and White Poplars look fantastic and thrive well, White Poplars flicker in the sun, (take a look at the White Poplar trees on the harbour edge at the Shell Bay restaurant).	Banks Road diagonal parking would destroy beauty of Harbour. The proposal does not extend the season. Not enough emphasis on landscape quality along Harbour. Any tree planting should be indigenous species, e.g. pines and white poplars.
Miss Annette D'Abreo		205	I am delighted at the plans to develop the seafront. The ideas are well thought through, sympathetic to the area, contemporary and will give the area a real lift from its' tired facade currently. This takes us into the future and allows us to have great year round facilities whilst enjoying our beautiful area. Good job. I really hope this goes through.	Delighted with plans - ideas well thought through and sympathetic to the area. Takes us into the future with year round facilities.

Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment ID	Question 1 - The draft SPD provides an approach to planning for the future of the seafront. Please let us know your views on this approach.	Key Points
Mr David Harris		256	<p>I am grateful of the opportunity to respond to the Shore Road development. I holidayed at Sandbanks as a boy and am a resident. I am dismayed that the plan is not harmonious with the area. Its natural beauty and geography is unrivalled in the UK. The peninsula of land leading to a chain ferry and one of the Worlds deepest natural harbour make this a very special place to holiday. Put tropical water in the harbour and sea and It is every bit as beautiful as the Florida Keys. Please don't degrade the beauty with this plan which turns a natural seafront and spit into a "Kiss me Quick" resort. Why have the planners not gone further a field to look at other places where there is natural coastline and harmony. Kiawah Island in USA, Hilton Head. They don't spoil the lines of their coast with too high buidings not in keeping with their surroundings. Trying to turn beach huts - a changing room into a cheap overnight accommodation entity that will encourage unsupervised beach parties, midnight swims, noise and anti social behaviour all around the Shore Road area. Did the planners go out in a boat and observe their folly from the sea side. Coming into the harbour looking at the sea shore it has a calm uniformity too it. It's understated. Put away your thoughts of bars and hotels. These will merely erase the existing owners as we don't have the wealth or the weather to sustain the commerce needed for more eateries. I don't know who you are trying to attract? If you are trying to do a Brighton and attract weekenders, people are willing to come down by car or mbike to the sea on a wet day 1hr form London with their money on the off chance of good weather but 2 1/2 - 3 hours no way. The businesses that are left will not have the financial backing to be anything other than seasonal. Why don't you develop under Canford Cliffs, make more traditional coloured beach huts and put wooden decking and a broadwalk offering Venice Beach type attractions. But let the beach recover silently at night and give up on this folly of 24hr party accommodation in double height beach huts that look out of character. People come to the Shore Road for the simple pleasure of listening to the Sea not a Benidorm experience. It is not meant to be a wild and youthful and bustling area. It wont work. It's a pity. Parking - Go to SOUTHSEA and see how they have destroyed the resort with their parking. In any case you are reducing public car park space and yet wanting to attract more cars/visitors with your scheme. The multi storey restaurant and cafe is the wrong idea. Please show me examples of where these have worked in the world. We want more longitudinal single storey venues/double storey under the cliffs. The triangular space by the Shore Road beach Office, WC's need modernising and upgrading link it in with a broadwalk going along to the Sandbanks beach but nice wooden deck, New England type buildings like US National Parks and link it up towards that end of the beach. Put accommodation where it wont cause noise up towards Canford Cliffs or Sandbanks Beach. I do want to endorse change and upgrading but having seen communities in Florida and the Carolina's in the US that would be my preferred vision for the Shore Road development.</p>	<p>"Kiss me quick" resort would result. Lines of the coast can be spoilt by high buildings. Overnight accommodation would lead to noise and disturbance problems. We don't have wealth or weather or support more eateries etc. Could develop Canford Cliffs with traditional coloured beach huts, decking and board walk, but not all night use as well. Shore Road should be left with no high rise building. Parking plans could destroy the area. Some upkeep and improvements are required.</p>
Mr Clive Goodwin		34	<p>I am happy to see the area improved, my only worry is the reduction of parking places from 550 to 450. There is already a problem finding a space at weekends after 9.30 am. If you need to get to the Cafe Shore area you have to join often stationary traffic, either trying to get to the ferry or looking for an elusive parking space. If the car park is full the traffic then doubles back. With improvements to the area presumably wanting to attract more, not less to the area, then surely more spaces need to be found, not a hundred lost?</p>	<p>Happy to see area improved but concern regarding loss of parking when congestion already occurs in the area.</p>
Mrs Judy Birch		112	<p>I am in favour of some of the proposed changes but not all</p>	<p>Mostly in favour</p>
Mr John Seabrook		124	<p>I am in favour of the local authority considering long-term improvements or alterations to the seafront areas, but only if the motivation is to provide benefit to the people of Poole and visitors, not for the purposes of maximising revenue to the Council or meeting the requirements of potential commercial developers.</p>	<p>Long term improvements are favoured providing they are for peoples benefit and not to maximise revenue.</p>

Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment ID	Question 1 - The draft SPD provides an approach to planning for the future of the seafront. Please let us know your views on this approach.	Key Points
Miss Natasha Harris		255	I am not a resident but have relations in Sandbanks, Parkstone and Canford Cliffs and spend considerable time there. I think the majority of the proposals would do nothing but damage to this relatively unspoilt and beautiful place. Also, visitors to the beaches would be adversely affected. Taking away parking places, when demand greatly exceeds supply, seems ridiculous and wrong. I disagree with the three proposed buildings: the boutique hotel, flats on the car park, and the Landmark building, an unpleasant-looking, view-destroying horror. The whole plan seems to focus on development at the expense of wonderful views, tranquillity and pleasant spaces. It looks like wanton destruction of what most people like best about the area. Wildlife and natural woodland have been ignored. The transport ideas are fine - water taxis/buses, park and ride. If the Purbeck Breezer and Poole buses were more frequent and ran later this too would be useful. And an ongoing Oyster-type card would save time and money. More sandwiches/coffee type cafes would be a welcome addition. The big cafes are expensive. Better toilets, changing rooms and lockers would be beneficial. But any additions need to be small-scale and unobtrusive. I do not accept that the beaches have to pay for themselves. The beaches bring people here from all over, and they spend money in many areas, not just the beach. I hope the council will think again, and conserve and value this jewel in their crown.	Proposals would damage currently unspoilt and beautiful place. Loss of parking and high buildings cannot be supported. Changes should be small scale and unobtrusive. Favour small cafes, park and ride, water taxi, better toilets, changing areas.
Mr Ian Marcham		93	I am particularly concerned about the proposed development of the seafront in the area of Canford Cliffs Chine. The area needs a sensible plan that will maintain the amenity of the area and not turn it into a Durley Chine clone. The victorian huts are in need of work but to totally remove them is vandalism. We do not need wholesale destruction of the existing sea front. There are other ways of maximising return on investment. In summary I am against the plan as it stands.	Against plan - Canford Cliffs amenity needs to be maintain and not a clone of other chines. Victorian huts need to be kept.
Mrs Gill Kirby		160	I am particularly concerned that the proposed developments will result in changing an area of natural beauty into an over- commercialised resort. Moreover, I do not feel that enough has been done to raise awareness of the SPD amongst Poole residents; a couple of posters next to beach offices could hardly be considered adequate publicity.	Inadequate publicity. Over-commercialised.
Mrs Isabelle Edward		145	I am particularly interested in the plans to redevelop Branksome Dene Chine (my house overlooks the chine). some of the ideas are good (sports and water sports facilities/ new seating and lighting) but i am very concerned by the construction of a hotel, or new beachhuts with overnight accomodation. Branskome Dene chine is still rather wild. We regularly see a common busard there, wood peckers, a heron, a kite and occasionnaly an owl at night time. We have a lot of newts that migrate through the chine and our pond, sand lizards & toads. At twilight, bats fly around the chine. Over-developping the chine will compromise all this beautiful wildlife.	Some ideas at B Dene Chine are good (lighting, seating, water sports) but hotel, new beach huts an overnight accommodation are not favoured. Overdevelopment will compromise wildlife.

Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment ID	Question 1 - The draft SPD provides an approach to planning for the future of the seafront. Please let us know your views on this approach.	Key Points
Mrs Gillian Holloway		72	<p>I am putting in writing my strong objections to the proposals that Poole Council suggest on sustaining pooles beaches! 1) The monstrosity of a building on the corner of Shore Road & Promenade, would not be in keeping with the area, and looking at the plans the height is ridiculous and with large glass windows which means being over looked by all. Are we going to loose the public toilets which is for everyone's CONVENIENCE !! & the RNLI hut for safety when the holiday period (6 weeks) is over & the beach guards huts are removed at the end of season. It is stated in your proposals "another lmax" !! look how long it took to pull that Carbuncle down, 10 years after protests and look what we have now, you have given the public what it wants/needs. How are the emergency vechicles, dustmen, beach hut maintenance and beach/maintenance employees & police going to have access. 2) The proposals states that the young predominantly use the beach, PREDOMINATE means have CONTROL/BE SUPERIOR !! as a resident of the area & my friends who have lived in this area for 40 years plus, I can tell you that their parents used to drop them off as children at the end of Shore Road for them to spend the day on the beach on their own safely, gone are those days now parents drop their children off and have to go looking for PARKING SPACES! As for the young as you call them, most of the windsurfers are in their thirties with families. I see mostly middle aged people keeping fit (with or without dogs) walking the beach & stopping for coffee or a glass of wine. If you note not many youngsters/younger people attended the 'Wind Fest' (mostly 30 plus die hards) of course this is a shame, but after they have finished surfing all they are looking for is a hot drink as they have come some distance they just want to get back to their cars which are parked some distance & home, my son included. As for bike hire there is already a place to hire bikes, boat and boards etc, indeed my grandchildren have used all these facilities. All in all I would say it is families, middle aged and older people who come to Shore Road. 3) There is not enough parking in the area and the thought of losing part of the car park in Shore Rd! it is a win win for the council to sell off the land and still get paid for more parking metres on all the roads, which will mean parking on both sides of the road getting further & further away from the beach making it practically single lanes and traffic jams. I could go on... 4) Regarding overnight stays, I think it will turn our wonderful beach & surrounding area (which tourists come to enjoy) into a HOLIDAY CAMP SITE, or BLACKPOOL who is going to police it regarding noise & all night drinking. 5) I do believe we have to move with the times, as a forward thinking person with 3 children & four grandchidren I feel not enough people spread themselves along the beach to Canford Cliffs, Branksome and along, there they will need facilities like cafe bars, tea rooms, craft shops (not pubs-ever heard of lager louts!), childrens play areas (but not gyms... have you been to Venice beach! gangs showing off their prowess and taking over, say no more). A few people do use the beach to train, I say a minority and not on a regular basis. I feel more could be achieved by using that stretch of the beach and under the beautiful cliffs but not touching them. Where has the class gone, class makes money too.</p>	<p>Objection to Shore Road building and access to beach here. "Young" branding incorrect. Loss of parking unacceptable and would add to congestion. Do not support overnight pods as would turn into a holiday campsite. People need to use beaches to the east of Shore Road more with cafe bars and tea rooms not pubs and play areas not gyms.</p>
Mrs Adele Provan		174	<p>I am surprised with the magnitude of the changes proposed that there has not been greater public consultation, or really any public consultation. It has not been publicised as far as I can see, I only became aware of it by hearsay and it took me quite some time to track down the document. I would have thought as a resident we might have received a mailing signposting us to the document. I think the plans are over ambitious and cannot be achieved without substantial commercial investment. I have been coming to Sandbanks for over 40 years as my parents and their parents before them. I am now lucky enough to call it home. We were and have always been attracted by the unspoilt and uncommencialised nature of the area, it really has not changed in character in all that time and that is what we love. If we want pubs, arcades and restaurants we can go into Bournemouth. Yes there is a need to improve facilities but please please please do not turn our unspoilt natural idyl into another tacky seaside eyesore.</p>	<p>A lot of changes for limited public consultation. Overambitious plan. Need to improve facilities but not by spoiling natural character with over commercialisation.</p>

Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment ID	Question 1 - The draft SPD provides an approach to planning for the future of the seafront. Please let us know your views on this approach.	Key Points
Mrs Patti Hegarty		261	<p>I am the owner of a flat in Canford Court, Cliff Drive. I am stunned that only this week I have found out, by chance, about these proposals for Poole Seafront and am horrified that such a enormous plan, not to mention document, have not been publicised enough so that all residents in the borough should have easy access to them and be able to comment. Not everyone has access to the internet, especially older residents. This is unacceptable. The plans are very detrimental to our beautiful area. I agree that some small improvements are always welcome where toilets and seating on the promenade are concerned and better lighting on the promenade/chine paths for the evenings are but a few. However, the addition of more beach huts, adding another storey to existing ones, 2/3 storey beach studios to allow overnight stays, a Dune Hotel on the beach at Sandbanks and more restaurants on the beach are just too commercial, unwanted and unnecessary. You are wanting to overdevelop an area known for tranquil family beaches, beautiful natural cliff backdrops and chines. There are plenty of hotels, guesthouses and B&B's in this area - There is no need for another. Why do people choose to come to Poole Beaches? Because it's not like Bournemouth. You only have to walk along the Promenade towards Bournemouth to notice the change when leaving "Poole Beaches" behind - It is too busy, smells of fried food and hot oil in the air from the numerous places to eat. The promenade gets crowded from the overspill of the beach hut users having BBQ's using the Prom as an extension of the beach hut. This is not what we want for Poole Seafront. I noticed over the Summer this year that this overspill onto the Promenade is starting to happen locally, also. Losing parking spaces is not an option nor is the echelon parking on Banks Road - This is a dangerous, ill-thought idea. How can you add more parking spaces to Cliff Drive when there are the maximum safely available already? The proposal to build a house as a holiday let on Cliff Drive next to No 24 on the cliff top opposite my property is absolutely ludicrous. This small area of green provides a shelter with the trees and a haven for many who come and sit here to take in the views from the morning to the late evening. Many of whom are elderly or infirm and cannot cope with the steps down to the beach. Why deprive local residents of this much loved spot? You say you want to "Make best use of existing assets with all development maintaining or enhancing the natural environment" This particular plan does none of the above. I would wholly object to anything being built on here as would all residents of the road - if they were actually made aware of such plans. The only people to benefit here are the developers. Who are these changes for? Do local residents really want all this? The Council should have written (this could have been with our council tax statements) advising each and every resident and council tax payer whom these changes will affect, of their plans so they could all have their say. It is, afterall, their seafront.</p>	<p>Unacceptable access to the SPD for consultation. Plans are detrimental to the area. Support improved toilets, seating, and lighting. Object to beach huts, overnight accommodation, Hotel, restaurants, house off Cliff Drive and loss of parking.</p>
Mr Peter Willingham		95	<p>I am very concerned as to the lack of publicity regarding this extremely important matter - it was not very easy to find this proposal on-line. The small leaflet showing before and after pictures certainly did not show the vast changes to the area, and it was quite a shock when I finally found the 93 page document. Although I agree Sandbanks could do with a some modernisation - public toilets, better access to beach and general tidying up - I am completely opposed to the scale of development proposed. The main problem with Sandbanks is the parking (which unfortunately has become a lot worse since the cycle lanes were put in). These proposals would make the matter considerably worse and make our beautiful Sandbanks a visitors' nightmare and certainly not encourage more people. For example, the plans show the play area and mini golf has disappeared to make more parking, where is the reasoning for this! Sandbanks would go from a beautiful tranquil family beach to a concrete jungle with traffic congestion completely out of control.</p>	<p>Lack of publicity. Sandbanks could do with some modernisation but the parking is main issue, and plans would make it worse with loss of crazy golf and play area.</p>
Miss Carol Desouche		282	<p>I am writing to you today to express my disappointment in the new ideas you have to redevelop the area immediately behind my house. We bought this house 10 years ago because we love the area, it is so peaceful and safe and at the time we had a sea view. We moved from Boscombe where I was almost too scared to shut my eyes at night because of the noise and constant trouble coming from the children's play park opposite. We had bullets from a "BB" gun shot through our bedroom window in the night and endless door bell ringing because of cars being broken into or people wanting us to call the police because some one was about to be beaten up in the park. On each occasion it was put down to youngsters bored at half term or similar. I really don't want to go through that again. We took time to research the Branksome Dene area to make sure it would be quiet and safe and had no building plans in the pipeline. The land at the back of our house used to be overgrown but also largely inaccessible until the Council employed a warden who took out all of the beautiful rhododendron shrubs and various pine trees seemingly to suit himself and did not take in</p>	<p>Concerned about noise, disturbance and crime resulting in B Dene Chine. Loss of trees and wildlife an issue. Area needs to remain quiet with facilities provided for older people. Hotel, beach huts and overnight accommodation is not favoured.</p>

Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment ID	Question 1 - The draft SPD provides an approach to planning for the future of the seafront. Please let us know your views on this approach.	Key Points
			<p>to consideration our wishes. We wanted some pine trees taken down which were interrupting our views and didn't understand why he took some good trees out and left others that bothered us. The rhododendron trees were taken out because they are not indigenous and apparently nothing can grow or live underneath them. The pine trees are the same they are not indigenous, most were planted after Capability Brown made them fashionable and thousands were planted, which is why there are so many dying trees at once. They only have a 100 year approx. lifespan. Nothing much grows under Pines either as the needles are quite acidic and dense and smother other plants. I have been to have a look down the chine in the area I think the proposed Go Ape is planned and I can't see which trees look healthy enough to have children swinging in them therefore I can't believe that this is a viable option to be quite honest. Since the rhododendrons have been killed the area has been opened up and there are now quite often people camping down there which is a worry as the toilet facilities are in the other car park and they are locked at night which brings environmental health issues. There are also now picnic tables down there and often at night we hear lots of noises mainly loud drunken voices which can be quite frightening. As you can tell I am not at all happy with what has already happened to the area behind our house but I really don't want the constant noise of children screaming either. I can't believe that only a couple of years ago you wanted to conserve the area and make it a haven for lizards, dragon flies and grass snakes which apparently were collected from Canford Heath and relocated here. We bought our house because of the surrounding area, we paid a higher price because it is quiet and had a view are you going to compensate us because the value of our house will drop? Are we going to be able to ignore T.P.O.s? The Council seems to avoid putting them on their land, it is only the Council Tax paying residents whose wishes are ignored! I can understand how tempting it is for the Branksome Dene Pavillion to be made into a going concern and I think it would be lovely to have a very good restaurant there that closes at a reasonable time as at present. There is nowhere near enough parking for a hotel or more beach huts, please look at the attached photo from Saturday 31st August. That car blocked my driveway for at least two hours! I had to walk into Bournemouth and get a taxi home! Why should local and non local people have a right to encroach on the lives of the residents of this area by providing beach huts that they can stay in over night making lots of noise and allowing their kids to run almost feral which is what happens at Hengistbury Head, though fortunately there are no neighbours in the vicinity. There is a lovely beach for everyone to enjoy by day, surely that is enough. There are loads of activities in this area for children already. If you must redevelop please think of something that would interest older people who would respect this quiet residential area that we have all invested so much into. I am impressed by a little patch of ground by Alum Chine where they have planted seeds into the grass there are poppies and lots of sorts of summer flowering plants that have naturalised into the grass, I think they may well self seed, maybe that sort of planting could be done at the bottom of the Cassel Avenue steps and into the inner area. It could look lovely and be self maintaining. There is a little pond with dragonflies in there also. I also think if the Pine trees were taken down along the steps down to the carpark from Cassel Avenue the path would be much safer as the build up of pine needles and pine cones would not happen and the tree roots would not push up the paving slabs therefore there would be no need to sweep them. Perhaps a wheelchair circuit with a few benches dotted around could make a lovely place for older people to sit on a sunny day, the land is flat down there and obviously there is access directly from the bottom carpark. I don't suppose the Council would support an idea like this as it wouldn't make money but how lovely to provide an area especially with the older generation in view. We have all chosen to live by the coast it is such a shame to think that we might not be able to see it as it becomes obscured by various hotels, theme parks and tree top cabins and beach huts.</p>	
Mrs Kathryn Jenkins		148	<p>I appreciate revenue needs to be generated to maintain the seafront however this is a public site which many people use for a variety of reasons. I therefore strongly object to any plans to sell off/lease land for development of exclusive hotels as proposed. There is plenty of 'exclusive' property and commercial premises such as cafes and restaurants in the area and any more means that prices get pushed up disproportionately for local residents and all users.</p>	<p>Object to hotels and more exclusive commercial premises. Accept revenue needs to be generated but seafront is a public site and should not be leased or sold off.</p>

Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment ID	Question 1 - The draft SPD provides an approach to planning for the future of the seafront. Please let us know your views on this approach.	Key Points
Mr Henry South		64	I believe it is appropriate to plan for the future but it should be planned on the basis of the requirements of the local community and visitors.	Appropriate to plan for the future but for the requirements of locals and visitors.
Mr C Darley		84	I believe it to be over commercialised in an area where the people who visit Canford Cliffs beach do not want the commercial amenities and the youngsters facilities, for that they can all go to various other poole beaches. Canford Cliffs is a unique place and I as I see the plans it will be completely ruined and lost forever.	Canford Cliffs should not be over commercialised or youngsters should go to other beaches.
Miss Emma Hann		26	I believe that any proposal that includes infill of any area of the harbour to be unacceptable. The harbour is a habitat that is fragile and these proposals could cause untold environmental damage. Poole council appears to be considering financial gain over their role as protectors of the town for future generations. These proposals sound like yet another DolphinQuays.	No infill to the Harbour. Financial gain should not be at cost of protecting the environment.
Mr Richard Logan		172	I believe the council is right to address the facilities on the seafront as a lot of them need updating. More amenities are needed such as cafes, toilets etc.	It is right to update facilities and provide cafes and toilets.
Mr Michael Harrington		116	I certainly agree that the seafront needs improvement with a proper plan for the future but I am not entirely happy with everything in the proposals contained in the draft SPD.	Improvement required but not all proposals are acceptable.
Mr Mike Watts		45	I do not support the approach set out in the draft SPD. I think the approach appears more driven by where can we make money from exploiting our beaches than it is driven by maintaining the beauty of the seafront and ensuring access and facilities meet visitors requirements. The SPD is just focussed on selling Council plots for hotels, apartment blocks and beach-huts. The draft SPD plans are a complete over-development of the natural environment. I think proposed buildings are ugly and look like the Mowlem Centre at Swanage which is cheap/tacky, ugly and breaks up the natural beauty of the bay. The SPD is NOT offering Landmark buildings with architectural merit such as the Sydney Opera house... the plans offer just cheap office block looking buildings. The approach will introduce more 'fast-food' approach to seafront use and cause littering and obstructions to the natural beauty of Sandbanks. The document uses lots of words and pictures that give the impression that this is all about preserving the natural habitat but in fact its a plan to take some of that away and commercialise the area. What the document describes as 'A Dune Landscape' turns out to be a Hotel, more beach huts and more fast-food outlets.	Do not support approach driven by making money from selling plots for development at cost of maintaining natural beauty. Shore Road Landmark building is ugly and resultant development would over commercialise..
Mr Will Robbins		76	I don't think many people are aware of what you propose. I would have thought you would have positioned temporary visitor centre(s) in Sandbanks car park and other areas ie Shore Road where the masses could review and comment. It all seems a little undercover.	Inadequate publicity.
Stehrenberger		180	I feel that the Council has not made it easy for residents to see what changes are being proposed for the seafront. I only found out about all this by chance, and lots of people I have spoken to have not heard anything about it. It should have been much better publicised and because so many people are still unaware of all this I think they should somehow be reached and the time allowed for them to make their comments should be extended for a few more weeks.	Inadequate publicity.
Mr Patrick Marlow		32	I feel that the draft SPD is greatly under exposed, I am concerned that your local feedback will be extremely diluted and under represented as your 'advertising' strategy has had limited reach.	inadequate publicity
Mr Michael Hudson		133	I FEEL THAT THE WHOLE APPROACH TO THE FUTURE PLANS OF SANDBANKS AND POOLE BEACHES IS BEING DRIVEN BY THE GREEDY DEVELOPERS WHO IN MY OPINION HAVE NO INTEREST IN POOLE HERITAGE. I am Poole born and bred and I have talked to dozens of local people about some of these cranky ideas such as a hotel at Sandbanks and reducing the car parking numbers. I do not know of a single person who thinks its the way forward. The council needs to as a matter of urgency find a better way of surveying the thoughts of locals.	Hotel and loss of parking not favoured. Better consultation required.

Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment ID	Question 1 - The draft SPD provides an approach to planning for the future of the seafront. Please let us know your views on this approach.	Key Points
Mr Ben Rayner		182	I feel the options looked at in the draft SPD provide a wide range of features and facilities which take into account future needs and affordability (including revenue provision). I think the theme of enhancement of the identified characters of the different areas/chines is very effective.	Wide range of facilities proposed that consider future needs. Effective enhancement of different character areas.
Miss Pat Tempany		28	I fully support the need for a sustainable, long term vision for the seafront which offers a framework for future development. However the need to allow sufficient development to pay for necessary improvements to facilities must be balanced with the responsibility to prevent the wanton destruction of the "essential natural setting" and "wonderful environment" of the beaches and chines. I am disappointed that Poole Council's approach to consultation on this SPD has been so low key that although I use the beach and seafront every day I have been unaware of the development of this document. Since this is a seafront focussed document - perhaps a few posters along the seafront would have given those of us who use it regularly a chance to be involved in its development?	Support long term vision but essential natural setting must not be harmed by need to pay for improvements. Poor consultation.
Mr Peter Marley-Shaw		246	I have already responded to the Consultation on behalf of a dog owners group. These comments are however are my own & do not represent the views of the Group. My comments follow the sections of the Consultation document. Page 1 I do want the Seafront sustained i.e using a resource so that the resource is not depleted or permanently damaged . I want the Seafront conserved i.e. kept or maintained in a safe or sound state . Expenditure should be made to conserve & sustain it. Page 2 We can already go to the beach in the day & evening all the year round. Lighting will cause light pollution to one of the few places in Poole where the heavens can be properly seen at night. There are already plenty of adequate restaurants shops & bars. Tesco Express has only just opened to the opposition of other traders who say there is not enough business out of season. Canford Cliff restaurants are closing through lack of business. Sandbanks has Cafe Shore & a cafe on the Harbour side plus the newly built beachside restaurant. Shore Road has Jazzys & the Sandbanks Hotel. Branksome Beach has the excellent 1930's pavilion. At the Haven there is a cafe & Hotel. There are also numerous kiosks selling Ice Cream coffee & snacks. This is too much for me but development & further urbanisation never goes backwards. I do not want my beaches to offer anything other than the "environment". Page 4 Foreword I am against aim 2 which is in conflict with 1, which I endorse. The word invest is used a lot in the SPD. It confuses maintenance of existing facilities with property development. I think the intention is to confuse. We must "put up a Hotel or the toilets will stay blocked". Of course existing core services should be preserved. Doing Nothing It is not clear whether the drainage & toilets are the only infrastructure or whether further things need attention for the £7m. I note recently some resurfacing was done on the road down to Branksome Dene together with scrub clearance. Extensive maintenance was also done to sewage pumps out side the toilets. So investment (maintenance) still happens. A pistol is being put to the residents head. "Unless you agree to extensive property development your lovely beaches will be destroyed". BoP knows that further intensified & over-development is normally opposed by the voter when put forward by residential & commercial developers. It would seem the current tally on the Consultation website is 3 for (including one councillor) & 43 opposed or for modest non-capital generating improvements. For BoP to use land in their ownership creates a difficulty. They would like to make some money by selling or long leasing their land but fear a voter backlash. Clearly only the parade of shops & 2 hotels are the only items creating significant sums. Doing Something Shades of 1984 here, only by covering the natural environment with buildings can we preserve it. Doing Anything I agree with Cllr Butt's statement here. It is just that these particular proposals will harm "the existing qualities of the seafront". Page 6 Chapter 4 There is an underlying message that further visitors should be encouraged to the Poole beaches. Those residents of Poole who know the beaches come already, if they crave more "metropolitan" seaside facilities Bournemouth will provide them. If the visitor from Basingstoke or Reading want more exotic facilities Bournemouth will welcome them. Wider issues of sustainability are raised by encouraging visitors from outside BoP. The SPD accepts more beach use increases car use. No doubt another department in BoP is thinking of ways of reducing car traffic rather than making efforts to increase it. It is interesting to note that Criterion 26 of the Blue Flag Regulations states "It is recommended the Local Authority implements a traffic management plan to reduce traffic volumes". The report uses much Planner-Speak which I do not understand. "Engagement tells us that there is a demand for facilities to widen the offer". Is it this	Beach should be conserved not sustained. Prom lighting will be light pollution. Enough premises already. Proposals would harm existing qualities of the seafront. Uncertainty surrounding the financial demand for more income to fund improvements and investment. Unconvincing arguments for commercialising beach, Poole has different character/demands to Bournemouth.

Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment ID	Question 1 - The draft SPD provides an approach to planning for the future of the seafront. Please let us know your views on this approach.	Key Points
			<p>engagement that has driven this exercise? Was it a couple of people responding to another survey? How representative of the citizens of Poole were they? Were they visitors from out of town? Were the comments cherry picked? How many people do I have canvass on a particular topic to get the council to act? Perhaps the out of town metropolitan young designers brought in to write this report may find it easy to see the seafront as a single entity but regular users would never think that. Currently the more effort it takes to get to the more attractive the natural environment & local character is. Chapter 5 The theme here is "Sandbanks is busy so let's spoil the quiet areas". It should be emphasised that although Sandbanks is busy in the school summer holidays & cannot cope at all at weekends during this period it is relatively quiet for the rest of the year. (Easter provides a blip). Page 9 Introduction Here the spectre is raised of a reduction in Poole's £200 m . tourist revenue being damaged if the the toilets stay closed. I am not clear that it is the Council's duty to maintain the income of local restaurateurs, shop & cafe owners. However, BoP's annual budget is c.£300m. Let us suppose the £7m "investment " is spread over 3 years this would amount to 0.7%. p.a. I can find no further information on the Council's Annual Accounts on the web site so all I can look at is the Council Tax leaflet. Nowhere does it indicate revenues from car parks or beach parking tickets which clearly should be ring fenced into seafront maintenance. BoP receive £55 m income from the provision of services. A further spectre is raised that if a toilet closes the beach may be closed. This is ludicrous scare mongering. There are no toilets or cafes on the beach at Shell Bay but this beautiful natural environment can still be enjoyed all who can take the trouble to visit it. Of course the BoP's drains should not pollute the beach but this is self evident & against the law. Once more maintenance, investment & improvement are confused. Maintenance yes, replace new with old when worn out. That is not investment. Page 12 BoP adopted a Strategy in 2011 on beaches to improve the quality of life of the residents. This was admirable but visitors are not mentioned. The resolution does not give authority to improve matters for visitors. Where Council authorisation is necessary for this plan matters which deal with visitors may well be ultra vires. I can see why members voted for the 2011 SBS & I agree with it although the meaning of investment is inexact. Page 15 The Seafront today The eulogy "anyone can use & all can enjoy" does not ring true. The dog walker most certainly cannot use the majority of the beaches from May to September. The facilities have not been maintained that is not the same as investment. Page 17 Land Ownership The nub of the issue is here. With their land ownership BoP wish to maximise the capital & revenue from their assets. As the Planning Authority they can, once this SPD has been approved grant themselves consent for anything they want. Issues of Natural Environment can be swept aside & instead of preserving it for future generations they will destroy it. Clearly there is severe conflict of interest. As a retired Chartered Surveyor I know it would be a property owners dream to grant himself planning permission for anything he liked on his own land. Page 24 Demand for facilities Demand here cannot be demand in the economic sense. Demand in an economic sense require payment. In Italy & France beaches can be privately run & those doing the demanding pay for it. Here the demander wants my Council to provide them with Council Tax payers money free. I can "demand" that my grandchildren go to the school of their choice, the pot holed roads are repaired, I can see my doctor in less than 10 days & get treatment in A&E within half an hour. I can demand until blue in the face there is no money so it will not happen. I do not accept that the facilities mentioned do not exist. However even if they did not why should BoP satisfy these "demands" when other more pressing ones are not provided by the state? How far can the visitor from Basingstoke walk before he gets a cup of coffee? Cheap water taxis & cheap park & rides have been put forward in Public Engagement vox pops. These will never be cheap unless subsidised. BoP have no money for this. It costs Â£17 for a family of four to go the 300 m from The Haven to Brownsea. Unfulfillable public expectations are raised by mentioning these concepts. Page 33 Access Strategy Access, especially to Sandbanks is self regulating. Local Poole residents will not attempt to approach Sandbanks on a busy day. With traffic backing up beyond Shore Road & waiting for a never to appear vacant car space is a pointless exercise. However in that queue will be someone wishing to go to the Ferry or the RMYC. These people are prevented from accessing the peninsular. Additionally residents are denied being able to come & go for many hours on end. No suggestion is made in the SPD to deal with this. There is already a "full" sign which occasionally works but drivers will still hope for a street parking space. Technology does not exist to say whether all street places are taken. Tourism I & probably many other residents know nothing of the Tourism Strategy but no doubt it is for a greater number of visitors, further</p>	

Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment ID	Question 1 - The draft SPD provides an approach to planning for the future of the seafront. Please let us know your views on this approach.	Key Points
			<p>economic activity & expansion. Those of us who wish to conserve our existing Natural Environment will have already lost the battle. However if more development must take place let it be at Sandbanks & Branksome Chine. If you must tell visitors about the other places, tell them they will have peace, quiet, natural charm & limited facilities there. Many people will actually like this & come to Poole for this reason. Want some action, go to Bournemouth, enjoy the Surf Reef, Imax & Boscombe beach pods. Accommodation Strategy I am opposed to the Beach pods & hotels as being inappropriate in the environment. However even if I was in favour in planning terms I believe these will not be a commercial success. Presumably BoP cannot raise finance itself to carry out the developments proposed. The land will therefore be sold Freehold or on a long lease. I see low occupancy out of season particularly if the hotels are small & unable to offer banqueting events like Harbour Heights, Haven & Sandbanks. Who would want to walk up Branksome Dene Chine on a wet January evening in search of nightlife? Potential low returns would leave a very low residual value of the sites. There has been little interest in the vacant hotel/site at the top of Flaghead Chine for the years it has been on the market. Spreading the limited demand out of season may cause the existing hotels at the top of Branksome Dene Chine to close. Page 44 Lighting should be limited to Sandbanks Shore Road & Branksome Chine. Light pollution is a bad thing. Page 45 I reject the idea that there are not enough places to eat & drink at Sandbanks. The economic demand to justify viable commercial rents is not there. I note commercial operators have already responded to the consultation pointing out the season is short & weather dependant. I question whether any seaside resort has regenerated itself for year round activity with beach front development. Brighton is a year round venue, one hour from London, but it's winter success is not to be found on the beach. BoP have the quayside to develop if they want to follow that route. Remember the supply & variety that the Quay is enormous but things are still extremely quiet in the winter. Page 46 6.1 Sandbanks It is difficult to read the elevations/plans in the web brochure as p 47/48 & 57/58 are designed to be open together. BoP's land here currently is a low Oasis in between the 4 storey bulk of other developments in Banks Road. It can only remain if BoP uses it's ownership to prevent further high mass development. Rebuilding on the current footplate & building height is acceptable. No further development should take place. Setting aside conservation objections I do not believe the proposals are commercially viable. If the current plan is passed I envisage in a few years time Commercial developers saying that the scheme does not have critical mass & something more substantial is necessary to create viable footfall in the winter. A "Retained Scots Pine" is mentioned. I would hope all trees in the area have TPOs or will shortly have. What is left of natural environment of the Sandbanks peninsula has been principally saved by TPOs preventing high mass development. BoP should not use their planning powers to fell their own trees to add commercial value to their land. This would be hypocritical given the restrictions currently enforced against private developers & lead to greater call from them to remove trees on their land for commercial gain. This would have repercussions throughout the borough. Page 55 6.2 Shore Road Halving the car parking provision is not going to encourage the out of town visitor. I have no objection to the flats at 15 which would be in line with the existing street scape. There is a kiosk at 14 . It is not clear where this is located but I would oppose any structure on the harbour side of Banks/Shore Road. Replacement structures on existing footplate to 2 storeys would be in order. What is planned is overdevelopment & would change the character of the area. It is not clear where Shore Road proposals end & Flaghead start. Page 62 Flaghead This is one of the quiet chines and should be left alone. The authors seem to feel they must do something at each location. Perhaps this was their brief. They give the impression of having turned up for a couple of days walked along the beach & gone back to their metropolitan environment. They mention Blue flag status. There are only 3 blue flag beaches in Poole, Sandbanks, Canford Cliffs & Branksome. Flaghead is not one of them. I hope it is not the ambition to create more such beaches. BoP tells us they have no money hence the need for all this development. It is costly in capital & annual running costs to comply with the 33 Blue Flag Criterion. No to a kiosk, play area but additional beach huts would be in order. Page 64 Canford Cliffs This is the locals beach with free parking. Long may it remain. 313 beach huts with 90 car spaces, how will that work? By all means rebuild the existing beach structure to existing footplate. Lighting will be required down the chine for evening use. Also how will it be serviced by lorries? Is it realistic for it to be attractive to the unaccompanied to go down in the evening when it is quiet? It is not clear what Beach Marquees (34) are but the limited parking means that only few people can practically use them. Page 75 Branksome Beach The</p>	

Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment ID	Question 1 - The draft SPD provides an approach to planning for the future of the seafront. Please let us know your views on this approach.	Key Points
			<p>first beach the out of town visitor reaches. Rebuild existing building at 42 on same footplate to 2 storeys. The Beach Road car park is largely unused except at the Air Show. It is a long walk with free parking in Lakeside. No doubt on street parking charges will be part of BoP's improvements to attract visitors but do not tell the residents that yet. BoP will have a wealth of data about how long beach users spend at the beach from car park ticket sales. Many residents just pop to look at the sea & go for a short work. This applies especially to the infirm & elderly. (We do not all get blue badges). To be able to get to a promenade easily from their vehicle is an attraction. Many of the spaces talked about in this report are not of that nature. At Branksome they are. Why take them away? Page 83 Branksome Dene Woodland by the sea indeed. Hearing about a hotel is the reason I have bothered to have a look at the SPD in detail. I could not believe what I heard & am convinced few residents & beach users know about this. At first I thought it had been put forward so that it could be withdrawn with the other proposals sailing through. This is Poole's hidden gem accessed from a quiet residential road down a lovely winding track. Lightly used and forming access to part of the "dog ghetto", it is an unspoilt natural environment. It is home to the protected green lizard. A hotel will mean intensification of traffic especially at night. The road will need to be widened & lighting installed. The little pavilion is regularly used by groups (including the elderly & those with disabilities) for meetings & celebrations. It sounds as though the authors are really worried about this; "they can be relocated somewhere else on the beach" . They have not even given any thought where. By all means up grade it as suggested in Para 2. Activity wire slides will create noise & destroy tranquillity which is the essence of this wonderful place. Tree top trails & Go Ape must not happen. Page 87 Delivering the vision I am afraid I do not understand this planner-speak & local authority jargon. However we already have the landscape, habitat & natural environment we love. It is you the Council who want to interfere with it because you cannot afford 0.7% of your budget to keep toilets open & mend drains.</p>	
Mr Matthew Eeles		153	<p>I have been fortunate enough to grow up and spend a vast amount of my adult life using Shore Road Beach on a very regular basis. I am horrified to see the plans for a multi-story building on the entrance to the beach. Have we learnt nothing from the IMAX experience? I would like to see the Councils supporting documentation justifying the requirement for more bars, restaurants and Hotels in the area. I was not aware of people bursting out of overcrowded existing social areas and Hotels, I am very aware of businesses already struggling, infact closing down to be replaced with Tescos providing a cheaper alternative to the expensive bars and shops already in existance. The beach should be a place for families to go to enjoy being together away from the stresses of town life and not be pressured by a commercial environment designed to extract money from tourists. Families should not be forced out by bars full of youths and richer communities that can afford to frequent the new design beach.I would like to point out, that these establishments are unlikely to be successful as there will be nowhere to park. The multi-story building onto the beach will also block all late afternoon and evening sun from the beach to the east. Therefore, reducing the appeal of going there for evening BBQ and socialising on the beach itself. Shore Road is always full of families and older people using the beach, I am horrified by the thought of it being labled the "Social Beach". Overnight accommodation is surely going to lead to an increased drinking culture, is this to be policed by an already overstretched and underfinanced police force? Building on the Shore Road car park is a very short term plan to raise funds but it is an irreversible decision and would limit access to the beach for many. Cycling and public transport is not an easy option for elderly or people with young families carrying all their beach supplies. Parking is already in very short supply, the car park is well used, as are the local roads which are bursting to capacity on a sunny day-winter and summer. On New Years Day in the freezing cold, there wasn't a space for miles. The council talks about improving year round access, the charm of Poole is its undisturbed beaches which are already well frequented on a nice day. On not so nice days, it is the opportunity for other Tourist Attractions in the area to make their money. The 'Harbour Lives" programme, pulling tourist into the area focusses specifically on our wonderful unspoilt beaches. These plans seek to add commercial aspect to every area of beach life turning us into a more Bournemouth/Weymouth environment which dates quickly and needs regular updating. As for the plans for Branksome Dene, our wonderful 'locals beach' which is so enjoyed by windsurfers and kitesurfers, walkers and families, the plans are abhorrant. Hotels and "Go Ape"-are you kidding?????</p>	<p>Shore Road development is too big, tall and will cast shadow on beach. There is no demand for the new commercial premises. Inappropriate labelling as "Social Beach". Cycling and public transport already difficult for some beach users and loss of parking is already a problem. Area needs to remain unspoilt. Go Ape and Hotels are not supported.</p>

Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment ID	Question 1 - The draft SPD provides an approach to planning for the future of the seafront. Please let us know your views on this approach.	Key Points
Miss Julia Furbey		130	I have lived in Poole for 56 years so regard myself as a local! Where I agree that some of the areas are "tired", I do think that the Borough need to be sympathetic in any changes they wish to make. Part of the beauty of the seafront and surrounding areas is the natural beauty and "quaintness" of the area and this could be so easily spoilt. This has been apparent over the years by the changes made on Poole Quay.	Some areas are tired, but must be careful not to improve and spoilt natural beauty and quaintness.
Mr Andrew Mecke		214	I have often stayed at the Sandbanks Hotel, which I prefer over both Harbour Heights and The Haven, simply because of its marvellous unrivalled location right on the beach and its splendid uninterrupted views in all directions. It is without doubt a real credit to your borough that you have been blessed with, and maintain to such an exceptional standard, miles and miles of beautiful golden sands that are clearly world class and enjoyed by both British and many foreign tourists alike. To spoil such natural beauty would be an absolute travesty and I was therefore suitably horrified to learn that someone, with clearly zero appreciation of natural beauty and/or conservation, has proposed the erection of a modern 3 storey monstrosity right on the beach at the end of shore road???! It sounds absolutely preposterous because Sandbanks customers and local residents will lose the uninterrupted views, and with more restaurants and a visitor centre(?) that rather quaint little part of the beach will become an eyesore with increased traffic and mayhem, it is madness. Such a measure would be a complete and utter blot on the landscape and destroy the tranquil nature enjoyed there at present and I would ask you to seriously reconsider because such an eyesore is hardly compatible with conservation. One of the great joys of walking along the beach from the pier to sandbanks is to enjoy the natural beauty with diverse flora and fauna and to feel the refreshing cooling winds sweeping down the chimes with their low rise discreet restaurants. Why spoil all that with a modern monstrosity? As an alternative I feel you should give serious consideration to a part of the beach that is screaming out for some investment. I have attended the beach polo for the last few years and the area around the car park has an odd collection of buildings that are ugly empty and underutilised. Given the popularity of the polo I do feel you are missing a fantastic opportunity by not capitalising on this fact by building modern facilities there that would enhance your own revenue and attract even more events. I really do hope you have a change of heart as you are about to destroy a part of Poole's heritage to the detriment of both humans and local flora and fauna.	Objection to Shore Road developments and overnight cabins. Blot on the landscape and loss of natural setting. However, at Sandbanks there is an opportunity to enhance the area and buildings close to the beach polo space.

Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment ID	Question 1 - The draft SPD provides an approach to planning for the future of the seafront. Please let us know your views on this approach.	Key Points
Mr Alexander Birch		234	<p>I have only recently been made aware of the proposed regeneration to the beachfront in Sandbanks. I think that the council has done a poor job of advertising this consultation. Were it not for extensive networking by concerned residents and residents associations I do not think anyone would have known about these proposals. I am a daily user of the beach and haven't heard or seen a thing from the council! As a resident of Chaddesley Wood Road I am particularly interested in the proposals at Shore Road. It is sad that Poole council seems to be trying to commercialise the beachfront. The vast majority visit the beach for its outstanding beauty. The beach is busy when sunny and not at other times and there is no demand for the type of facilities and buildings that are being proposed. The area is already well served by the Jazz Cafe and the Sandbanks Beach Club. Recently the Sandacres pub closed because of lack of demand! I do not believe that the Landmark building proposed for Shore Road in any way provides an appropriate balance of facilities to improve Poole's seafront. The building shown in the diagram in the plan as being 3 storey's high, could be up to 5 storey's, and would extend over the beach. This is totally excessive in terms of scale and bulk and would be completely out of character for the area. No other building extends on to the beach and this would therefore block the view of the beach in both directions. In fact the survey conducted by the council in March/April last year concluded that there is strong opposition to new landmark buildings, and concern about additional buildings and over-development in general. I am very concerned about the proposal at Shore Road for an additional 80 beach huts and overnight beach studios which will be up to 3 storey's high. This again would be completely out of character within the existing area. Overnight beach huts are currently against council policy and there has historically been a problem with antisocial behaviour around Shore Road during the evenings. It is worth noting that planning permission for additional beach huts near Shore Road was refused in February 2007 on the grounds that the proposal would result in significant harm to the character and visual appearance of a prominent site along the seafront. This proposal will result in the reduction of the visual and natural amenity of the cliff at this point. Therefore why is the council proposing additional beach huts in place of the natural banks and around the pathways and in front of the houses that it refused only a few years earlier? This area is also home to protected lizards and grass snakes. Finally, I am sad that the proposal is actually going to build on the much needed car park at Shore Road and thus reduce the number of spaces. Lack of parking spaces is one of the real problems of the area and a reduction will result in a direct reduction in visitors. Do we really want Sandbanks to resemble Blackpool or an overdeveloped Spanish resort - no we don't. Big schemes historically have been unsuccessful for example the Imax and the surf reef in Bournemouth. Please preserve the beauty of what is a natural place and not over-develop it for short-term gain and long-term regret. I therefore hope the council will reconsider these proposals.</p>	<p>Poor consultation. Over commercialisation of the beach and no need for additional facilities with existing premises struggling. Landmark building too big and overnight accommodation not favoured. Threat to wildlife and fauna.</p>
R Cant		196	<p>I have read the document regarding the above and should like to make the following broad comments: 1. Affordability of the facilities The enjoyment of the beach and the facilities should be affordable to all and not exclusively to those who can afford what could be expensive cafes, stores and the like due to high rents, council tax etc. For the same reasons is a boutique hotel appropriate? Sandbanks has a reputation as being an unspoilt family friendly resort and is one of the main attractions. 2. Car parking and road management There is already insufficient car parking and road congestion is critical at peak periods. The boutique hotel would take out 100 car spaces which would be difficult to replace in the immediate area. 3. Environment It is noted that great care will be made to protect the environment but there are several examples of developers destroying trees and no doubt vigilance will be paramount.</p>	<p>Affordability is key, so that beach is enjoyed by all. The Boutique hotel and expensive cafes may not achieve this. Already there is insufficient car parking, hotel would reduce further. The environment must be protected.</p>

Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment ID	Question 1 - The draft SPD provides an approach to planning for the future of the seafront. Please let us know your views on this approach.	Key Points
Mr Hall		233	<p>I have read the Draft SPS and do not think that it is a sensible approach to take. There is no financial assessment included to indicate whether the plan is financially viable and it relies on selling off public space to private enterprise which is not the best outcome for Poole. I list some comments below: The project team consisted of groups with a vested interest in property development...so they produced a property development based plan. It is very difficult to make money all year from the beach and easy to make poor decisions like the Imax, the surf reef etc. Poole as a whole has to attract investment, that in turn pays for the seafront. The assessment of the current seafront was wrong. For example Branksome Dean Chine is not the sports beach. The harbour is full of kite surfers and windsurfers, and when conditions are right for the sea they use the nearest car park which is often Sandbanks or Branksome if they can park. Most of the volley ball, slackline and beach rugby is at Sandbanks or Shore Road. Young people often go to Shore Road beach because of the volley ball and Sandacres Pub (now Tesco's). Families go wherever they can park (because they have lots of stuff to carry) and dog owners go to Branksome Dean where dogs are allowed on the beach. Many local people use the Community Hut at Branksome Dean and it clearly is extremely fit for purpose and a true asset to the community. On peak days the problem is access to the beach, and the solution is to provide more parking and better road access so buses and cars can access the beach. Bikes can always get to the beach. A hotel on Sandbanks car park is a loss of required parking and the loss of a space for beach events like polo and wind fest. Similarly the hotel at Branksome Dean would replace a community facility with an unrequired hotel. Some ways that revenue could be increased include: Get more revenue from the existing food outlets and kiosks. Benchmark kiosk sales against the Tesco. It is alleged that the new Tesco store outsells the beach outlets for coffee by a long way. The main Sandbanks Cafe could be more of a restaurant in the evenings. The kiosks cannot satisfy demand for hot food in the summer. Review the buses. The open top buses should charge a nominal fee for everyone. Currently fee paying passengers cannot get on because of OAP's and children having a ride because its free. Even the ferry becomes free if you are on the bus. With paying passengers it becomes viable to lay on more buses and routes. Make the Sandbanks Road seasonally tidal so there are 3 lanes on busy summer days (no cycle lane) and the car park queue does not mix with the ferry queue so you can then get to the roundabout to turn around and the buses can move. Don't make it more narrow with perpendicular parking. Consider temporary structures on the car park in the winter and summer. e.g. remove the kids play area for parking in the summer and reinstall it in the winter. The beach huts should be profitable and pay for their own maintenance. Look at making more money through higher occupancy. Do not sell them off and don't build designer ones that are expensive to maintain. Learn and copy successful ideas from other beach resorts. Temporary beach cafes, mobile icecream salesmen (maybe hot drinks are required more). Get cheaper solutions to the upkeep of toilets and the infrastructure i.e. less than 7 million.</p>	<p>Selling public space for private enterprise is not the way forward. Assessments of each beach area are not accurate. Hotels are not required. Ideas for increased revenue include: enhance existing kiosks, review bus service and fares, 3 lanes of traffic on Sandbanks Road in the summer, 2 in the winter to cope with seasonal changes, no perpendicular parking to obstruct flow, temporary structures on car park in the summer (e.g. kids play area), higher beach hut occupancy and provide easy to maintain ones, temporary beach cafes and mobile salesmen. Cheaper solutions required.</p>

Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment ID	Question 1 - The draft SPD provides an approach to planning for the future of the seafront. Please let us know your views on this approach.	Key Points
Miss Isobel Quinlivan		292	<p>I have read with concern the proposals put forward about the future of Poole's seafront. It is a great pity that these proposals were not made public long before this last week so that one could mull them over and comment more fully. My comments refer, in the main, to what is proposed for Branksome Dene Chine: Good idea to build more beach huts Amenities building - is suitable for the area - right height so does not impinge - attractive roof shape - fits into surroundings - could surely be updated inside Hotel - too big and tall - would involve too much 'footfall' and traffic could easily take over space which at present is available for the public - contract could be handed to someone who produces something totally unsuitable and sees it just as a money spinner - would need yet further amenities to make it palatable in winter Activities in trees - would have to be very carefully monitored - children could not be there on their own - could generate more noise - difficult for parents to control children if they are on the beach and want to go into the woods and therefore end up in different places - children unfortunately could not go there by themselves in this day and age - not good for the wildlife - area not big enough both to accommodate the human activities and maintain the peace and quiet Shops, restaurants, cafes, kiosks - in Branksome Dene these, if in any number, would completely ruin the beautiful, peaceful atmosphere - families come here because there are none of these things except the one small kiosk which does not impinge - not much needed generally except in high summer - simple beach cafes soon turn into expensive up-market ones which are not wanted by families on holiday or many local residents (cp the restaurant at Branksome Chine - used to be a lovely simple cafe serving well-cooked simple food which we and others visited regularly - now altered beyond measure and far too expensive and high-class for day to day living) Water sports - again could ruin peaceful, quiet atmosphere - these facilities are on offer in other places not too far away Improvement of facilities - for whom? - holiday makers come mainly in the month of August - what about the other eleven months of the year when local residents prefer it as it is? Visitors and holiday makers should not be the sole consideration - families with young children enjoy the uncrowded, unsophisticated and peaceful beach which would be in danger of being spoilt - elderly residents enjoy the peace and quiet afforded by the area. Poole is a beautiful place with lovely unspoilt beaches. Commercial interests could easily ruin the whole scene because in the long run that is what happens. Money talks.</p>	<p>Not enough earlier publicity. At B Dene Chine more beach huts supported but new building should be in scale of existing. Concern about the tree top trail for safety, quiet and wildlife. Watersports will bring noise. Small cafes required for locals all year round, not just seasonal facilities for tourists only.</p>
Miss Victoria Williams	Coach House Investment Managers Limited	183	<p>I have read with interest your consultation for the beach areas around Poole. My family have a property on Sandbanks which we have owned since about 1900. I have been coming to Sandbanks every summer and Winter for the last 40 years, my mother, grandfather and great grandfather before me. We love the place and I am interested with your proposals for change. I am in agreement with most of them. My only concern would be the additional 450 car parking spaces - I think that you are proposing them all to go along the harbour's edge (echelon style). What bothers me is the traffic. When it is a hot summer's day and everyone floods to the Bournemouth beaches it is almost impossible to get onto sandbanks and back to our house as it is - goodness knows what will happen with more provision for parking. It took me over 40 minutes to get from Canford Cliffs to Panorama Road this Thursday! Is there any way that you can sort out the traffic so that we do not have such enormous queues? I know a huge number of cars queue for the ferry - but those of us who just want to get home find it increasingly difficult. Please give this some serious thought before you go ahead and put hundreds more spaces on Sandbanks. The road network simply cannot take it.</p>	<p>Interested in the proposals but concerned about the traffic implications exacerbating the existing traffic congestion on the peninsula. This problem needs to be solved beforehand.</p>

Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment ID	Question 1 - The draft SPD provides an approach to planning for the future of the seafront. Please let us know your views on this approach.	Key Points
Miss Julia Palmer		278	<p>I have rented a beach hut at Shore Road for many years. When I was there yesterday there were 2 gentlemen measuring the block of huts that includes mine - number 118 to 128 Shore Road. We enquired why they were there and were told that they were costing for refurbishment or a re-build! I am concerned that we have not been informed of this as it could obviously have a huge impact on us. Are you going to inform the affected tenants of your plans? I have also heard that there is a possibility of adding a top layer of huts onto ours but this may depend on whether the land behind is a habitat for lizards? Over the years we have often seen lizards on the wall behind the huts and various other places, including the steps that lead to Chaddesly Glen. I believe that the council need to give serious consideration before spending on increasing the number of beach huts. In my opinion the annual rent is now out of reach of many of Poole's residents. Have the council done a study to look at the home location of the tenants? My guess is that the majority are rented by "richer" members of our area. The cost of renting our hut £1554.00 per annum (£30 a week) is a huge cost, and I am sure that this will increase substantially again next year? I have heard of several people who have been on the waiting list for many years and have been offered huts this year. I believe this is because there is probably now a quicker turnover as the "ordinary" Poole resident can no longer afford the cost and there will be an increasing number of tenants not renewing their licences. I would imagine that the beach huts are going to become more and more rented by the more affluent members of the Borough. There are always comments in the press that beach huts are so little used, the reason for this being that the "richer" tenants can afford to pay the extortionate rent without worrying about the fact that the ten times (as an example) that they visit the hut each year are costing them £150 per visit!! I am not sure what the answer is to make beach huts more affordable to the normal family, however, I strongly believe that if you looked at the facts now re. turnover that it would not be advisable to invest in building more huts as you are possibly in danger of struggling to rent them all on an annual basis. Also, I would imagine that the majority of beach huts are in desperate need of refurbishment and that there needs to be a huge spend on replacing the wooden doors - there is a limit to how often they can be repaired! Has the cost of this been factored in?</p>	<p>Beach huts - new or refurbished huts must not disturb lizards. Hut rentals now too expensive for ordinary people. No need for more huts. Cost of refurbishment needs to be considered.</p>
J D Bridgewater		194	<p>I have studied Poole Council's Planning Document for para. 6.2 Shore Road, and I can't believe what I see. Having lived in Poole for over 30 years, and having a beach hut in Section 21 for some 15 years, the impact on the local community both from a residents point of view, and that of visitors is absolutely beyond belief. To erect a possible 5 storey building on the beach front to destroy the peace and tranquillity of the very special site, destroy the neighbouring properties of their privacy - and their value. I can't believe what I see. In addition, car parking is reduced - instead of increased, and I would imagine in the winter the entire development will be a 'white elephant'. In conclusion, my vote is totally against the proposal and I have no doubt that if it goes ahead, it will suffer the same fate as the Bournemouth Imax Cinema - a total waste of local ratepayers money.</p>	<p>No support for the SPS and specific objection to buildings shown at Shore Road.</p>
Miss Margaret Bettley		197	<p>I learned about your proposed consultation from a neighbour and to my knowledge not many people know about it. I am writing to object to the major part of your ninety three page booklet, 'Sustaining Poole's Seafront', which apparently cost £60,000 to produce. I am concerned with my particular area. Change is not always for good. This is a small area and the beach is not very wide. To build anything in Shore Road car park is ridiculous, to reduce car parking is madness, and at times, even with the improvements, there is a noxious smell there. There has been so much building here the infrastructure has been overloaded and the roads have been left in a parlous state. If you re-align the car spaces the road will be more narrow and dangerous. When the weather is good and in holiday times the Sandbanks car queue causes congestion as far back as Lilliput. The plan to build a three storey building with a proviso to five storeys will turn this small beautiful beach area into IMAX 2. Do we really need more beach huts? Some are not even let. We already have 3 hotels in Sandbanks, what has happened to the hotel in Flaghead on Haven Road, which would be an asset, once refurbished, if it is viable. Your plans in my opinion would destroy the area if implemented, by all means improve the infrastructure of the toilets, maybe add a shower or two. Do not let this area become a cynical ploy for attracting greedy developers. I have spoken to many people and they feel your ideas will take away the beauty in the area. I have been informed that the National Trust want to keep the coastline free from development.</p>	<p>Reducing parking not supported. Infrastructure is already overloaded without adding to it. No need for more beach huts and enough hotels already. Other than provision of showers keep seafront as it is.</p>

Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment ID	Question 1 - The draft SPD provides an approach to planning for the future of the seafront. Please let us know your views on this approach.	Key Points
Mr Ian Paterson		268	I live on Cliff Drive, Canford Cliffs and fundamentally object to anything done above the Seafront, specifically any increase in Parking, Overnight Pods, New properties for Council Lease! More cars? Where is your green integrated local transport system? Where is your park & ride scheme? Where is your support of local habitat & environment? As regards the seafront I do not understand your business plan? Realistically visitors descend on Poole seafront for a maximum 60 days of the year, essentially when the weather is hot as per this summer, the best in 7 years by some way. For the rest of the year the beaches are empty and nothing the council does will change that human behaviour. Even on the hottest Bank Holiday this year 60% of existing beach huts were empty. I understand the waiting list for a beach hut is now less than a year after an annual price hike to circa £1800. This is your main revenue stream & you destroy that at your peril. Building 2 new hotels is probably great news for the local builders but suicide for existing hotels and probably for whoever is going to run the new ones. The Beehive has just put in planning to convert to 7 flats. I believe Harbour Heights is running at a loss. On the beach front some of the ideas have legs but others are an outrageous waste of my taxpayers money.	Do not support more parking, overnight pods, new properties. Need to support local habitat, integrated local transport scheme, park and ride. No need for new hotels. Beach huts are main revenue stream, current plans could diminish return.
J W Steevens		281	I live with a house overlooking Sandbanks and am horrified at your proposals set out in the attached flyer. This scheme should be dropped forthwith. The proposal to build a Dune Hotel in the car park is nonsense as the loss of car parking is a serious loss of amenities for summer visitors. The building will spoil an open area and Sandbanks is already served by three hotels so does not need a fourth one. Similarly the loss of 40 car spaces in Shore Road is not justified when there are other sites in the area for blocks of 40 flats which on the proposed site represents overdevelopment. Echelon parking on Banks Road should be considered on its merits due to the shortage of car parking at peak times and not be connected with any other proposals for development given the revenue generated by Sandbanks and its beach huts. A landmark building on Shore Road must rank as another IMAX especially up to five stories. Do the planners actively wish to destroy the beach environment which visitors and residents seek to enjoy? If you continue with such inappropriate development Bournemouth and Poole will lose their reputation as a major tourist destination and end up as just another seaside resort in decline. Similarly the addition of 80 beach huts falls into the same category and opens the door to sleeping on the beach front with attendant risks of rowdy parties, litter and vandalism.	Loss of parking would harm amenities for visitors. Shore Road building and Dune Hotel not supported. Echelon parking should be considered for peak times. Risk of ruining what the beach of Poole is famous for.
Mrs Julie Bailey		48	I must first take issue with the lack of publicity for this plan. Were it not for extensive networking by concerned residents and residents associations I do not think anyone outside the council would have heard of the plans. Large informative posters should have been put up all along the beach front and leaflets delivered to local residents. The plan Sustaining Pooles Seafront • covers our harbour, the entire seafront area from Sandbanks through to Branksome Dene including all the chines and the cliff top areas and leaves very little that is not affected in some way. Whilst I would agree that some modernising of facilities is necessary, I find the scale of the suggested proposals at Shore Road and Sandbanks quite alarming. The word "Sustaining" in the title appears to have been used inaccurately, perhaps "Developing Pooles Seafront" would have been more appropriate.	Lack of publicity. Agree with some modernising but scale of change is alarming.
Miss Hilary Hall		264	I note the proposed changes to the beachfront areas of Poole and whilst the proposal is very detailed, aspects of it are surprisingly disappointing; As a Poole resident we are having to adjust to having the street lights in our street switched off during the night in spite of our road having had several breakins so I do not understand why the promenade needs lighting. It would be a shame to remove the playground and crazy golf from Sandbanks car park. Do we really need more hotels when the existing ones are not full. The community room in Branksome Dene is a real treasure which is affordable and unique, it would be a shame to make it cost - prohibitive for locals to use by transforming it so much that its upkeep becomes too expensive. Surely there must be more cost-effective ways of updating the toilets. I appreciate the financial challenges that a seasonal resort brings but do not see how the proposal to increase hotels and eating places etc. will improve the income as when the weather is bad, people do not want to go to the beach (or Go-apes). Having undertaken several consultations in my role, it is shocking to see how poorly circulated the proposals have been with many Poole residents being completely unaware of its existence. Will there be an extension of the consultation period and an improved campaign to raise the public's awareness and get local engagement in deciding the future for our waterfront?	Existing hotels not full so no more needed. When street lights are being turned off why does the prom need lighting? Playground, crazy golf and community room should be kept. Poor weather will keep people away whatever the attraction. Poor public consultation.

Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment ID	Question 1 - The draft SPD provides an approach to planning for the future of the seafront. Please let us know your views on this approach.	Key Points
Mrs I G Cotterell		225	<p>I object to the generality of the policy proposals set out in it, and the apparent rationale behind them, to the extent that it is evident from the document. I set out in the attached appendix more detailed submissions relating to the principal points raised in the Draft SPD. The seafront and its environs is the most important environmental asset in the Borough. The SPD proposals seek to realise minor windfall development profits for the Council at the expense of the quality of the seafront environment. The long-term effect of intensifying existing uses, and additional commercialisation of the seafront, will be to degrade its attraction to visitors and its benefits to Poole residents. The approach as detailed in the Draft SPD is misconceived : the analysis and proposals indicate a short-term planning horizon, with an emphasis on commercialisation and windfall profit at the expense of the natural environment. The natural environment is the attribute that makes the seafront the Borough's most important environmental asset, not the commercial and infrastructure "facilities" that are imposed on it. If there is a perceived need for additional infrastructure or commercial uses in the Borough, these uses should be targeted towards those parts of the Borough that require regeneration.</p> <p>Commercialisation of the seafront will degrade its attraction to visitors and its benefits to residents.</p>	<p>Objection to the generality and rationale of SPS. Area will be degraded, environment is the asset not the facilities.</p>
Mr George Perrins		201	<p>I object to the proposal to build overnight beach pods in the woods/chine areas of Canford Cliffs and Branksome Chine. Such accommodation is entirely inappropriate to the area, would prove difficult to manage and would detract from the present pleasant sylvan setting enjoyed by both residents and visitors. Specifically there would be no way that the buildings could be built on the Canford Cliffs cliff top and chines as a covenant exists, enforceable by The Canford Cliffs Land Society Limited, which was imposed when the land was initially transferred into Council ownership which prevents any building. The Land Society, whom I represent, would need to give consent and this is unlikely. The same comment applies to the proposal for a dwelling adjacent to 24 Cliff Drive. Apart from the fact that this is in an area of extreme vulnerability to cliff instability it would be entirely detrimental to the open cliff area to construct a new dwelling. The covenants mentioned above would in any event prevent it. With regard to the building proposals for Sandbanks, although the Plan is unspecific in terms of design, you have to have regard to the clear restrictions imposed by the Poole Council Act 1986. The water taxi idea is ill conceived. The tidal nature of the waters would prevent this being viable and I cannot conceive that any operator would be interested in operating such a seasonal and weather dependent service. Sheer folly and not fully thought through. Generally the Plan is fundamentally flawed in that without additional parking and infrastructure there is simply no point in bringing additional visitors into the area which simply could not cope. Rather that spending resources on adding the facilities suggested by the Plan, simply manage what we have.</p>	<p>Object to overnight pods and building of a house off Cliff Drive, both contravene Canford Cliffs Land Society Ltd covenant, and cliff stability. At odds with Poole Borough Council Act 1986. Water taxi idea is ill conceived. Plan needs additional parking and infrastructure to work. Need to manage what we have and not spending more resources on providing more.</p>
Miss Janette Tams		210	<p>I object to these plans for the following reasons: The height of development proposals are not in keeping with surrounding area. Increasing the volume of traffic to this area which is already burdened with traffic and parking problems. Offering overnight beach-side studio accommodation is going to increase the existing problems with night-time partying and noise to this area. The double height beach huts would be better placed further down the beach where there are single storey currently with no houses behind them! As a former resident and on my monthly visits to Sandbanks areas to work, I feel that the area outside Jazz's cafe is already too noisy and attracts the type of person who is disrespectful and uncaring of the area, leaving litter; creating noise and nuisance. This proposal will add to that, generating a completely different experience for users of the beach. It is a great place, with the amenities of Jazz's cafe and Sandbanks Hotel and with the Lifeguards - why change something that already works well - spending resident's council tax payments upon unnecessary buildings?</p>	<p>Object - buildings too high, too much traffic, problems with overnight cabins. Already works well at Shore Road, proposals would increase problems of litter, noise, and nuisance.</p>

Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment ID	Question 1 - The draft SPD provides an approach to planning for the future of the seafront. Please let us know your views on this approach.	Key Points
Miss Isabelle de Caslou		220	I read with alarm the proposals contained in your document "Sustaining Poole's Seafront". As a regular visitor to Poole, my primary concerns relate to the proposals at section 6.2 Shore Road and most notably: The height of the proposed development which is not in keeping with the surrounding area. The double height beach huts will be out of scale and lead to a disproportionate loss of outlook and amenity. The new multi-storey cafe/bar/visitor centre will be visually extremely intrusive for visitors, local residents and businesses. The damage to the environment (particularly the grass bank between houses and beach huts) in search of commercial gain. The local area is already unable to cope with the number of cars so increasing teh volume of traffic whilst declining the available parking spaces, makes no sense. Surely it makes sense to either concentrate development to Sandbanks beach, where there is more scope for parking and less intrusion for existing occupiers, or else spreading usage more evenly along the promenade. Even the aspects of the plan that normally I would support seem poorly thought through e.g. a bicycle hire shop for a promenade where cycling is banned in teh summer! I trust you will rethink your proposals.	Shore Road proposals are not in keeping, both the new building and 2 storey huts. Development should be concentrated on Sandbanks or more evenly spread along seafront. Too many cars already.
Miss Jeanne Macaulay		219	I read with interest your proposals for Poole Seafront and Beaches and overall feel it is forward looking, attractive and thinking "outside the box". The main objection I have is the further reduction in parking spaces if the main aim is to attract more people to provide extra revenue. I estimate the BoP lost about 100 car-parking spaces along Shore Road and Banks Road when the cycle lane was installed. This has resulted in horrendous pressure on the existing spaces, especially at Sandbanks which is the main beach for tourists and events. To further reduce car-parking is a folly unless you wish to alienate the local residents (who pay your council tax). Several of my colleagues at work no longer go to the beaches in Poole as it is so difficult to park; and bus services, while fine to go to and from the beach during the day, do not run either to or from Sandbanks to Poole after 6pm which is no use for anyone wanting to enjoy an evening on the beach. You must think of disabled people (already rationed to 5 car spaces out of 550 at Sandbanks) and the elderly who are unable to walk the distances from the ancillary car-parks, plus families with young children who necessarily travel heavily laden. Unfortunately, life is not all about the young, fit and able bodied, wouldn't we all like to be like that? I know you are hoping to improve public transport but if the bus companies felt there was a profit in continuing the service later in the day, it would already be in place. One very contentious suggestion I have is to run a land train along the harbour edge from Sandbanks beach, in front of the properties that overlook the water, along Whitecliffe and Baiter to Poole Lifeboat Museum. If the average resident has to adjust their travelling habits, maybe the above average residents should also adjust. Locals and Tourists alike all expect to be able to park at or easily access advertised venues and people will stop coming if there is inadequate public transport or parking is either extortionately expensive or, you have to get there at the crack of dawn to secure a space My other cause for concern is that decking , especially on even a gradual slope, can become very slippery when wet and needs annual treatment to maintain the surface. I hope you have considered a special anti-slip treatment. If you could incorporate at least the existing car-parking facilities within the main plan, I would whole heartedly support your plan for the future.	SPS is forward thinking, attractive and thinking "outside the box". But the loss of parking (already) and poor, out of daytime hours, bus service will not attract people. Need to consider the disabled and elderly more. Decking proposals will be dangerous when wet. Suggest a land train around the Harbour. If existing parking were to be retained then there would be support for SPS.
Mr Mike Pearce		252	I realise it is tough to get the message across but I have only just found this document but even at this late hour thought it wise to profile feedback. Generally I agree that some thing needs to be done and suggest that the proposals are bold and positive, but there are a few areas where there is going to be major discord and I consider the design concepts to be out of keeping and fundamentally poor for some of the buildings. Sandbanks The idea that this area is prime land but underutilised is correct. There does not appear to be any village "feel" to the parade of shop(s) or to the beach as a whole. The cafe on the beach is poor in terms of design, (awful how this got approval I don't know as it could have been drawn by a first year design student and so an opportunity to enhance the location has merely ended up with a functional shell with the feel of a school cafeteria). The proposal to enhance this area with contemporary beach huts and good architectural design is a great opportunity, but I remain sceptical that the right design can be created if the existing seafront cafe is anything to go by. I do not agree that beach huts are the be all and end all of shore life, I would much rather have cafes and bars (and parking) than more and more regimented beach huts. I would like one myself but see many which are seldom used and would rather have a rotation of beach hut "ownership" and the provision of more fun and inclusive facilities rather than single use and limited occupancy huts. The loss of car park spaces is however, where the scheme falls down. Stating that street car parking will compensate is robbing Peter to pay Paul. Having drawn cycle lanes in the road and reduced	Bold and positive proposals but seriously flawed by lack of parking and poor, out of keeping, design concepts. More investment in cafes rather than beach huts or they will dominate. Sandbanks is already a bottle neck worsened by bike lanes, and this does not encourage people. Inadequate demand for more hotels. Unacceptably high building at Shore Road. Good idea to

Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment ID	Question 1 - The draft SPD provides an approach to planning for the future of the seafront. Please let us know your views on this approach.	Key Points
			<p>the number of car parking places the suggestion is that they be reintroduced to compensate the loss of about a third of the on grade car park just doesn't add up. A cycle way by the side of the footpath adjacent to the harbour would and should and even could be introduced. This would increase the available street parking immediately to what it was before it was changed. Parking is commented strongly within the document as a whole yet consistently there is less of a provision for cars. Cars, driven by tourists and locals, is how most of the people access the beaches. This will continue to be the case and seeing the congestion and chaos on a hot summers day it is difficult to consider any plan which seeks to reduce the provision. The peninsular chokes with cars and the car park was virtually full early in the morning. There is no point having additional facilities if tourist and locals cannot access it or find it so frustrating that they do not bother. I appreciate that there are not too many summers where the temperatures are so high but the reputation of the area should not be, it a great place but a nightmare to access and park. I therefore am strongly against any plan which seeks to reduce the number of car parking places from the presently low number. I am not aware of the demand for hotels in this spot, but would not be surprised if it was in demand if positioned well. Shore Road Again I have a specific issue with the suggestion to reduce the car parking provision. This car park provides access to your "accessible beach" I therefore fail to see the sense in reducing the number of available spaces. The reason people do access the beach at this point is because it does have a car park near by, if you take this away you risk taking away the footfall and therefore the love of this beach. The proposed 3 storey building on the prom at Shore Road is the worst I have seen for a long time, I suggest that it should be maximum of two levels but suggest a single storey building. The image is totally out of keeping, a slab on the beach. Enough said. The other offerings are fine, to commercialise the area is fine but it must be done well and this is not. The proposed cafe on the old Esso garage, is this not public land offered as grass in perpetuity, rather than a cafe? I consider a cafe to be a great idea and proposed one on the other side of the road with a great design, but as it was in the SSSI land it was not an option. I consider that careful thought about calming traffic here is required and still consider that not offering anything harbour side is a real gap in the strategy as it is this harbour beach which looks and feels forgotten and this strategy does nothing to address the needs of the kite and wind surfers which is far more of an activity beach than anything further along the beach. This is a fundamental flaw in the whole strategy document you are ignoring the needs of hundreds of water sport enthusiasts which create the iconic image of Poole. Flaghead I am not too sure what is proposed, a cafe where the present toilets are? A play area where there is a private beach hut and a steep slope and beach huts where there are already beach huts? Better access at the head of the chine, but with private land either side I am unsure how this can be achieved. Branksome Redeveloping the beach shop is a very good idea. The present cafe is constrained by the old design and is "stale" so a contemporary alternative will be very welcome. The reduction in the car park will be a nightmare as this is a well used and move loved small stopping point. The car park up Haven Road is hidden and at dusk a dark and poor walk to the beach. It is not well signposted and needs to be but is is not an alternative to the short stay Branksome car park. I need to log off now and may miss the rest, but consider your draft document to be a very good document which brings many issues to the fore. Excellent design will help ease queries but the lack of parking will create a ball and chain and bog the debate down, away from many of the great proposals which are contained within the document.</p>	<p>update shop at Branksome. Some good changes but should not be at expense of parking and access.</p>

Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment ID	Question 1 - The draft SPD provides an approach to planning for the future of the seafront. Please let us know your views on this approach.	Key Points
Mr Sam Harris		254	I recently heard about the council's plans for building close to beaches at Sandbanks and Canford Cliffs. As a child I spent much enjoyable time on these beaches and at the Pavilion. I have stayed nearby over many years in summer and winter. I understand that the public toilets need updating and some of the buildings need costly maintenance. I agree that changing rooms and lockers would be very useful. I like the idea of water taxis/buses and park-and-ride. A shuttle service to the beaches from inland areas might be good too. Some more budget cafes along the promenade would be popular, I think. But the new buildings proposed are quite awful, in design, situation and purpose. I think it a great mistake, and unfair on people who cannot afford to live or stay close to the beach, to reduce parking places. Building (high-priced) flats on the Shore Road car park will benefit the wealthy at the expense of the less wealthy, which is not right. The Banks Road street parking sounds a safety risk. The Shore Road Landmark Building would spoil all that is lovely about this neighbourhood: long views of the beach, low-key buildings different but harmonious, in traditional materials. It is brash and unpleasant. Glass is a harsh material, glaring and hard. A cafe extension is fine but not an obtrusive eyesore like this. Nor should it stick out beyond the promenade and block the views. The Sandbanks Pavilion area does not need a hotel. It is a popular recreation area with fine landscaping and enduring rock gardens. Creating a 'dune' landscape seems pointless and wasteful. The activities here are much used. I think the existing buildings should be converted or rebuilt, to 2 or 3 storeys only. The car park is very over-subscribed in school holidays. It makes no sense to reduce parking. The best thing about the beaches here is the amount of natural features remaining - woods, green cliffs, bats and lizards. Not much is spoilt, unlike Bournemouth's coast. The idea of lights in the chimes is a mistake. Light pollution is a problem already - there is no benefit in it. I am opposed to most of the ideas suggested, and hope the plans will be revised radically.	Some updating is required and lockers, changing rooms, shuttle buses and park and ride and budget cafes are good ideas. But new buildings are of poor design, situation and purpose. Loss of parking is not good. Greenery should be kept. No need for lighting.
Ashley Tatham		222	I strongly disagree with the proposals discussed in the documents. In general: They are blatantly commercial. They are an over-development of a beautiful area. Efforts should be focussed on maintaining and upgrading existing amenities which are very shabby. Efforts should be focussed on litter arrangements as this is increasingly a problem. There are already plenty of restaurants, shops, cafes and accommodation. The traffic infrastructure is already at maximum capacity (and recent improvements have only made this worse). Car parking is already at a premium and should not be reduced further. The birds and other wildlife, such as beach lizards, could be severely affected by the development proposal. Minor projects, such as parking, recently instigated by the council have not been successful. In particular: Sandbanks Beach The traffic is already gridlocked on most days in the summer and any increased amenity on this site would only make this worse. Any further development would spoil the character of this beautiful area. The multi-storey buildings would look like an eyesore. The demand for further accommodation is questionable as there is already plenty in the area. The car parking is at full capacity, in particular after recent changes to the parking system. Shore Road The multi-storey buildings would look like an eyesore The area is already congested This is a magical spot and is already fully developed Car parking is at a premium	Disagree with commercial overdevelopment of plans. No overnight accommodation, loss of parking, additional eateries, multi storey buildings. Need to focus on upgrading and reducing litter not new development.
Miss Beryl Fraser		195	I strongly object to your proposed plans for the multi-story cafe/bar restaurant/visitors centre at the end of Shore Road. Also the double height beach huts - an "oblique view" to the sea is un-acceptable!! You have already de-valued the properties in the area by announcing this ill-conceived plan. The car parking problem is already chaos for visitors and the stench of sewerage on Shore Road is extremely bad some days. Your plan will destroy wildlife in the area sand lizards in particular. There are dozens of reasons why this plan should not go ahead. Please think again! Remember the Bournemouth IMax fiasco!!!	Object. Too much height with Shore Road building and double level beach huts. Car parking already a problem and smell from sewage station here.
Mrs Bea Littlemore		41	I think some of the current proposals risk turning an area of outstanding natural beauty into a potential theme park and this greatly concerns me.	Risk of turning from beautiful area to potential theme park.
Mrs Lesley Stacey		29	I think the 3 storey building at Shore Road will be an eye sore. Does the Council not remember what has just happened to the I-Max. Can't something that's the same style and size as the current buildings be built? Also, the Council should not be agreeing to building more hotels on land that is put aside for parking when there are sites in Canford Cliffs that are already hotels/pubs where the land can be used, i.e. the New Beehive, a pub/hotel that wants to change usage for flats. I understood that accommodation could not be removed from the Poole area?	Shore Road building would be an eyesore. Existing vacant hotels so new ones shouldn't be built on car parks.

Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment ID	Question 1 - The draft SPD provides an approach to planning for the future of the seafront. Please let us know your views on this approach.	Key Points
Mrs Cary Wicks		163	I think the SDP on Sustaining Poole's Seafront has been clearly presented. It is good to be able to consider each of the seafront areas separately, and I understand this plan is an opportunity to explain the vision in broad terms, rather than in detail. I also understand that further work is required on various matters - including what the Borough would do first once a plan was adopted. My view is that following this consultation, a full strategic plan is adopted for the whole Poole Seafront and then the various phases planned accordingly. The Borough will have to make a decision on what to prioritise, but if the priorities are set based on the 3 main aims ('Conserve', 'Improve' & 'Invest'), then any work carried out would always be in accordance with the overall framework and the Borough shouldn't go far wrong. But take care... today's decision makers are the guardians of this beautiful natural environment and they must act responsibly, so that future generations can enjoy our precious beaches. They are the jewel in Dorset's crown and are what sets Poole apart from many other coastal towns. I would not like Poole Council to go down the route that Bournemouth Council took when they commissioned the building of their IMAX complex. It ended up never being used for the purpose for which it was built, became an eyesore to residents and visitors alike, and resulted in the Council having to pay millions to have it demolished. Whatever approach is taken, the Borough of Poole mustn't lose sight of what is important - to keep Poole a beautiful place - and to ensure that equal importance is given to the needs of residents as well as visitors.	Clearly presented document. Various phases with priorities should be planned once SPD adopted. Need to keep sight of keeping Poole beautiful and addressing residents and visitor's needs.
Mr Thomas Moore		269	I understand the motive of the Council to attempt to generate income from the Jewel in our Crown, but these ideas are spoiling and not enhancing our area. I do not support over commercialisation of the Sandbanks area. Several proposals set very bad precedents : Buildings projecting OVER the sand is detrimental to the beach scene. The road side kiosk cheapens the asset value of Sandbanks rather than enhancing it. Encouragement of overnight accommodation in beach side buildings brings its own problems and further strains on the infrastructure. Other proposals need more careful attention : Creation of diagonal parking on the road together with cycle lanes will create narrow traffic lanes on a major through road. The loss of the Community Hall at Branksome Dene must be avoided, but it would benefit from some upgrading of the existing facilities, possible with a restaurant but not accommodation. What we really need is enhancement of the area. Urgently required is safety improvements to the end of Shore Road as it becomes Chaddesley Wood Road. Many drivers use this area as a turnaround, after dropping people off for the beach, without understanding the joint use of the road by families with young children. Maybe speed humps or a chicane system could be introduced. Exploring "ride and bike" facilities could be a way forward. Great care needs to be exercised in modernising the seafront, as the attraction is the openness and beautiful vistas backed by dunes or cliffs. The natural dune landscape environment should dictate the height of buildings. Facilities need to be improved to encourage visitors all the year round.	Ideas spoil and do not enhance. Sandbanks would be over-commercialised. There should not be building over the sand. Road side kiosk, overnight accommodation, and diagonal parking is not favoured. Community room must be kept with a restaurant maybe. Health and safety issues with access to Shore Road. Investigating Park and Ride is favoured. Modernisation is required to provide all year round visits but not at the loss of openness and the beautiful beach vistas.
Mrs Marian Steele		158	I understand the need for the plans	Need for Plan is understood.
Mrs G Huntly		263	I understand there are plans to change the seafront of Poole, ie, demolish beach huts, improve toilet facilities, have shops and to build chalets with overnight accommodation. The seafront at Poole is a place of outstanding natural beauty and should be maintained as such. Visitors rhapsodize about it. I can see the need for updating the existing infrastructure (toilets, piping, renovation of existing beach huts etc.) but the idea that there should be shops and chalets with overnight accommodation is too awful to contemplate and is a retrograde step. Where will it end.	Improvements required but not with shops, chalets and overnight accommodation.

Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment ID	Question 1 - The draft SPD provides an approach to planning for the future of the seafront. Please let us know your views on this approach.	Key Points
Mr Walter Harris		243	<p>I want to comment on the proposals because although I live in London, I have stayed in Canford Cliffs and Sandbanks almost every year for 31 years, in all seasons, and have many in-laws living there. I believe that sending comments to the council has been made unnecessarily difficult and time consuming, because no email or postal address has been given specifically for the consultation. Not everyone has email, especially older people. Nor, I gather, have the proposals been at all well publicised locally. Overall, I find most of the proposals shocking; and potentially destructive of a uniquely beautiful and tranquil area. It is utterly wrong for the council to even consider most of these ideas. Several proposals would benefit only the better off, which is quite wrong. I absolutely oppose the proposed Landmark Building at Shore Road beach. It is ugly. The lovely view of the curving shore would be completely wrecked. The amount of glass would cause an unpleasant glare over a widearea. Any new cafe ought to blend in and not extend beyond the promenade. I also oppose the flats proposed for the car park, which would be visually obtrusive and remove much-needed parking. My grandmother-in-law donated this land to the council for use as a car park. The suggestion for street parking seems very unsafe for users and traffic. Similarly, I object to the Dune Boutique Hotel proposed for Sandbanks Beach. It is too big and obtrusive. I think any more building should convert/extend upwards existng buildings. The Pavilion area has lovely rock gardens which should be kept. The whole of the landscaping there is very visually attractive. Any development should respect the popularity of the play/leisure facilities there. Adult beach visitors would probably happily use buses if they ran oftener and later. The water taxis and Park and Ride ideas are good. Shuttle in-buses might be introduced from inland hotels to the beaches. But families and the disabled and elderly do need to come by car, and need all the existing parking. Better toilets, changing rooms and lockers would indeed be useful, but do not need sea views. More cafes, especially for snacks, would be welcome, but should not spoil the views, and should be in traditional building materials, and designed in keeping with surroundings. It sounds as though the council believes the beach should be self-financing. I strongly disagree. This would spoil it for everyone. People coming to the beach spend in many other locations in the borough: shops, accomodation, cafes, ferry and boat trips. Surely year-round parking brings in a good income? The beaches do belong to everyone. The council has a duty to preserve the views, the sand cliffs, the greenery, and the wildlife, for future and present users. I believe that with better ideas this can be achieved, but a much wider approach that includes the hinterland is required. I recommend a well-publicised invitation to members of the public, local businesses, services, voluntary groups and organisations, to send in suggestions for sustaining the seafront. The Echo newspaper might play a big part in this. It is only fair to involve the wider community in any changes to a public amenity. I hope the council takes my views into account. I have spent holidays in many countries and UK places, and this locality is amongst the best.</p>	<p>Proposals not well publicised. Landmark building is ugly and most of the proposals are shocking. Street parking would be unsafe. Dune Hotel is too big and obtrusive. Rockery and play area should be kept. Water taxi and park and ride are good ideas. Beaches are for everyone. The media can play a part in wider consultation.</p>
Mr John Martindale		69	<p>I welcome the opportunity for comment and consultation.</p>	<p>Consultation welcomed.</p>
Mrs Anna Castley		189	<p>I wish to object strongly to the proposed development at Sandbanks beach for various reasons as below: Parking is already totally inadequate at holiday time, high season and in good weather. The existing parking is used all the year by walkers, dog walkers and for the enjoyment of the beach and is usually full. Access for emergency vehicles is of great importance. Apart from Shore Road the nearest access is at the bottom of the Avenue - a considerable distance away. Building a large five storey construction at right angles to the beach would put countless beach/sea/beach hut/promenade users at risk unless vehicles could get underneath or through it. I query the legality of building over the beach. Frequently at high tide in bad weather the sea comes right up to the promenade wall. Access to the promenade is also needed for the coastguard, garbage lorries and council maintenance vehicles. The sand lizard, which is a protected species, is very evident among the Council-owned grass in front of the sea-front properties in Chaddesley Wood Road and also on the walls, gardens and patios. The sewage underground collection point in the Shore Road car park, although recently enlarged, is still extremely small, and yet more pressure on this facility cannot be a good idea. If the proposed new two/three storey beach huts/beach studios were moved a short distance towards Bournemouth, there would be no direct effect on any householder, as there are only cliffs behind the existing beach huts. I do sympathise with Poole's wish to generate some financial return from the many tourists who visit our area, but Shore Road simply cannot contain a flood of extra buildings, cafes, retail outlets, beach huts, restaurants etc., and the parking would be impossible.</p>	<p>Object to Sandbanks proposals. Parking already a problem and emergency access required all year round. No favour for building over the beach at Shore Road. Need to protect wildlife. Development should occur nearer Bournemouth and not at this part of the beach.</p>

Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment ID	Question 1 - The draft SPD provides an approach to planning for the future of the seafront. Please let us know your views on this approach.	Key Points
Mrs Frances Wheatley		216	<p>I wonder how many people have read the 90 page draft report on Sustaining Poole's Seafront? (Very few I should think) Including the: "Illustrative plans." Many big 'commercial' changes are being considered for Poole's beaches; for example at Sandbanks the plan is to demolish all the perfectly sound brick built beach huts and replace them with expensive 'studios' and inferior beach huts. Other plans are: Demolishing the beach office, a large complex that is only a couple of years old and took the whole of one summer and great expense to build! The idea is to build a beach cafe/bar in its place, then build another beach office near the pavilion! The existing cafe which is excellent will be demolished! Plus the popular crazy golf, for car parking! Is that marvellous play area being demolished as well? Replaced by: "All ages play space," whatever that is. Why on earth doesn't Poole council built a two floor multi storey car park instead? A hotel and dune wedding venue is visionised on the site of the first lot of demolished beach huts, resulting in a loss of prom along its front. This will mean having no proper access to the dog walking area and designated barbeque area. Will the beach in front of the hotel become a private or semi-private one? Would they want events like Sand Polo on 'their' beach? We've already got two hotels on this small peninsula. Surely that's enough? The studios (Pods) will most likely be far too expensive to buy or rent and if sleeping overnight is allowed and will be a costly security problem. The proposed back to back beach huts will be cramped with only the back of the other beach huts to look at! There will be a terrific amount of disruption for locals and holiday makers whilst all this wasteful destruction and building is going on. Will this be a 25 year noisy building site! The water taxi (harbour side) is a lovely idea in principle but it's no wonder that the pleasure boat owners are not interested, as the tides will be against them. Harbour arts cafe might be fun? Why don't they use this area as a land fill, like Holes Bay, then build a fun fair or a great theme park? This would make loads of money! One of the proposed parking spaces would mean levelling the wild life area, is this not protected? The whole top end of the car park will be taken up by, shops, apartments plaza and private parking! The idea of side parking along the road is crazy, as this will mean either getting rid of the cycle path or losing the limited amount of grass verges! Double parking by the entrance to Sandbanks is also ridiculous as people queue up behind these thinking they are waiting to get into the car park! That and the cycle path is the main reason why we have so many traffic jams there. I sincerely hope that they don't get rid of all that wonderful rockery and lovely walkways behind it. People have been complaining for many years about the toilets and inefficient taps. Apparently the sewage system and so on is very outdated and was not built to cope with so many buildings and people. This is going to cost a fortune to replace to accommodate all these new cafes hotel, shops and so on. I hope Poole rate payers won't be footing the bill! On the plan there is no mention of public toilets or public water taps. All people want is good sand and decent facilities. What is needed at Sandbanks, is better control of traffic, so there's no traffic jams in heat waves, weekends and Bank holidays, to prevent essential services getting through; also more car parking (multi story.) Better public transport and improved beach maintenance. This could all be paid for out parking fees and beach hut rents, 100% not 20% as it is at the moment.</p>	<p>Good beach huts are being replaced with studios and inferior huts at Sandbanks. Multi storey car park would be better than losing existing facilities to new parking areas. Loss of prom to Dune Hotel not favoured, and questionable need for Hotels. Echelon parking and new shops will add to congestion. Improvement and maintenance is needed and should be paid for from parking fees and beach hut rentals.</p>

Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment ID	Question 1 - The draft SPD provides an approach to planning for the future of the seafront. Please let us know your views on this approach.	Key Points
Mr & Mrs Mike & Debbie Hickmott		248	<p>I would comment on the proposals as follows: The creation of beach huts with accommodation for 'overnighting' would spoil the promenade, as there would be all the clutter spilling out onto the prom, and at night there would be noise and light pollution. It would set a precedent with other beach huts also being used for sleeping, and it would also create a need for parking by the occupants. It would change the relaxed atmosphere of the prom. Proposed Hotel/Shop/Apartments in existing car parks at Shore Road and the Sandbanks Pavilion. This would substantially reduce the available parking when the car is the likely to be major form of transport for families visiting the beach for foreseeable future. Creation of diagonal parking on the road together with cycle lanes will create dangerously narrow traffic lanes on a major through road, with current heavy bus and lorry traffic. The proposed 3/4 storey restaurant at the end of Shore Road extends over the beach, and will be detrimental to the existing beach scene, nearby hotel and adjoining houses. It will obliterate the wonderful vista of the Purbecks that you currently get when you approach the beach. Bournemouth have just demolished such a structure, the Imax, by the Pier! The creation of a Kiosk at the junction of Shore Road and Road will create a traffic hazard, spoil the vista across the harbour and is completely unnecessary. The loss of the Community Hall at Branksome Dene must be avoided, but it would benefit from some upgrading of the existing facilities, possible with a restaurant but not accommodation, which would use up valuable parking. The existing facilities do need up dating and the conversion of the existing kiosks into small cafes and restaurants would enhance the prom and merit consideration. Great care needs to be exercised in modernising the seafront, as the attraction is the openness and beautiful vistas backed by dunes or cliffs. The proposed development would overdevelop the seafront and could produce a concrete jungle reminiscent of past development of the Costas. This would not be attractive and with reduced parking would reduce its current attraction.</p>	<p>Noise, clutter, light pollution and precedent from overnight pods. Loss of parking and echelon arrangement at Sandbanks not favoured. Buildings at Shore Road (Kiosk and new café) would obliterate views. Community Room important to keep, maybe with a restaurant but not a hotel. Updating required and conversion of existing kiosks into small cafes would enhance the prom. Openness of the beach and the beautiful vistas should not be lost, current plan is overdevelopment.</p>
Miss Katherine Sheldon		260	<p>I would like to lodge my objection to some of the plans you have for the Poole beachfront. I think building a hotel at Sandbanks is a terrible idea. At the moment Sandbanks is a lovely area but the addition of a hotel will make it very cramped and crowded and overly commercial. My family get a lot of recreational pleasure from the crazy golf and playground when it's too cold to go on the beach. Please don't spoil it. I also strongly object to plans to turn the Branksome Dene Chine community hall into a hotel. It's a well used, attractive building which is in keeping with the landscape. The addition of Go Ape and a hotel to that area will put unbearable pressure on access and car parking. Please don't spoil our beautiful local beach. I think adding more beach huts to the landscape is a bad idea. There isn't room and the layout you're proposing sounds ugly. I acknowledge that there is a problem with a long waiting list for huts but building more wont solve that. The problem is that the majority are not used. I think the council should come up with a way to take huts away from people who don't use them and come down hard on people who have private rental arrangements. I think some of your ideas are good and will clearly make money for the future maintenance of the beach, but building hotels and selling land to Go Ape just provides a single injection of cash, keeps the local developers happy (which builds residents resentment towards the Council) and will make the midsummer traffic unbearable.</p>	<p>Hotel at Sandbanks would be cramped and overly commercial. Do not lose crazy golf and playground. Pressure on parking with Go Ape and Community Room. No more beach huts, they won't solve long waiting list. Some ideas for the seafront are good but not ones (like Hotel and Go Ape) that bring a single injection of cash.</p>
Mr Peter Marley-Shaw		68	<p>I write here as a member of one of the groups that opposed the proposed year long dog ban on Poole beaches in 2009. We submitted a petition with over 700 signatures, names & addresses of citizens opposed to the ban. We are alarmed to note that nowhere are mentioned in this 90+ page document are one of the major users of the beach, the dog walkers with their accompanying family & friends. In the Council's own Beach Users Consultation survey in 2008 54% of interviewees had dogs & they exercised them on Poole's beaches. 29% of households in the South West are dog owners. Please ensure your considerations for the next 25 years take into account the needs of these dog walkers who are the principal users of the beach outside the summer school holiday season. They should not be further marginalised into the existing "dog ghettos" of a few hundred yards at the far ends of Poole's beaches.</p>	<p>Dog walkers are the main users of the beach in the winter months, do not marginalise them.</p>

Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment ID	Question 1 - The draft SPD provides an approach to planning for the future of the seafront. Please let us know your views on this approach.	Key Points
Mr James Wilson		258	I'm a windsurfer and from my perspective maintain access from the car parks to the sea for windsurfing is paramount. The SPD refers to Branksome as the location where watersports will be encouraged and where most happen now. The latter point is not correct. Which beaches get used by windsurfers and kites is dependent on the wind direction and water state. When it's southerly then Sandbanks will be used, when the wind is south westerly (which is the predominant direction) then Branksome Dene or Branksome Dene Chine are where people windsurf from. At the moment the majority of windsurfing and kite surfing occurs from Branksome Dene Chine, i'd say approximately two thirds of windsurfer's sail from here with a third using Branksome. Branksome Dene Chine is used by local windsurfers and people who sail in the area a lot, with Branksome attracting more infrequent visitors to the area. Branksome Dene Chine is preferred as the waves break better in this area of the bay, the access to the water with kit is easier from the lower car park than at Branksome and there are no swimming lanes or lifeguards to constrain access onto the water. The upper part of the car park is used more by kite surfers who can carry there equipment easily up and down the stairs to the beach.	Need to secure access to the beach for windsurfers. Use depends on the weather/wind so difficult to dictate which beach typology is for windsurfers. Branksome Dene is more appropriate than Branksome Beach for this activity due to access, lack of swimming zone and lifeguard hut.
Mrs Alison Frawley		142	I'm pleased to see that members of the public have the opportunity to see the proposals in full and to put forward views.	Good to have opportunity to respond.
Mr A Gregg		253	In general I am impressed with the potential developments but have some reservations related to: 1. The provision of overnight studio huts; who will monitor the facilities and control the spread of overnight use to other huts, with the sanitary implications. Surely the provision of overnight huts is inconsistent with the sustainability of a beach Dune hotel. 2. Will the additional retail and catering outlets be self sustaining, given the variable length of the tourist season? Are the existing kiosks viable? 3. The cliff top parking at Flaghead-Canford Cliffs was restricted some years ago to relieve the stress on the cliff. With the freak weather extremes expected in future is it wise to add to the stresses on this section of the cliff? Is it wise to allow further development on the cliff side? 4. The preamble to this extensive document made much of the dilapidated toilet facilities that need updating or will be lost. They appear to have been lost anyway, I see no specific provision on any of the plans. 5. Presumably the water taxi will be privately operated, any landing jetty that the Council might build should be maintained from leasing/mooring fees. 6. Finally the Shore Road improvements imply a redevelopment of Jazz's Restaurant and kiosk. If it is funded by the Council who will stump up the compensation to the current operator, or is he funding the redevelopment? No costs are included in the plan. With decreasing civic revenues and pressures on services where will the funds be coming from, what services will be curtailed?	Generally impressed but concerned about overnight huts, viability of new outlets, parking in relation to cliff stability. Mooring fees should pay for water taxi jetty, where will funding come from and will existing operators be compensated if their businesses are lost?
Mr Philip Segelman		109	In general I am in agreement with the proposals other than those for Branksome Dene Chine. I would resist any change of use to the Community Room as I believe it is a unique and excellent facility for the community in general. Changing its use to a hotel would be detrimental. There are already sufficient hotels in the area, most of which are unprofitable. I believe with some forethought and minimum expense the existing community centre could be upgraded and additional decking installed to the front with a facility to cover the area with a temporary gazebo type construction to protect against the weather suitable for wedding/celebration use. The area is so unspoiled and I would suggest the only additions would be showers on the seafront to match those of Bournemouth. I would be against any development or removal of my beach hut number 115 on the small seafront terrace adjacent to the ice cream kiosk	Generally agree but not at Branksome Dene - hotel would be unprofitable and Community Room must stay and be upgraded. Showers are required and no loss of beach huts.
Miss Christine Kenton		30	In general keeping up to date and moving with the times is vital to maintaining the popularity of the seafront and it's benefit to the area. It is also important to combine development with keeping popular facilities.	Moving with the times is vital to maintain popularity and benefits.

Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment ID	Question 1 - The draft SPD provides an approach to planning for the future of the seafront. Please let us know your views on this approach.	Key Points
Mr Albert Jackson		107	<p>In my opinion the proposals represent an ill thought out assault on an area of outstanding natural beauty which forms part of the Jurassic Coast. There is unquestionably scope for increasing and improving the existing beach chalet provision including the maximisation of vacant areas which are ripe for development; but these proposals are overshadowed by the incursions proposed into those areas of natural beauty enjoyed by residents and visitors alike. My wife and I reside in Cliff Drive and the proposals for this area are of particular concern. The road is an area where visitors come to sit in the park-like tranquil surroundings and enjoy the spectacular views in peace and quiet. To destroy this by introducing diagonal parking in order to attract additional vehicular traffic would, in my opinion, be an act of folly. Cliff drive, as you know, has already suffered serious subsidence in the past; a warning notice is in place to this effect. As a result of this, specialist engineers had to be called in some years ago to strengthen the cliff face. The road was narrowed in this area for further protection. Any additional excavation work in the region would only serve to undermine this work. Whilst on the subject of excavation I must draw particular attention to the proposal to build a house on the area adjacent to No. 24 Clif Drive. This proposal is beyond comprehension. First of all, leaving aside the destruction of a popular amenity area, the site is extremely close to the cliff-top and just a few metres away from the re-inforced cliff area. In addition, the construction would necessitate the removal of long established trees which are subject to Tree Preservation Orders. The removal of these trees, which would have enormous root growth because of their age, would have a further destabilising effect on the area. Please publish these comments in all of your Consultation Documents in order that they may enjoy the maximum readership.</p>	<p>Proposals are ill thought out. Room for increasing number of chalets but not where natural beauty would be harmed. Strongly oppose parking and additional house off Cliff Drive due to cliff stability and tree issues.</p>
Mrs Jennifer Saunders		114	<p>In my opinion this is an overdevelopment of a sensitive site. What about the sand lizards and other species that will be displaced Are these to be forgotten.</p>	<p>Overdevelopment of a sensitive site.</p>
Mr David Wikramaratna		74	<p>In principle, long term planning is obviously an insightful and entirely sensible approach to take. However, given that I was only made aware of this consultation via word of mouth, the plan has barely been publicised to the public, which given the scope of the plans is entirely unacceptable. Wider awareness of the project through further publicity material would have allowed for more input from local residents, and hence result in greater satisfaction from the resulting project.</p>	<p>Long term planning is good but this document not publicised enough.</p>
Mrs Tracey Bethell		43	<p>in theory this is a clear, concise approach to the possibilities however most local residents have not heard about it and wont get the chance to comment resulting in a sense of under-handedness on the council's behalf. Why not display the draft in local libraries or do some leafletting?</p>	<p>Clear and concise approach but local residents unaware of it.</p>
Mr Brian Imms		259	<p>IS POOLE COUNCIL WASTING OUR MONEY? My attention has recently been drawn to a document entitled 'Borough of Poole Sustaining Poole's Seafront'. This document in 93 pages of overly verbose generalisation and often repeated assurances, largely conflicting with what is proposed and irrelevant photographs, one wonders if the consultants fees are being paid per page, it is a pity they did not set out their proposals in a clear and concise manner easily read and digested by all. If all the proposals are carried out it seems to me that it would change the entire nature of our well loved present seafront, much to the detriment of all the local residents. Included in the proposals are a major increase in the number of beach huts, are they needed, when many of the present huts are usually unoccupied even at peak times, and would they be financially viable? - they do not say, children's play spaces, more shops, kiosks and restaurants, beach hotels, car parking in current popular cliff top recreation areas, beach overnight cabins, beach changing rooms, storage space for small craft, training and teaching areas, a watersports building and a visitor centre, who would service and maintain all of these and pay for them? Do any of the present residents want all this, or does it provide any significant benefit to them, in my opinion it does not. To provide all these extra facilities would add huge amounts to the annual rates, or alternatively would require inviting extensive commercial development, neither of which are in anyway desirable. The greatest lunacy is a proposed new cliff top private dwelling on a small plot of land in Cliff Drive, on which at present there are mature trees. Do the tree preservation orders in Canford Cliffs not apply to the Council, or would they just ignore them? This would benefit only the eventual owner, but much to the detriment of all the many local inhabitants who regularly use this popular area for picnics and for sitting under the shade of the trees to admire the view. Whilst I would not be adverse to improvements to our seafront, in my view they should be carried out on a small and tasteful scale, and only after wide consultation and debate with the rate payers</p>	<p>Beach huts not required when so many unoccupied. Who would pay and service all the new facilities and are they wanted? House at Cliff Drive is not a good idea and conflicts with trees. Inadequate costings included, report too long. Plans should be small and tasteful in scale.</p>

Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment ID	Question 1 - The draft SPD provides an approach to planning for the future of the seafront. Please let us know your views on this approach.	Key Points
			with all the likely funding & maintenance costs and benefits explained in detail. In conclusion, this report is overly long, far too extensive in the scope of the proposals, which are entirely inappropriate for the area and completely lacking in clear and detailed explanation of the costs involved, how it will be funded and by whom, as a result I consider it to be a complete waste of ratepayers money.	
Mr David Stapleton		38	It hardly qualifies as public consultation when most residents are unaware of the proposal and those asked were possibly visitors with no vested interest and possibly no interest in returning.	If most residents are unaware it is not a public consultation.
Mrs Helen Turner		241	It has just come to my notice that there are plans to conserve, improve and invest in Poole's seafront. However I have been told that Poole Council intend to demolish the existing beach huts at Canford Cliffs and build chalets with overnight sleeping accommodation, plus shops and other recreational facilities. Whilst I agree that the existing infrastructure needs updating the idea that an area of such outstanding beauty should be exploited by excessive redevelopment of the seafront is horrendous. Overnight accommodation will completely change the environment. Poole seafront is a very special place for all age groups be they locals or visitors. One does not have to look far to see the consequences of an ill-thought out planning decision.	Existing infrastructure needs updating but the excessive redevelopment is horrendous. Overnight accommodation is not favoured.
Mr Geoff Allen		70	It is a good basis for discussion. However, I am greatly concerned that this consultation has not been widely publicised to the residents of Poole. We only found out about it by chance. It almost feels as if Poole Council didn't actually want opinions that might differ from its own views. Some of the proposals eg. loss of amenities enjoyed predominantly by Poole residents such as beach huts, would upset a large proportion of Poole residents if these proposals had been more widely publicised.	Good basis for discussion but not widely publicised and loss of amenities like beach huts not supported.
Mr Stephen Bailey		24	It is clear that the beach facilities have been under invested in for many years and I applaud the councils intention to upgrade these, however I believe the SPD is deeply flawed. Whilst the first part of the plan says all the right things e.g. "Sustaining Pooles Seafront, "Conserve the beautiful natural environment, "Invest in aging infrastructure, the second part of the plan appears to largely ignore these principles and go with: how do we raise the maximum amount of money from this commercial resource . This plan if carried out as written will become a drain on the councils resources with empty hotels, apartments and beach huts as visitors go elsewhere. I strongly suggest that the council learn the lessons of the Bournemouth lmax and the Boscombe Pods. However all is not lost, it can be improved and the worst excesses removed.	Applaud Councils intention to upgrade but initial principles are ignored in the commercial gain aim. Could be a drain on council resources with empty hotels, huts and apartments. Remove excesses and plan will improve.
Mrs Suzanna Harris		127	It is excessively weighted towards building and development, which seems poorly thought out, and generally inappropriate for this coast. The attractiveness of the coast comes from the natural features of its gentle curve, views of cliffs, woodland and low, greenery-covered sand cliffs. The ideas in the approach are not holistic, nor do they seem to have incorporated factual surveys of current beach-users through the seasons.	Weighted towards building and development and inappropriate for the coast. Attractiveness is from the natural features, approach is not holistic.
Mrs Nicky Chilcott		65	It is good to have long-term planning as long as we are careful and it is well thought out so we don't make any irreversible mistakes to this beautiful and well loved enviornment.	Good to long term plan but need to avoid irreversible mistakes to beautiful environment.
Mr Dennis Pedley		81	It is needed!	Needed

Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment ID	Question 1 - The draft SPD provides an approach to planning for the future of the seafront. Please let us know your views on this approach.	Key Points
Mr Andrew Reed		20	It is sensible to have a document to guide future development of the beach front and dividing it into sections with different characters is a reasonable approach as part of the wider vision. My comments are seen through the multiple lenses of a dog owner walking the beach at least weekly, beach hut user, and car driver. The proposed SPD sends mixed messages with regard to access. It endeavours to promote cycling while accepting that the predominant means of access is, and will, remain by car (enabling people to carry their screens, coolbags etc). The strategy says that it will maintain volume of car parking close to the beach while proposing a reduction from 97 to 56 spaces at Shore Road. The approach of trying to deliver improved bus transport by securing a "lifestyle brand " provider for what seems to be admitted to be a commercially unviable service, appears to be a little optimistic to say the least. Perhaps a council run park and ride would be more appropriate? As a policy document, areas seem to be too vague and seem likely to result in future "development-creep". It states that development at Shore Road would be limited to 3 storeys unless someone wants to build 4 or 5 storeys . At Branksome Dene Chine the hotel would only be 2 storeys, unless it was exceptional in which case it could be 3 storeys. It is inevitable that these higher figures would be the future baseline. The commercial emphasis behind the document is clear in Section 6.2 where it states that "additional height would be acceptable where this enable a better commercial operation".	Sensible approach. Mixed messages re access, i.e. promoting bike use but car remains dominate transport. Council park and ride may be better than unviable bus service. Risk of development creep where document too vague. Commercial emphasis is obvious.
Miss Julia Seibold		14	It is so refreshing to look at the fabulous ideas for a sustainable seafront. I could believe that some ideas will stir some complaints with people of a more traditional view to the present. But I would like to emphasise that we agree with the importance to revamp, modernise and invest into the out-of-date seafront. With the stunning scenery and beautiful views it will make a groundbreaking difference to see stylish buildings, high-quality restaurants and cafes, and in general a new approach. This very unique place deserves a huge investment and people with a vision. Well done everyone involved. Looking forward to any news up-date.	Fabulous ideas and new approach. Important to revamp, modernise and invest. Stylish building and high quality restaurants within new vision is welcomed.
Miss Barbara Andrews		49	It needs to be more widely publicised.	More publicity required.
Mrs Lynn Allen		66	It seems a money making scheme as far as I can see from the Sandbanks plan. The reason that people love Poole rather than B'mth is that B'mth is too commercialised, too crowded, too rowdy, too tacky. We don't want that at Sandbanks or, on the other hand just for the benefit of the rich.	Money making scheme for Sandbanks and the rich.

Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment ID	Question 1 - The draft SPD provides an approach to planning for the future of the seafront. Please let us know your views on this approach.	Key Points
Mrs Jillian Biggs		280	<p>Item 1 As far as I can gather from reading this, it is felt that overdevelopment should not be allowed, and the extraordinarily beautiful area should be maintained much as it is. I wholeheartedly agree. Item 2 Raising funds to maintain and improve the seafront will be difficult. You have few options if you are to keep the area as it is. However, I certainly think opportunities have been lost in the past, especially with regard to Beach Huts. Having read your Beach Hut Letting Policy Document it would appear that past mismanagement of Beach Hut lettings has resulted in a non return on this capital asset. The funds, lost over the years, would have contributed to the rebuilding and maintenance of these structures. A case in point is the Canford Cliffs seafront where only a single line of dilapidated huts now stand. These could have been made into double storey structures. There is also the question of the wooden huts situated down through the Chine - these are very seldom used. Whilst I appreciate they were built by the present leaseholders - the time has surely come for the Council to take them back into their control. New ones could be built and perhaps the density increased a little without losing the special ambience of the area. I read with dismay that existing Beach Hut tenants can sub-let. This should be stopped. Short term lets should be provided only by the Council. Keeping the minimum letting term to one week (maximum 2 weeks) rather than a daily basis would ease the problem of cleaning between lets, and provide much needed jobs for the area. The long term leases should be severely restricted, and properly paid for, with a maximum length of 5 years. Those coming to the end of a lease who wished for a beach hut could let from the Council, or go to the bottom of the waiting list for leases. Funds from short lets should only go to the Council, and not line the pockets of those already unfairly grabbing what is a public amenity and not paying the proper price for it. They are unfairly depriving other Poole residents of any use of the amenity, and depriving Poole Council of much needed funding. In effect Poole Council Tax payers are subsidising those with long leases. THE WHOLE BEACH HUT LETTING POLICY SHOULD BE REVIEWED AGAIN AND I CAN NOT UNDERSTAND HOW THE COUNCIL HAS ALLOWED THIS SITUATION TO CONTINUE. Also at Canford Cliffs there is a run down building between the toilets - not clear what this is used for. Could this not be knocked down, and rebuilt to include a cafe or similar - make it double storey and the upstairs could be let for parties and events all year round. Parking Charges: One of the serious problems in visiting Sandbanks is the lack of parking space. Whilst multi storey parking should be avoided, would it not be possible to build another layer above existing main car park. This could be concealed and made attractive by the use of bushes/plants etc. on the sides and roof. Parking along the cliff top is free at Canford Cliffs - why not including parking charges here and the surrounding roads. At times of peak use i.e. July/August why not commence a park and ride. There is a disused facility at Fleets Bridge, and a fleet of small frequent buses could operate from there during the Summer only. Hotel: I assume this would not be a feasible choice. Any Hotel built in such an expensive area would have to charge large sums in order to make it pay. This would only attract the wealthiest holiday makers, and our uncertain weather would mean that usage could not be guaranteed. What about a Hydro Pool or spa to include an exercise area, massage, beauty therapy etc. Council Tax: I assume this is high in comparison with out-of-area properties. If not, why not increase council tax for this highly desirable slice of real estate. Navitus Bay Wind Farm: I understand there will be no funds coming in to Poole Council with this project. What is to stop the Council approaching Crown Estates with their own tidal project involving the Harbour Entrance. The Queen has quite enough money - if ever this type of project gets off the ground then Poole should benefit financially. One last comment - cycling should be kept to a minimum along the front - they are an absolute nuisance, riding in groups far too fast. Old people and children are at risk. Also the question of dogs on the beach is another contentious issue. Dogs and beaches don't mix well.</p>	<p>Agree that overdevelopment should not be allowed and the beauty of the area maintained. Raising funds is difficult - beach huts should be examined more closely as a revenue stream and tenancy policy reviewed. There is space for double storey huts and a cafe at Canford Cliffs. Parking is a problem; multi storey should be avoided but maybe one additional layer at Sandbanks. Parking charges could be introduced elsewhere, like at Canford Cliffs. Hotels would only attract the wealthiest if they are to pay. More revenue from raising Council tax, Crown Estates or Navitus money maybe? Facilities like a hydro pool, spa or massage centre would be good. Cycling and dogs should be kept to a minimum.</p>
Mr John Sprackling		166	<p>Its essential to have long term plans for the seafront and beaches - but do we really need such an expensively produced document, with many photographs unrelated to Poole in earlier versions, which make the whole thing look like a hard sell rather than a genuine consultation.</p>	<p>Long term plans are necessary but document looks like a hard sell not genuine consultation.</p>
Mrs Xena Dion		1	<p>Its essential to have long term plans for the seafront and beaches - but isn't it a case of spending too much time on developing strategies, refreshing/updating them etc. before anything gets done?</p>	<p>Long term plans are necessary but too much time can be spent on developing strategies instead of getting things</p>

Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment ID	Question 1 - The draft SPD provides an approach to planning for the future of the seafront. Please let us know your views on this approach.	Key Points
				done.
Miss Suzie New		58	Its really important to plan ahead and prepare for the future in terms of making improvements and making the beaches and sea front secure for the future generations.	Important to plan improvements and make the future seafront secure.
Cllr May Haines	Borough of Poole	67	<p>More Restaurants This is an issue of traffic flow needs to be resolved prior to any further intensification retail and hospitality outlets being developed in the area. There is one road serving Sandbanks beach on a one-way system. Traffic often tails back to Evening Hill during peak season. This is frustrating for visitors, particularly so for day trippers. Visitors or indeed local residents will be put off going to venues situated in Sandbanks as has been demonstrated by the experience at the Royal Motor Yacht Club. On days where traffic is busy, the restaurant sees a noticeable drop in members dining at the restaurant. One has to bear in mind this road also serves as access to the Studland ferry which only adds to the traffic problems. The proposed flagship building on Shore Road promenade has raised significant concerns from nearby residents. The current arrangement with Jazzy's and the atrium building of Sandbanks Hotel serve as adequate landmark. The feature should be the seafront and not a building to detract from the main attraction of the blue flag beach. More Hotels/ Beach Pods There are currently two hotels in Sandbanks, with the Harbour Heights on the cusp of the area. There are a few smaller independent hotels in the Canford Cliffs Area. These establishments are finding it tough going and business has declined in recent years with no signs of picking up. To propose more hotels would spread the business even thinner and could cause some of the smaller hotels to close down. With reference to beach pods offering overnight stays, there are concerns that this could and would cause anti-social behavior, which the police have worked so hard in the past years to control. The sector that such accommodation would appeal to would be single, younger groups and not families. It must be noted that the proposed location of these pods are in close proximity to residential properties and any late night parties or noise form would impact on their living conditions. More Beach Huts - In principle this is a good idea. Thought should be given to offering some of these for sale on a freehold basis and perhaps installing electricity and water making them more attractive to buyers. An annual service charge of say £250 per year could be levied annually to maintain communal areas. This would generate some of the much needed funds. One particular location where more huts have been proposed along Shore Road (near Jazzy's) has been turned down for such development by planning previously due to the adverse impact construction would have to the cliff face. I would suggest that more thought be given into whether this is even viable to pursue. Water Taxis This is a good idea but there may be problems with getting permission from PHC to construct a jetty along the front. BoP may have to come to an agreement with one of the local yacht clubs to use their facilities. Traffic This has been alluded to under 'More Restaurants' section. This is a very real problem. Thought should be given to negotiating an increased bus service between July and August. A service such as a 'Route One' that collects from all the Beach car parks could be introduced. Improved signage to direct visitors to Beach Road and Pinecliff car park from Sandbanks Rd can be made. The sign along Sandbanks Rd which indicates Sandbanks Car park is full could be made to have flashing lights. Temporary brown signs could be put up with directions to alternate car parks. Branksome Beach Community Room This is a popular venue for local groups and individuals to use for celebrations or meetings. It would be a real shame to see this turned into a hotel. A better suggestion would be to improve the facilities there for example a small kitchen with a cooker, more electrical points and some shelves. The rent could be increased slightly to pay for these improvements. The car park could be used as a venue for a Christmas farmers market and the room could be rented out as a tea room for the duration. This could be used as a pop-up restaurant as well. If this was pursued there has to be conditions on opening hours such that there is no adverse noise impact to nearby neighbours. Car Parking I do not agree that selling off car park space in Shore Road or Sandbanks is acceptable. Presently, there is a struggle to find parking along this section and to take away spaces would turn potential visitors away. Another way to get more income is to hire out the car parks outside peak season for events such as markets or water sports road shows.</p>	<p>Traffic flow on Banks Road to Sandbanks needs to be resolved before any intensification of retail outlets. Adequate landmark building at Shore Road with Atrium and Jazzy's. Questionable viability for new hotels, and old. More beach huts (maybe some could be sold off?) but not overnight pods. Water taxi is a good idea but there may be operational problems. Parking and access to the beach is a real problem in the summer and better buses should be investigated. Community Room should be kept without the hotel. Area here could be used for Christmas markets. Car parking land should not be sold off.</p>

Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment ID	Question 1 - The draft SPD provides an approach to planning for the future of the seafront. Please let us know your views on this approach.	Key Points
Mr Jeremy Retford		99	<p>My comments relate to the elements of the SPD that deal with Sandbanks. This is an area that I have had family connections with for 50 years and I am a member of a yacht club there. I cannot disagree with the need for a coherent plan, but I do not think this is it. The levels of development proposed (hotel etc.) are too much for such a small area and seem poorly thought out from the point of view of practicality or financial viability. For example, the current hotels seem to struggle during the winter - you are adding more capacity. The car parks are always bursting in summer - you are reducing numbers of spaces. You appear to be creating artificial sand dunes - they will blow away, probably onto the cars. You are proposing a water taxi - it will not function for more than a few hours a day because Whitley lake is shallow and there is no channel. Are you suggesting that visitors will need to understand tide tables? The plan also ignores the current boat moorings and appears to remove vehicular access to North Haven Yacht Club.</p>	<p>Too much development proposed (e.g. Hotel) of questionable viability. No loss of parking or artificial dunes or water taxi (impractical).</p>
Mr Mike Wilson		242	<p>My immediate and general thoughts are that Poole Borough Council are seeking to implement too much change. The beauty and attraction of the area is self-evident and lie in its natural surrounds, notably, the beach; the sounds of the sea; the trees and the cliffs; the peace and tranquillity of the place. As the planning document states; "Poole's seafront is breathtaking, precious and much loved". Canford Cliffs and Sandbanks do not need a massive investment of the size and magnitude proposed and it should not be turned into an over-commercialised district. There is a clear risk that the planners are likely to do just this and will fail to ensure a "balance between buildings and open space (which) must be carefully controlled". I have resided in Bournemouth and Poole since 1968. I have observed the transformation of Sandbanks and Canford Cliffs (notably Shore Road and Chaddesley Wood Road) into the so called "millionaires playground" with some concern. Thus far, the Councillors of Poole have seemingly kept a close watch on how much development will be allowed and (by and large) it has been well controlled to the extent (arguably) that it has introduced wealth and prosperity into the area whilst maintaining its essential character as an unspoilt peaceful residence. The development proposed will change this (see below). I have spoken to some of the residents who live in the area, some of whom the Councils plans will affect. The feedback is balanced, but the prospect of the large-scale development proposed is generally regarded with scepticism. The overriding concern is that the area should not be "over-developed and unnecessarily commercialised". Whilst acknowledging that parts of the beach area (e.g. the beach huts near Jazzys and the toilets could be sympathetically developed, but not as proposed) in many other respects it should be left alone so that residents and visitors can enjoy the natural calm and beautiful landscape. In short, why try and fix something that is not in need of any significant repair? There is considerable concern that the Councillors will allow the planners and developers too much leeway and ruin the character of the area. The sceptre of another huge "blot" on a beautiful landscape arises. Comparisons are drawn with reference to those individuals within Bournemouth Borough Council who permitted the over development of the town's seafront with large, out of character, buildings and the "Imax Debacle"; a huge and costly mistake which resulted in many years of opposition from local residents, intensive lobbying; and criticism of the towns councillors and planning officials, before its very recent demolition. I (and others) have concerns that Poole Borough Council are about to embark on another "Imax Folly" despite what is said in the draft consultation document. If the Councillors and planners are sincere about retaining the essential character of the environment the extent of the development cannot proceed. I set out below some of my specific concerns, but before doing so I ask whoever is ultimately responsible for this project to think very carefully about it. Please consider the views of those who reside in the area; please reflect on its peacefulness, and the natural beauty and charm that already draws huge numbers of visitors; please ask yourself; does the area really need to undergo such an extensive and elaborate change? My specific comments are: Beach huts Many of the beach huts are extremely old and worn, but please be careful. New overnight accommodation, particularly the "beach studios", may well lead to noise, vandalism and other anti-social behaviour. This will deter other visitors and spoil the peaceful character of the seafront. Beach huts should be kept as day facilities, but should be smartened up. Creating night accommodation will lead to "all-night" beach parties and will blight the lives of local residents and place increased pressure on local services to clean up and deal with noise complaints. Please do not allow this. Construction Buildings, once constructed will remain for many years. Please consider very carefully the height of all construction, which must be in keeping. The Banks Road shops concern me as they will, inevitably, create a more commercial district at the end of a peninsular which really</p>	<p>Too much change. Need a balance between buildings and open spaces. Beach huts are old but need careful upkeep. Overnight pods will lead to problems like noise. Must not overdevelop and over commercialise. Beauty of the area is its simplicity, if buildings are too high they will be too prominent and detract from environment which area is famous for. Low rise only at Shore Road. Hotel is an interesting concept but is it required? Current congestion needs to be addressed. Additional cafes etc. could be over-provision, will create light pollution and will distort balance between buildings and environment. Would there be loss of greenery between huts and houses at Shore Road? There should be no extension onto beach/sand. Minor improvements requirements but rest should be left alone.</p>

Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment ID	Question 1 - The draft SPD provides an approach to planning for the future of the seafront. Please let us know your views on this approach.	Key Points
			<p>does not require it. The beauty of this area is its simplicity. Should improvements to the buildings in Shore Road be seen as a priority, who could possibly believe a building the height of that proposed in the promenade area is in keeping with the beauty of the landscape? Low rise improvements to the toilets and the area, I would accept as being necessary; architects would be able to create a smarter area of the promenade and the buildings in its vicinity without building upwards and creating an eyesore, which will lead to increased noise levels and unnecessary lighting. As for the residents of Chaddesley Wood, their views of the beach and the Purbecks will be significantly obscured. It cannot be right to take this away from them? Furthermore, the proposed new multi-storey caf�/restaurant/bar/visitor centre will be extremely intrusive for visitors, as well as local residents and businesses, especially from the visual aspect. Hotel The hotel proposed for the Sandbanks peninsular is an interesting concept. Modernising the area around the car park is a good idea as it is rather old fashioned; whether a hotel is the answer is a question that needs much more exploration. Poole and Bournemouth are over-run with hotels, why is the council considering another - are there not other options which could be considered? The beach at this point is so beautiful, there is a danger its natural beauty will be severely impacted by the construction of a hotel. Congestion/ Infrastructure The area is bound by finite boundaries and can only be accessed by one road which can be congested during the summer months; car parking is currently a problem. The increase in visitor numbers will place an increased burden on the roads and parking. I cannot see that this has been sufficiently addressed in the draft proposal. Restaurants and Bars Increasing the number of restaurants and bars will undoubtedly distort the balance between maintaining a quiet and peaceful environment and providing additional facilities. The area is already well served by Jazzys; The Sandbanks Hotel and other beach cafes and restaurants. There is often capacity in these. Additional bars and restaurants may well create an over-supply; and will lead to noise and light pollution. Grass Bank What will become of the grass bank between the houses and the beach huts? No mention is made of this in the plans? Will it be preserved? Promenade Extension The appeal of the beaches at the point where the existing promenade ends (at The Sandbanks Hotel) will be lost if there is any attempt to extend it onto the sand. It would lead to a loss of available beach space; will definitely take away the charm and natural beauty of the beach; worse, lead to nothing short of a kind of "sunset strip" with way too much and unnecessary infrastructure. I do consider that there is any case for extending the promenade onto the beach, or public buildings onto the promenade (or the beach). Summary This submission is not premised on the fact that I now live in the locality. Having been a resident of both Bournemouth and Poole for most of my life (and returning to the area after working away for several years) I do not want to see it blighted by over ambitious plans, well intentioned though they may be. The attraction to visitors is obvious; it is different to almost any other beach in the area (and the country); the scenery is "breathtakingly beautiful" (as the planning proposal quotes) and the appeal lies in the calm tranquillity, as I have said. By all means, please take some steps to enhance the somewhat tired and jaded parts. But these are only minor considerations that will cost only a fraction of the cost otherwise envisaged; in almost all other respects, please leave the area alone.</p>	

Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment ID	Question 1 - The draft SPD provides an approach to planning for the future of the seafront. Please let us know your views on this approach.	Key Points
Miss Hilary Cole		176	<p>My property backs onto Branksome Dene Chine and is within The Avenue Conservation Area. I welcome the prospect of improvement in the facilities provided on the seafront in general, and at Branksome Dene Chine in particular the suggestion that improvements are needed in both access and signage I have major concerns about several aspects of the draft SPD so far as they apply to Branksome Dene Chine. Many of the proposals in the SPD seem not to have taken account of the Land Management Strategy included in the Council's Seafront Beaches Strategy published in 2011, which highlighted the need to 'preserve and enhance the existing character, habitats and eco-systems' of the chines. In particular: the proposed replacement of the Community Room I do not accept that the Community Room is no longer fit for purpose and should be demolished. It is an attractive building in scale with its surroundings and is much valued by the community. Its facilities could, however, be substantially improved within its existing footprint by, for example, providing additional facilities in place of the existing public toilets since it is proposed that new public conveniences should be located on the seafront the proposed new 2-3 storey building would be totally out of scale with its surroundings and would substantially diminish, rather than enhance, the attractions of the Chine's existing character and woodland environment a hotel of the scale proposed would diminish the amount of public space, public parking and general public access to the Chine access to a hotel for service vehicles as well as guests would be problematic down a narrow access road a hotel and the traffic it creates would also generate noise, not only during the day but into the night and early morning, within what is a quiet residential area the need for parking provision for the hotel itself, including space for deliveries, would reduce the number of publicly-available parking spaces. This would then increase pressure on on-street parking in the immediate area which already causes difficulty in the summer, particularly on Pinewood Road with its bus route development of 13 new beach-huts/overnight studios such huts/studios would, like the proposed hotel, diminish the amount of public space in the Chine use of the huts/studios, and access to them, would generate noise into the night and early morning provision of a venue for music and performance events any performances would have to take account of what the SPD refers to as the intimacy of the space it would be inappropriate to generate noise into the evening in what is a residential area construction of a 'Go Ape' Experience in the Chine woodland the Chine is a fragile environment still in the process of recovering from the removal of the large amounts of non-native shrubs and extreme care is needed in order to sustain its status as an SNCI it is difficult to see how an 'adventure activity feature' is compatible with the aim of putting SNCI protection at the heart of proposals for the Chine there are already several well-constructed access paths through the Chine which offer views down into and across the woodland area widening the Chine access road the current access road is indeed narrow, but again it is difficult to envisage how it could be widened without severe damage to the woodland environment which is at the heart of the attraction of the Chine the damage would be particularly severe because the road is built for the most part on a narrow ridge and is closely hemmed in by mature trees widening would therefore be incompatible with protecting the SNCI status of this fragile eco-system</p>	<p>Welcome prospect of improvement. Community Room should not be demolished but improved as an attractive building. Building too high and loss of parking a concern. Go Ape not appropriate in fragile environment.</p>
Mr Brian Imms		229	<p>My wife and I are appalled by the proposal to build a house on the small plot of land opposite our flat for the following reasons: It is a very small area, but an area which is used regularly by elderly disabled or handicapped visitors, who are unable or unwilling to access the beach, they have picnics, sit and admire the views, and enjoy the sun. A house occupying this space would deny them this pleasure. It is also an area which I and my family have also used for 35 years to sit and enjoy the views on a nice summer day and evening, does this not give me any rights over this area? It would much obstruct the sea view from my lounge which my wife and I, our 4 children and grand children have enjoyed for many years. It would diminish the value of my flat should I wish to sell at any time. I would do all in my power, and I expect the other residents in the block will do the same, to obstruct and prevent such a development. As to the extensive proposals contained in this document, the case and benefits of the developments are wholly unclear, and are quite unnecessary and seem of no benefit and probably to the detriment of the local residents and should be scrapped without further debate. However, I am not against some smaller and more selective improvements. If they are presented in the future they should be made much clearer and in more detail for the average resident and be well publicised and offered for detailed explanation and debate by all in the local libraries and/or press. Much in contrast to this proposal which is inadequately shown, explained, published and far too large in scale and scope.</p>	<p>Object to house off Cliff Drive because of the loss of a public picnic area, and loss of views. Other proposals too large scale, more detail and publicity required.</p>

Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment ID	Question 1 - The draft SPD provides an approach to planning for the future of the seafront. Please let us know your views on this approach.	Key Points
Mr & Mrs John & Elizabeth Fordham		285	<p>My wife and I are opposed to the plans, and the Shore Road section in particular. You would expect us, as residents of Chaddesley Wood Road, which will be directly and materially adversely affected by the proposals, to be opposed to them. But there are other, much more general grounds for concern, including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. While the stated aim of the scheme is to increase the number of visitors to the area, there is no satisfactory explanation as to how the resultant further traffic congestion will be dealt with; indeed, in many areas, car parking provision will actually be reduced. Your own survey report, as recently as March/April last year, revealed that approximately 90% of visitors arrive by car; in my view, the road network already struggles to cope, and cannot support any more traffic at peak times. 2. Similarly, that survey showed strong opposition to new landmark buildings, and concern about additional buildings and over-development in general. Instead the preference was for making use of existing facilities, and enhancing the natural environment. I believe that the hotels described in the plans, and (in particular) the 3-5 storey building on the promenade at Shore Road, would not be in keeping with the character of the area, and would run the risk of deterring, rather than attracting visitors. 3. As a related point, new overnight accommodation, particularly the "beach studios", may well lead to noise, vandalism and other anti-social behaviour at late hours, which will deter other visitors and spoil the peaceful character of the sea front. Beach huts should be kept as day facilities. 4. I am not aware of a need for more commercial operations: yes, the cafes and the mini golf, to take two examples, are busy at peak times and in sunny weather, but for much of the year, in the Shore Road area, the Jazz Cafe and the Sandbanks Hotel are comparatively empty. I would worry how these businesses would survive with more competition, or how any potential operators of new facilities would be confident of achieving a satisfactory return. 5. I agree that in many areas along the front, the public facilities such as WC's and existing beach huts need investment and modernisation, both cosmetically and probably more fundamentally, to ensure that the infrastructure continues to function. I accept also that the Council's available capital for these purposes is restricted. However, refurbishment of the existing facilities could, as to a significant part, be funded by a sympathetic beach hut construction and sales/letting programme: I understand that there is currently a long waiting list for huts (does this mean that more rent could be achieved from existing huts?), and that new huts at Alum Chine appear to have been sold on relatively long leases by Bournemouth Council quite successfully a few years ago. There is ample room along the length of the Poole sea front to build new huts, rather than stacking them in large concentrations, and this would also spread the usage of the beach itself more evenly. 6. Despite mitigation measures, there is bound to be an adverse affect upon the natural environment as a result of this scheme, as well as upon the overall character of the area. It is hard to see how this can be justified in the pursuit of commercial gain, without it being absolutely clear that there are no other ways of funding essential infrastructure investment. The consultation paper in no way proves that case, in my view. Returning to my more local concerns, the proposals on the promenade at Shore Road, notably the double height beach huts and the multi-storey cafe/restaurant/bar/visitor centre, as well as being out of scale and inappropriate in their own right, would lead to a completely disproportionate loss of outlook and amenity. The paper refers to the properties in Chaddesley Wood Road retaining some "oblique views" to the sea, but this degree of intrusion is simply unjustifiable. I therefore hope that the Council will reconsider the plans. 	<p>Object - especially to Shore Road proposals. Additional traffic from extra visitors would exacerbate existing congestion. New buildings would detract and not enhance the environment. Chalets likely to lead to disturbance to currently peaceful area. Proposals would unfavourably compete with existing facilities. Sympathetic beach hut construction could lead to long leases or sales to raise revenue. Spread huts more evenly along the seafront rather than stacking in concentrated areas. There would inevitably be a negative effect upon the environment.</p>

Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment ID	Question 1 - The draft SPD provides an approach to planning for the future of the seafront. Please let us know your views on this approach.	Key Points
Miss Valerie Sheldon		226	<p>Of particular interest to me is the Canford Cliffs area and promenade, and a number of plans for extra beach front facilities are to be commended and would enhance the area's facilities. However I am alarmed by certain proposals and feel considerable more thought should be given before going ahead with any of the following: the folly of considering building a house on the cliff top near Flaghead! Does no one remember the cliff slide nearby which took out a number of beach huts below some 20-25 years ago? The cliff side could still be unstable, and surely digging into it for house foundations could cause further landslips? And it would take many, many years to get back in rental fees the outlay that would have to be expended on such a development. The trees on the cliff top by this site have preservation orders on them but they could be in danger from works access required to get to this site. Any further building along the cliff side would be to the detriment of the area. why despoil the natural beauty of the green grassland along Cliff Drive to make more ugly car parking spaces? It is only for about two months a year when the beaches are really busy that car parking is in demand, and then very often families like to stay on the grass on the cliff top for picnics and pleasure. For nine or ten months a year there is ample space to park for those who wish to come and walk along the cliff top paths, or bring their chairs to sit on the grass and enjoy the views and these lovely open spaces. the idea of beach pods in Canford Cliffs Chine is horrific. These are ancient, ecological pathways which need to be conserved - indeed I believe they are already in a conservation area. No overnight camping nor sleeping in cars is allowed on the cliff top roads, so why damage the steep leafy paths down the Chine to accommodate cars bringing the visitors and all their holiday gear. And what about electrics and water needed for living and hygiene? It would be an upheaval of greatest thoughtlessness and destruction to the natural surroundings of the Chine, and at untold expense which would take years to recuperate from the few summer months when they could be let out to visitors. There are already inadequate parking facilities at Shore Road and Sandbanks for the number of visitors wishing to bring their cars into these areas, so why propose building hotels/apartments on these areas which would restrict parking even further? Also it would be completely out of character to consider three story, or more, buildings on the seafront at any location. Remember the Bournemouth Imax debacle? Please do not detract from the wonderful cliff sides, the wide expanse of a sweeping sandy beach, good swimming, and uninterrupted sea views. which are the main reasons visitors flock to our area. This is just the area of our concern - I feel the whole Beach Plan needs careful reappraisal following public consultation, and not be just an optimistic but somewhat unreal vision for the future without thought for the consequences. The expense consigned to some parts of this project would take many, many years to recover from any additional income derived from extra tourism.</p>	<p>Some of the plans are commended and would enhance the seafront. A new house off Cliff Drive would threaten cliff stability and trees and loss of grass for parking would erode valued open space that offers sea views. Pods in the chine would erode character with the need for associated facilities and utilities. Buildings should not be 3 storeys because of visual intrusion. A less optimistic but more realistic appraisal should happen following public consultation.</p>
Mrs Penelope Samuel		146	<p>On the whole, I think it is well balanced & contains some imaginative ideas. I agree with improving the Community Room. This is our first year as beach hut owners & we are just across the path to the Room. It is so well used & a valuable local resource. As residents, we sometimes feel that we are overlooked in favour of tourists. This Room is perfectly located with easy access; excellent outdoor facilities as well as indoor accomodation if required. PLEASE DO NOT BUILD AN HOTEL ON THIS SITE. An hotel will not be in rate-payers interests and has limited year-round attraction. I am also concerned about the possibility of granting a music/performance licence. This would detract from the peace & quiet that is expected from this area. Proposed overnight accomodation needs careful thought regarding noise; toilet/washing facilities; litter. Next thing we will be having to look at people's washing hanging put to dry! I think the rope-adventure activity is a feasible idea & would make the woodland space more available. Not many visitors appear to use it at present or to know that it exists. Toilet facilities definitely need up-dating although I think the showers and other water taps are adequate at present.</p>	<p>Well balanced and imaginative ideas. The community room should not be replaced with an hotel, locals should not be less important that visitors, and a music license would bring disturbance. Overnight accommodation raises concerns around noise, litter, appearance of domestication. Rope adventure a good idea. Toilets do need updating.</p>
Mr & Mrs Christopher & Ruth Orme		90	<p>On this consultation we wholeheartedly support the comments made in the comprehensive document drawn up by Mr & Mrs Barry & Allison King of 20 Branksome Dene Road.</p>	<p>Support comments of Mr and Mrs King</p>
Mr Paul Denham		77	<p>Only 4 days to the close of consultation and I have just managed to find the documentation after online searches and finally, in desperation, a phone call to your planning department. Perhaps a more open awareness campaign, regarding such important long term changes could be considered, so realistic feedback on residents opinions could be gained. I dare to suggest there are many who don't and never will know until it is too late.</p>	<p>Poor consultation.</p>

Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment ID	Question 1 - The draft SPD provides an approach to planning for the future of the seafront. Please let us know your views on this approach.	Key Points
Mr David Segal		35	Over complicated and verbose, thus intellectually out of the reach of most residents, other than looking at the micro plans. The apparently one person forwards for each section, from a 2012 review, are leading and by no means agreed.	Overcomplicated and verbose.
Messrs Jon & John Gardiner & Challinor		224	Overall, the plans look reasonably encouraging to us. However, we have 2 main issues: 1. We would welcome fewer cars in the Canford Cliffs/Lower Parkstone/Sandbanks area overall. This is increasingly an issue for local residents who are endlessly seeing a handful of property developers 'bending or indeed flouting' planning regulations in order to develop plots (which previously housed a single dwelling) so that they house more than one dwelling and often flats. These new developments often do not have adequate and easy parking/garaging for both occupiers and visitors. This leads to both occupiers and visitors leaving their cars on the local streets/roads. There are many areas where this is becoming a nuisance and indeed potentially hazardous eg The crossroads of Compton Avenue with Lilliput Road -particularly in the evenings and at weekends. Thus, if we can also encourage the use of walking, cycling and use of public transport by making them more attractive to visitors to the area, we think this would help enormously in maintaining the natural beauty of the area. 2. The possibility of a 'Landmark Building' so near the beach in Shore Road is a major cause for concern. Placing 'boxy', large buildings near to the beach is never attractive - particularly in an area of such beauty in terms of the natural landscape. (As you point out, there is a building up on the cliff close by, which although contemporary, is designed in keeping with the landscape and the tall, pine tree which remains in front of it.) Some of the Spanish resorts have learned from their mistakes in this respect and we should certainly not repeat the costly mistake as evident in the Bournemouth Imax building. In our view, it is important that any planned building work near the seafront should be both attractive and low level.	Encouraging plans. Would encourage fewer cars to surrounding residential roads and more alternative modes of transport. The boxy landmark building shown at Shore Road is not favoured.
Mrs Helen Hughes		22	Planning is good as long as you do actually listen and act on people's views, even if these do not agree with the plans.	Good only if responses listened to and acted upon.
Miss Hilary Bailey		266	PLEASE 1. This area has already been turned into a concrete jungle - leave the beach alone! 2. There are far too many people using it already - don't bring in more. 3. Traffic is Horrendous, far worse now than ever before. 4. More attention should be given to park & ride (flat fare £1) and water taxi. 5. The litter generated by these millions of grockels is GHASTLY. More and better and fox/seagull - proof bins need to be provided, esp by the bus stop to Bournemouth at the ferry. 5a. The bins need to be emptied in the evenings not left to the mornings as litter is strewn everywhere by the wildlife. 5b. Use Community service offenders to do this. 6. I am really ashamed when visitors come from afar and can NOT find anywhere to park. 7. Building that Huge structure at Shore Rd would ruin the area. 8. Don't want a hotel by the Pavillion. 9. The wild areas where wildlife can flourish are minimal. Save the sand lizzards. 10. These proposals smack of pure money-grubbing greed as does the planning permission granted for all these huge mansions that are replacing normal houses that then don't sell and if they do the occupants are hardly ever in residence. There is no community spirit left in Sandbanks. THANK HEAVENS Shell Bay/Studland Heath etc belong to the National Trust - These areas are the only places that make living round here bearable.	Too many people using area already so leave it alone. Traffic is already horrendous and nowhere to park, look at park and ride and water taxi. Litter picking and animal proof bins required, could be emptied by those on community service. No to a hotel or large building at Shore Road. Protect wildlife and wild areas.

Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment ID	Question 1 - The draft SPD provides an approach to planning for the future of the seafront. Please let us know your views on this approach.	Key Points
Mrs Margaret Richardson		218	PLEASE don't touch Shore Road (apart from the toilets!) I have just spent some time looking at the plan for Poole Beaches and whilst I believe that some of the proposals are beautiful, I am writing to say please don't change Shore Road Beach into a huge commercial development - in fact don't change Shore Road at all! I regularly use the beaches in Poole and enjoy the diversity of the landscapes - the main Sandbanks beach for cafes and organised entertainment and Shore Road for just simply a quiet day on the beach. There are already plenty of low key facilities at Shore Road (particularly with the addition of the splendid new Tesco store), the beach is less crowded and the ambience completely different from the main Sandbanks Beach. The toilets are shocking and could do with a refurb but that is all. Also to consider losing car parking would be to the detriment of people enjoying this beach. I would welcome a completely dog free beach where I could take my children without fear of them being eaten or them eating something they shouldn't! Make that area Shore Road and it would be perfect. With regard to the increase in beach huts, there are two blocks of single storey beach huts a little further up the promenade (total of 21) which could be added to without any loss of amenity to any of the houses in Chaddesley Wood Road, and this increase would not impact on the already massively used area in the semi-circle just outside the present beach station.	Some of the proposals are beautiful but don't change Shore Road. Diversity along the seafront is good, and Shore Road enjoyed for being quieter than Sandbanks. There should be no loss of parking, toilets do need refurbishment and a completely dog free beach would be welcome. There is an area at Shore Road where additional beach huts could be provided without detriment to neighbours.
Mr & Mrs Barry & Allison King		104	Please see the third consultation box.	
Mr Edward Wilton		161	Poole Council will never get unanimous agreement on an approach to planning for the future of our seafront. There will always be differences of opinion on how our beautiful natural landscape should be preserved and maintained for future generations to enjoy. However, as a local resident I have the following major concerns on the 'approach' and 'SPD'.... The Approach: 1) The level of 'consultation': I question how extensive the initial 'Public Engagement of Spring 2012' was? It seems to have used a rather 'selective approach' to its sample base because local residents who may be directly impacted eg. those who live near proposed re-development and also existing beach hut owners for example have not been directly communicated with regarding the SPD proposals. The SPD has not been well distributed to local residents and visitors; limited information (leaflets) were available within the beach offices etc but there was very little local display boards, posters and no mention of any public exhibitions or workshops to for local people and holiday makers to engage with and provide feedback. It seems to have been 'controlled' so this landmark document can simply slip under the radar and move out of consultation stage and into planning as quickly as possible. 2) Timing - The material and information has been provided too late for many interested parties to offer their comments. 3.) Whilst the SPD acknowledges that "work is required on various matters including first phase of change" there seems to be no plan in place for this and really very little detail on how the concepts/ideas put forward would be realised. The SPD: 1.) Fundamentally flawed due to the simple fact that the 'Sustaining Poole's Seafront' (SPS) SPD states in section 5.0 that "implementation of the SPS would involve the comprehensive delivery of all other strategies" ie.) the Shoreline Management Plan (SMP) 2011 and the Landscape Management Strategy (LMS). Based on the information available, the objectives of the SMP and LMS are stated as "to help preserve and enhance the existing character, natural habitats and ecosystem whilst maintaining and evolving a busy tourist destination." It goes on to state that the "key objective (of the SPS) is the enhancement and conservation of the chines, sand dunes and beach eco systems, working with the SMPs to develop high quality habitat-rich environments". In my view, the majority of ideas in the draft SPD are at total odds with both the SMP and LMS, they do not enhance and conserve the natural environment but simply seem to want to destroy and over develop them.	Will never be unanimous agreement on future of the seafront. Was the 2012 consultation too selective and has the follow up consultation been poorly targeted and timed? Inadequate information provided on the implementation and phasing plan for the ideas, and proposals appear to be at odds with the policies in the SMP and LMS.

Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment ID	Question 1 - The draft SPD provides an approach to planning for the future of the seafront. Please let us know your views on this approach.	Key Points
Miss Michelle Gold		237	<p>Poole council's priority should be to conserve the unique charm and beauty of the Sandbanks/Canford Cliffs seafront; we were therefore horrified at the proposed overdevelopment of the seafront. The proposed planning even at three storeys is too high and out of keeping with the rest of the seafront. However, the beach huts, promenade and surround are in a very sad, dilapidated state. We probably have some of the ugliest, utilitarian beach huts in the UK, there is now an opportunity to replace the existing with a far more appealing build. If they [the huts] were more attractive the rental yields would be higher - a bonus for Poole Council and perhaps an accolade for the best huts in the UK! To allow overnight occupation is a dangerous precedent, encouraging late night revelry, unnecessary late noise and misuse, I am surprised you are even considering this. The promenade desperately needs a bike lane as cyclists ride silently, often at great speed, two/three or four abreast with pedestrians having to jump out of their path, especially dangerous for children and the elderly.</p>	<p>Overdevelopment. 3 storey development is too high. Utilitarian beach huts should be replaced with more appealing build so rents could be higher. Overnight accommodation is not favoured and a bike lane for the promenade would be supported.</p>
Mr Jonathan Vaughan		296	<p>Process I would like to initially comment on the process that appears, or lack of process that appears to have been followed with this consultation. Why has there been no publicity that this consultation is happening? Simple actions could easily have allowed the residents and visitors to the areas to be made aware of the consultation and therefore more able to provide appropriate and relevant feedback, actions such as; - A mail shot to all Resident Beach Parking Permit holders, would have directly targeted a frequent user group. - Notices at the key access points to inform people of the consultation and it's proposals. - Invitations to key local businesses that utilise the area for the economic benefits of the town, such as Water sports, to a meeting to provide specific feedback. These industries would also be able to provide good representation for other groups of frequent/high volume users. It would be very helpful if the reasons for not actively seeking the engagement of the public as opposed to the apparent passive approach were openly explained, perhaps through an open letter to the local media. Given the approach that has been taken and very limited engagement, I would suggest it is appropriate to extend this consultation allowing people appropriate time to review and discuss the proposals. Proposals There are a number of good proposals included and I will reference various items below; - More lighting on the promenade is a good idea although I would suggest that this is turned off at a fixed time to minimise light pollution and running costs. - Development of the Cafes and adding more is also a good idea, there is more that can be made from the area. Learning here from other parts of the world, allowing smaller indoors facilities with the scope to provide significant outdoors seating, allows for economical scale in the quieter periods with the scope to handle the busier periods and generates good atmosphere. - Reducing Car Parking is a bad idea. I live in the area, relatively close the seafront, but like all my friends we need to drive to the beach. Whether going for a windsurf/surf or other sport we need a car and when going down for a family day/visit to the beach there is too much to carry to enable us to use public transport or walk. All you will do if you reduce spaces is push more people to parking outside the nearby house, park unofficially causing disruption or choose alternative place to spend their time. - Branksome Dene Chine is a much loved part of the seafront that is used predominantly by people living locally. The limited signage and off the beaten track location make it more accessible on the nicer days of summer. As such significant development of this area would only reduce the benefit to the resident population, the idea taking out already limited parking to build a hotel there is horrifying as is filling the car park with people want to climb trees and not enjoy the seafront. There are hotels being converted flats all of the area, lets protect a few of these before blighting such a beautiful and lovely part of the area. Unfortunately due to my late awareness of this consultation I have not been able to review further, as I mentioned above an extension on the consultant would allow far greater and more considered public views.</p>	<p>Insufficient consultation publicity so period should be extended. Good proposals include more lighting on prom at limited times, more cafes, smaller indoor facilities with outdoor seating. Reducing parking is not a good idea, and not replaced by an hotel.</p>

Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment ID	Question 1 - The draft SPD provides an approach to planning for the future of the seafront. Please let us know your views on this approach.	Key Points
Mrs Gillian Birch		209	PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AT SHORE ROAD, SANDBANKS We have spent many Winter's and Summer's staying in the Shore Road area of Sandbanks. We understand that a major new development is being planned which causes our family concern as: The infrastructure of the area which is already at breaking point, will be unable to cope with a major new development. Access for security and emergency incidents will be insufficient. Car parking is already at a premium. It is impossible to understand how the area will be able to take further parking. The proposed height of the proposal is totally out of keeping with the area and most unsuitable. This project is vandalism at it's worst. The Sandbanks area is world renown as an area of exceptional beauty. This project will change this. The proposed cost is ridiculously high. How will it be funded? There are so many more important projects in the Poole area which are crying out for funds. The season is July and August and the occasional sunny day. The remainder of the year, the area is extremely quiet. It does NOT warrant such a proposal. We accept that the area maybe in need of a refurbishment and an upgrade. This proposal is preposterous by any standard. Please discontinue wasting valuable council funds on such a hair brained scheme.	Infrastructure at breaking point and unable to cope with major new development. Parking and access are problems and the height of buildings would be out of keeping with the area. Costs are too high and other projects should be of higher priority.
Miss Tessa Berridge		200	Re: The Proposed development at the end of Shore Road (bordering on to the Promenade). We beg the Council to take heed of the ugly examples of re-development in some of our most beautiful coastal resorts. Sandbanks is unique simply because of the wonderful position and the scenery. PLEASE PLEASE keep the architecture of this particular position to a low characterful building for toilets and offices for our greatly admired Rescue Services.	Proposed buildings are considered ugly and should be kept low and characterful.
Mr & Mrs A J & J M Pulman		245	Response to the SPD Framework 6.1 Sandbanks Beach Having spoken to local residents and colleagues at work including Dr Phil Sterling, Natural Environment Manager at Dorset County Council, as Poole residents and regular beach visitors to Sandbanks, we have grave concerns about the "Dune Landscape" proposal/consultation currently being made. These are the concerns that we wish to raise: The proximity of heathland 5 minutes across the Sandbanks ferry Increased disturbance which would be caused by increased footfall from the proposed linking of the harbour/beach, of the much valued inter-tidal harbour area which is used by migrating/wading birds Rapid urbanisation in the proximity of and along the margins of a beautiful, natural shoreline Wind tunnel effect on the beach/dunes caused by new and larger buildings Erosion of the current dune system caused by increased footfall - irrespective of additional walkways built (the construction of which will also be detrimental to this fragile habitat) Increase in regular road traffic/jams and hold ups due to proposed nature of "angled" parking along the road and a decrease in car parking spaces. Local residents of Poole will have less chance of accessing the beach - especially at peak times - if increased overnight visitors are staying in/parking in the area. There will be increased beach litter/marine litter as a consequence of more staying visitors ie more bbqs and debris from these on the beach. And to finish, the much valued local character of the immediate area will be altered beyond all recognition.	Dune landscape proposals and urbanisation with increased footfall would disturb heathland at nearby Shell Bay, wind tunnel effect from the larger buildings, erosion of dunes, traffic jams and loss of parking. Also access to the beach would be harder and overnight visitors would bring more litter and BBQs. Local character would be harmed.
Mr Robert Lister		40	Sadly the Architects did not consult with any of the Residents Groups connected with the beaches and areas. So much of the ideas are just a wish list from someone in Southampton talking to a few holiday makers! There are some good ideas but not that warrented BoP spending in excess of £60,000 to get!	Residents Groups not consulted.

Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment ID	Question 1 - The draft SPD provides an approach to planning for the future of the seafront. Please let us know your views on this approach.	Key Points
Mr Peter Wadham		288	<p>SANDBANKS AREA The proposed Boutique Hotel & other proposed studios & commercial units with the loss of 100 car parking spaces should NEVER be allowed. The need for more, not less, parking is painfully obvious to see, not only during the summer, but all year round for the ever increasing water sports enthusiasts & families for the beaches from dawn to dusk by residents & visitors. The loss of parking revenues alone must be a consideration to the council! SHORE ROAD The 4 or 5 storey complex will be an eyesore & a blot on the skyline. We do recognise the need for more beach huts where there are available spaces but not higher than 2 storeys. Here again, you wish to reduce the number of parking spaces by 41 to make way for private housing development, also needing their own spaces making even more reductions in public ones. This is nonsensical in this very congested & popular social area. Restaurants & Bars are already in existence, so why more if the public is denied adequate access by this further lack of parking. We had SIMPSONS FOLLY , your LANDMARK BUILDING will be called SIMPLETON'S FOLLY. BANKS ROAD Extra Chevron parking here - are you MAD??? This road is SO BUSY. You're heading for additional chaos & Road Rage a-plenty. Traffic piling up in both directions behind drivers trying to park & leave the spaces with bad visibility & many lacking reversing skills! You have spent Thousands of pounds on cycle tracks to improve safety, so where are the cyclists going to be safe? FLAGHEAD Hooray for some common sense to retain its character! Proposed Cafe at the bottom of the Chine. It looks as if the site is behind the public toilets high on the steeply rising land. I understand this belongs to the Dorset Health Authority and not Council property. "All ages play space" There is no reasonable space for this without encroaching on the Promenade, which must be preserved for general use. CLIFF DRIVE Proposed private house on the cliff edge is inappropriate because of the loss of public amenity at this beautiful spot, & close proximity to a cliff edge with stability concerns. Parking is in place along Cliff Drive & use of the grass verges is not allowed. If you encroach onto these not only will this splendid amenity be lost but also more weight will be distributed closer to this fragile cliff edge. The road has had a weight restriction for vehicles for some time to guard against further slippage of this cliff. The Esplanade already has parking, in part, on both sides. The very valuable Park land must never be encroached upon. Green spaces must be preserved for generations to come. Provision of some unloading areas is a very good idea especially for families & water sport enthusiasts. It appears to us that the Boutique Hotel and additional apartments are going to have very limited use over a 12 month period, and designed for the more affluent in society and these ideas seem to be only catering for the "ELITE". We have so many properties in the area that are used for 2 or 3 weeks a year, which proves our point.</p>	<p>Commercial development at Sandbanks should not be allowed, and there should be no loss of parking or echelon parking. Shore Road complex would be an eyesore. More beach huts are required but not higher than 2 storeys. Play area at Flaghead should not take up prom space. At Cliff Drive an additional dwelling and extra parking would destabilise the cliff and incur loss of green areas, though a dropping off area is a good idea. Boutique Hotel and apartments would cater for the elite and would not be all year round use.</p>
Miss Priscilla Timoney		92	<p>Sandbanks beach is a beautiful unspoilt beach. Improvements to the public toilets is greatly needed as is a visitor centre to promote all in the local area. I believe more higher buildings & shops would only cause more heavy traffic & are not needed. What would happen to our local shops & cafe's?? They would go out of business! We should support what we have got now!</p>	<p>Support current facilities and upgrade toilets, but new buildings would bring more heavy traffic to the area.</p>
Mr David Wicks		162	<p>Sensible to have a co-ordinated approach. However, this tries to do too much and is not affordable without considerable commercial finance which would undoubtedly create a conflict with the need to maintain the uniqueness of our coastline. There is no real attempt to consider the needs and preferences of residents rather than visitors - and both need to be considered. One of the early photos is of a lone deck chair, but there seems no place for enjoyment of peace and quiet in your plan. A Go-Ape experience sounds a waste of this area. This could be built away from the seafront and be just as good for potential users, without clogging up a beach orientated area. There seems to conceptual link - it is out of place. Diagonal parking looks great on a plan, but would create increased hazards for drivers, cyclists and pedestrians. The consultation process has been haphazard and, judging by the many people I have come across who were unaware of it, will not reach a wide enough audience. You give no indication of how you will publicise the outcomes or how we can be assured the results are presented in an unbiased way. You should feel an obligation to treat responders and other residents fairly. (I may be suspicious, but the earlier engagement appears from the quotes given to be wholly supportive - is this really indicative of the outcome?) Also, asking three questions on a 90-odd page proposal does not seem to be a serious attempt to obtain a rounded view from responders.</p>	<p>Co-ordinated approach is sensible but Plan tries to do too much and not affordable. No space in Plan for quiet enjoyment and caters for visitors more than residents. Go Ape not appropriate and road hazard from diagonal parking. Poor consultation before and now.</p>

Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment ID	Question 1 - The draft SPD provides an approach to planning for the future of the seafront. Please let us know your views on this approach.	Key Points
Mr Brent Horder		128	some ideas are good but many are not practical. It seems the approach is asking the wrong people.	Some good ideas but not all practical.
Mrs Joanna Walker		97	Some of the ideas look interesting, however other ideas have clearly not been fully thought through. Before any increase in the volume of traffic is accomodated, there needs to be a full review of the traffic. Congestion from the full car park and ferry queue which can back up beyond Lilliput makes getting near Sandbanks on a sunny day a long journey. We have just enjoyed a good summer but there are many other months in the year when eating outside in the rain on wooden decking would not be appealing.	Some good ideas but traffic congestion needs to be sorted out first and some proposals wont work out of season.
Mr Richard Stephens		103	Sounds wonderful on paper, but during this period of economic restraint I can foresee only some minor upgrades taking place as opposed to large scale re-construction works. Start improving the important things like toilets and catering facilities first.	Improve toilets and catering first whilst economic recession recovers and we can undertake large scale works.
Miss Pat Ingram		135	Thank you for consulting the public on this important issue. My view is that the policy is expressed in rather "woolly" language which suggests that it has not been thought through sufficiently. For example, it refers to limiting development to three-storeys, and then immediately offers "wriggle room" by suggesting that it could be four or five storeys.	Woolly language, and unclear whether 3 storey is maximum as indicated, or can increase to 4 or 5.
Miss Nicky Hoar	Conservation Officer (Urban & East) Dorset Wildlife Trust	236	Thank you for inviting us to comment on this document. Dorset Wildlife Trust is concerned to protect and enhance the biodiversity of the seafront, in particular the Sites of Nature Conservation Interest (SNCIs) at Sandbanks, Flaghead Chine and Branksome Cliffs. Paragraph 117 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012) states that "policies should ; Promote the preservation, restoration and re-creation of priority habitats, ecological networks and the protection and recovery of priority species populations, linked to national and local targets, and identify suitable indicators for monitoring biodiversity in the plan" . Paragraph 27 of the National Planning Policy Framework makes further reference to the protection of SNCIs; "To minimise impacts on biodiversity and geodiversity, planning policies should: Identify and map components of the local ecological networks, including the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites of importance for biodiversity, wildlife corridors and stepping stones that connect them and areas identified by local partnerships for habitat restoration or creation". In order to comply with the NPPF, we would make the following recommendations: Section 6.1 (page 39) includes proposed planting around the dunes at Sandbanks. Any planting here should be planned and undertaken with caution, following advice from Natural England and under the supervision of an ecologist due to the fragile and vulnerable nature of the dune habitat. This section also includes a new hotel development (page 40). Any building development should not be sited on the Sandbanks SNCI, which is an example of dune and acid grassland habitats, listed as UK priority Habitats under Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act (NERC) 2006. Similarly, any building development should avoid Flaghead Chine SNCI, which is an example of heathland, acid and neutral grassland and dune habitat, and Branksome Cliffs SNCI, which is an example of heathland; all of these are listed as UK priority Habitats under Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act (NERC) 2006. We also recommend that development should avoid reducing the effectiveness of the undeveloped areas of seafront, which act as a refuge and corridor for wildlife in addition to the SNCIs. Gardens are important wildlife corridors and development that could fragment wildlife habitats by cutting off access between gardens and other habitat should be avoided.	Planting in the sand dunes should be undertaken with caution and with an ecologist to protect vulnerable nature of dunes. No development on SNCI site at Sandbanks. Recommend that development should ensure the retention of the undeveloped areas that act as corridors for wildlife.
Mr David Stuart	Historic Places Advisor English Heritage	231	Thank you for your consultation on this draft document. It has the potential to add positively to the impressive suite of policy documents informed by Poole's distinctive historic character which are intended to provide an integrated and comprehensive framework setting out the area's future agenda. As a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) this initiative will need to demonstrate conformity with both the statutory provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and your authority's own adopted Core Strategy. It will also need to show consistency and compatibility with other statutory and non-statutory documents which have been used and adopted by your authority to provide evidence and direction as far as this part of Poole is concerned. Of primary importance to us is that the area covered by the proposed SPD is sufficiently informed by an understanding of its heritage significance and that the document sets out proposals to	Plan is a positive step with potential to positively add to Poole's policies. Plan should be more explicit about the historic environment defining the area's distinctiveness, e.g. Conservation Areas. Needs greater explanation

Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment ID	Question 1 - The draft SPD provides an approach to planning for the future of the seafront. Please let us know your views on this approach.	Key Points
			<p>enhance or better reveal that significance in accordance with Chapter 12 of the NPPF on the Historic Environment. This is imperative is reinforced by policy PCS 23 of the Core Strategy on local distinctiveness and your authority's Heritage Assets Local List Draft SPD. Within the document, section 3.5 (P11) confirms that "the seafront and its beaches are environmentally and historically sensitive, helping to shape Poole's character". However, we are concerned by the absence of more explicit reference to the role played by the area's historic environment in defining that distinctiveness, especially given the statutory requirement to do so. This is pointedly illustrated by the omission of any reference to the (conservation and enhancement of the) area's historic environment in the three aims set out at the beginning of the document. Within the overall area there are designated heritage assets in the form of the Sandbanks, Beach Road and Canford Cliffs conservation areas. While these are identified and referenced as sources, there is limited reference to their significance and how this has specifically informed the proposals. Other, undesignated, but locally important heritage assets clearly exist; Page 8 of the document draws (passing) attention to the "quality architecture" and the "stock of heritage assets worth keeping". The Branksome Beach Café, referred to in section 6.5 (P67), is included in the Heritage Assets Local List, for example, and the Sandbanks Pavilion is proposed as an addition. An understanding of the significance of these and other relevant heritage assets is therefore important before identifying proposals which affect them. We appreciate that the exercise to produce a strategy for the seafront is challenging and mechanisms need to be identified for funding enhancements which also add interest and value to the area's distinctive qualities. We also appreciate that development may be desirable to generate enhanced income streams which can be used to improve infrastructure and other aspects of the area. But it is not clear whether some of the development opportunities identified are effectively "enabling development" scenarios. Given that the prevailing character of the area is one of natural landscape with incidental built features, conceptual images (eg pp 38, 39, 50, 62, 70, & 74) show concentrations of development which raise the question of whether the landscape may in some (key) locations become unduly subordinate to a new urban presence. There is obviously a balance to be struck between objectives for the area but this needs to be part of an informed decision making process which, on a pre-emptive basis, can ultimately satisfy the statutory requirements of the planning process as and when individual consents are required. It is therefore important to ensure that further beach huts in any area, for example, or increasing their height, will not inadvertently cause harm to heritage assets. In this respect, responses by your authority to our Conservation Areas At Risk survey has already identified the inappropriateness of some new beach huts in the Beach Road Conservation Area. And section 6.4 of the SPD (P59) confirms that the quaint, mostly single storey, timber beach huts at Canford Cliffs beach "provide an intimate, small scale family feel to the area, recognised in its conservation area status". The determination of the significance of heritage assets should also take account of their setting, with, in the case of the conservation areas, particular attention given to views into and out of them. This might mean that consideration should be given to conservation areas outside the study area, such as Harbour Heights. Our guidance on Setting is not included in the schedule of references in the document and we would strongly advocate its use (http://www.english-heritage.org.uk/publications/setting-heritage-assets/). The enhancement of the area could give thought to not only how regime improvement and profile uplift could directly address the physical qualities of relevant heritage assets within it but also those outside upon which overall success may to some extent depend. The Sandbanks Conservation Area is At Risk on our national Heritage At Risk Register and there may be scope for generating synergy and cross-fertilisation of interest and activity whereby both areas experience mutual benefit and added value. This further highlights the need to consider any initiative as part of a broader, integrated approach rather than as an isolated area in a vacuum. Overall, we believe that the document represents a positive step in recognising the value to Poole of this distinctive area and establishing a basis for its improvement. At the same time we also believe that the document could identify and celebrate the area's heritage more explicitly, and use this more effectively to reinforce its USP and underpin a strategy for its sustainable future.</p>	<p>and understanding of the heritage assets. Appreciate the need and aim of Strategy but unclear whether the landscape would become subordinate to new urban presence in some places. Further beach huts must not harm heritage assets, e.g. by increasing heights. Should also have regard to heritage assets outside the area (e.g. Harbour Heights) and the affect Strategy would have on them. Plan is an opportunity to add value and benefit Conservation Areas identified as "At Risk" like Sandbanks. Plan could identify and celebrate the area's heritage more explicitly.</p>

Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment ID	Question 1 - The draft SPD provides an approach to planning for the future of the seafront. Please let us know your views on this approach.	Key Points
Mr Bruce Grant-Braham	Chairman Poole Tourism Management Board	186	Thank you for your very informative presentation to the Poole Tourism Management Board on 17 July. Poole's beaches are highlighted as one of the town's primary tourism assets within the 'Tourism Strategy for Poole 2006-2015', so it is positive news that the Council still sees our stunning beaches as hugely important, and is planning ahead for their long term sustainable future. The Board welcomes the work that has been undertaken to develop this consultation document and supported the guiding principals of quality, natural environment and sustainable connections. There was also general support to the broad general direction of the proposals being put forward, including becoming more commercially orientated. The feeling was though that this commercialism should be kept in check and sensitively managed so as that the natural beauty of the environment is not sacrificed. There was also clear support to developing the use of the beaches area outside of the main summer season and making them year round destinations. There was also clear recognition from the Board that the infrastructure along our seafront needs urgent attention and as such the proposed developments will enable this to be planned and delivered. The financial position of the Council was made very clear, so the need for private sector investment is essential. The Board had hoped to see far greater emphasis on the water taxi element at Sandbanks and would like to see some form of berthing point incorporated onto the beach side, as opposed to the inner harbour. It was stated that owing to the tides this inner harbour area is dry for much of the day so would be totally inappropriate. There was also a request that the Sandbanks area be included within the broadband development currently taking place in Dorset. There is no broadband provision at present and any commercial investors will expect this as a minimum. Our hotel representative also raised the question of viability regarding the proposed small hotel at Sandbanks. Staying visitor traffic is largely seasonal so may not be able to produce the necessary returns needed to support such investment.	It is positive that the beaches are being planned into a long term sustainable future. Support principles and direction of being more commercially orientated but with sensible management. Support all year round use, and water taxi on Sandbanks side if this can be incorporated. Infrastructure does need attention. Broadband connection required for commercial investors. Viability of new hotels is questioned.
Miss Jacqueline James-Bryan		126	The amenities along the seafront certainly need a major facelift. Decrepit buildings (the loos and art deco building at Canford Cliffs) need a major overhaul and showers should be installed along the beach. Also the taps need to be higher. Why does one have to crouch down in order to get water?	Amenities need an overhaul and showers are required and higher taps.
Dr Alan Fisher		151	The approach is reasonable	Reasonable approach.
Miss Lindsay Etherington		25	The approach itself is reasonable, however the details of the plan are not, the reasons for which I give below	Reasonable approach but not details.
Mrs Allyson Bailey		141	The approach of "planning for the future" advertised by media, word of mouth, billboarded in appropriate sites for perusal was..... oh no, should have been praised but heh..... it was NON EXISTENT. How could such a big project not be advertised to your town people, beach hut owners, non council owned hotel and food retailers. I imagine that the money allotted to drawing up such a proposal all goes in the pocket of some employee rather than the true research needed for a consultation of the people and the advertising. You loaded your Proposal with such wonderful useless pictures that are irrelevant to the proposal. Not constructive therefore making people worn before they get to Page 33 for the real nitty gritty. Your Upload is enormous and its hard to stay focussed on each small proposal that you cant make sense of it.	Poor consultation and document too long.
Mr & Mrs Braham		121	The approach proposed by the SPD are overstretched and clearly does not aim to sustain Poole's beaches but rather to support those wishing to profit from them. It needs to be clearly identified what the cost of the essential infrastructure improvements will be and therefore the level of further development needed to support this cost. If the essential infrastructure really is just toilets and drainage as stated, then a far lower level of development is needed to support this.	Cost of infrastructure improvements needs to be stated so that an assessment of the level of new work can be calculated.
Mr Russell Merry		131	The approach seems well thought through and provides clear information.	Approach well thought through, clear information.
Mr Clive Andrewes		37	The approach to conultlation is to be welcomed and there is sufficient detail to allow informed comment.	Approach welcomed, sufficient detail to allow informed comment.
Mrs Irene Pemberton		56	The area purposed around Sandbanks pavilion looks more in line with Blackpool.	Sandbanks looks more like Blackpool.

Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment ID	Question 1 - The draft SPD provides an approach to planning for the future of the seafront. Please let us know your views on this approach.	Key Points
Mr Sean O'Kelly		149	The beach is renowned for its natural beauty Any development must take into account the fact that areas surrounding the beach are residential The surrounding road networks are already under pressure and parking availability limited Branksome Dene Beach 'Woodland-by-the-Sea' 'The most easterly chine in Poole, this is an enclosed bowl with the Community Room building sitting above the promenade and car park.' Why destroy this when there are numerous managed music or performance facilities in the Poole/Bournemouth vicinity. Squeezing another into a wooded area surrounded by housing does not seem a practical proposal. Additional parking is not easily available and traffic management would be a major problem without completely overriding local resident concerns. A Boutique hotel with underground parking could work. There are walkways through the Dene. Creating a rope walkway at the back of residents houses is unnecessary and probably an additional security risk to householders. Development of community facilities would be welcomed Constructing additional kiosks along the beach area seems pointless. The existing kiosks are usually closed outside the summer season.	Must take account of surrounding residential areas. Road network already under pressure. Performance venue and rope adventure course are not supported. A boutique hotel with underground parking could work and the development of community facilities are welcomed. No additional kiosks required.
Mrs Alison Layton		157	The beauty of Poole's sea front is its simplicity - just good family fun open to all without all the cheap commercialism that goes with other well known sea fronts. The current beach hut revenue should fund the toilet facilities and general maintenance. Where does the money actually go? The choice of beaches depends on individual tastes. Sandbanks is a lot busier and more commercialised where as further along Flaghead and Canford Cliffs are a lot quieter and this is the way they should stay. So any big hotel etc investment should be confined to Sandbanks area.	Beauty of Poole's beach is the simplicity, without cheap commercialism. Beach hut revenue should fund maintenance. Flaghead and Canford Cliffs should remain quiet, so any hotel should be confined to Sandbanks.
Mr Andy Ramsbottom	Harbour Engineer's Department Poole Harbour Commissioners	235	The Commissioners have no particular comments on the document, and are generally supportive of the objectives. However a reference to the Poole Harbour Aquatic Management Plan would be useful and the proposals need to be compatible with that document, eg page 28 where wind and kite surfing area shown is incompatible with the existing mooring layout and environmental designation.	Generally supportive of objectives. Reference to the Poole Harbour Aquatic Management Plan would be useful. Kite and windsurfing is incompatible with mooring layout and environmental designation.
Mr Chris Lee		164	The core aspect of this consultation is whether a 3 storey building is appropriate for Sandbanks carpark. The impact to the natural beauty of the area would be too great to justify the income it provides. In short, this would become Poole's IMAX. The planning committee must learn from others mistakes.	The impact of a 3 storey building on Sandbanks would be too great to justify income raised.
Mr David Lack		63	The council has rightly identified the need to update certain facilities, ie toilet blocks, water supply and showers have been mentioned. Beyond that any proposal of commercialisation (excepting small cafes such as existing) is a bad idea and will destroy the natural appeal. The suggestion of increasing visitor traffic without adequate parking facilities will not work as you first must make the facility visitor friendly. Having an army of car park wardens issuing fines is a sure fire way of discouraging visitors. Short term parking and drop off points - at no charge - would be a helpful and sensible consideration towards easing traffic congestion.	Rightly identified need to upgrade. Commercialisation beyond small cafes will destroy natural appeal. More parking needs to accompany increased visitor traffic. Short term parking and drop off points suggested to help ease congestion.
Miss Nicola Bailey		177	The draft appears to be very biased towards the commercial aspects and bringing visitors to the area, rather than conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of Poole's seafront and improving the experience for the residents and more local people, who may use the beaches all year round, and preserving our heritage for future generations.	Biased towards commercial aspects and bringing visitors to the area, rather than all year round local needs.

Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment ID	Question 1 - The draft SPD provides an approach to planning for the future of the seafront. Please let us know your views on this approach.	Key Points
Mr Francis David Hudson		86	The draft is ill considered and ignores, infact, strives to destroy the natural beauty of the area.	Plan is ill conceived and will destroy natural beauty.
Bloomfield		154	The draft proposal appears to be about destroying the local area for cash. It gives no thought to preserving the natural beauty of our beaches. Sandbanks is already well served with 3 large hotels as well as several smaller hotels. There is no requirement for any additional Bed space. With the season only being 6 weeks long, how would additional restaurants & shops survive with limited parking and customers. the water taxi has novelty value only. Most people coming to the beach like to park nearby so that they can carry all the beach toys, towels etc plus ensuring that children don't have far to walk. Its amazing how much stuff you need to carry especially when you have small children. by removing most of the car parks you will create chaos on shore road. By changing the way people park it will lead to the removal of the cycle lanes. The purbecks attracts people from across the UK. By changing the parking & removing cycle lanes it would create a life threatening environment for cyclists using shore road. Branksome dene community hall is well served by the local community. It would not need much spent on it to make it more attractive to let. kitchen and bathroom facilities would be sufficient. Again there is sufficient hotel accommodation in the local area to warrant an additional hotel. Many hotels have been converted to flats in recent years as they have not been able to fill their rooms. This beach is also well served by local people. Are we to be penalised? And what about our dogs? Where are the dog beaches.	No requirement for additional bed space. Short season would make it difficult for new businesses to survive. Change to parking layout would be bring chaos. Community room needs refurbishing not redeveloping. Need to make future provision for dog walkers.
Mr Andy Collyer		271	The draft SPD appears to be driven entirely by infrastructure funding issues rather than a desire to enhance the seafront which is after all the jewel in the crown of Poole and the predominant reason why people visit the area. Development of the seafront with hotels, shops and residential to fund the required infrastructure improvements is a flawed approach. The Adopted Core strategy (Feb 2009) PCS23 section C states provisions for waterfront areas. The draft SPD fails test against these provisions.	SPD driven by need for infrastructure funding and not enhancement of the seafront. Development is a flawed approach and contrary to Core Strategy provisions.
Mr Andrew Silver		167	The draft SPD does what it was intended to do - a thought provoking document as to the way forward.	Thought provoking and the way forward.
Mrs Joy		96	The draft SPD has been written by officers who have no understanding of the value of the Poole Beaches. Poole Borough Council has intent to "Sell off the Family Silver". The solutions suggested in the SPD are for short term gain leaving everything privatized and nothing in the kitty for the future generation to benefit. Responses to the survey carried out by the Council two weeks ago repeatedly stated The Beach is the main asset, it is perfect for all ages. This SPD is about privatizing Poole's biggest asset. I am stongly against the plan.	Oppose the plan because it will privatise Poole's main asset.
Mr Jerzy Krol		87	The draft SPD provides a particular approach to planning that I believe relies too heavily on the commercialisation of the sea front, by mistakenly trying to draw in more tourists outside of the summer season. This attempt at trying to compete with its neighbour's overdevelopment clearly contradicts one of its core aims 'Conserve the beautiful environment'. Poole's economic livelihood is reliant on its relatively unspoilt shoreline, the weather, be it sun or wind to bring in tourists, this is a fact of life. Concentrate on making the experience more pleasant for residents and visitors alike without the need for wholesale changes that risk ruining its original appeal.	Approach relies too heavily on commercialising the seafront all year round. Economic livelihood is reliant upon unspoilt shoreline and the weather. Wholesale changes will ruin original appeal.
Mr Brian Tustain		80	The entire area, and in particular, the seafront, is grinding to a halt due to a lack of sufficient car parking. Most properties along Banks Road and Shore Road do not have enough parking facilities for residents as it is, and thus when they have visitors, or at holiday times, the lack of spaces for trippers to the Beach is acute. This seafront area is surely at it's capacity! The proposal to build a new Hotel within the confines of the main Sandbanks car park, and a new block of apartments in Shore Road, is simply not viable, from a traffic capacity view, and a potential to spoil the natural beauty of this unique shore line. The proposal to create additonal parking in Banks Road as explained would be a potential danger to pedestrians, cyclists and other road users.	Insufficient parking. Proposals are not viable in traffic capacity terms. Echelon parking dangerous.

Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment ID	Question 1 - The draft SPD provides an approach to planning for the future of the seafront. Please let us know your views on this approach.	Key Points
Mrs Jeannette Aston		94	THE LAYOUT AT sandbanks is hopeless. WE WANT MORE CAR PARK SPACE. DO WE REALLY WANT ANOTHER hotel, no! BEACH HUTS WHICH DO NOT FACE THE SEA, STUPID. DON'T REDUCE THE PLAY AREA IT IS A GOOD ATTRACTION. We also need some park, garden area to make sandbanks attractive to ALL. We do not need changes which put money into developers pockets and spoil the area.	More parking space and huts that face the sea. No hotel required and keep the play area. Changes will spoil area.
Mr Harry Alexander	Open Spaces Society	223	The OSS expresses concerns regarding certain Proposals in the document, in particular, there are specific aspects in respect to Public Rights of Way and Open Spaces within the Areas encompassed in this, which are considered in the OSS response accordingly as follows. From the outset it should be recognised that extent of the Seafront Promenade from Bournemouth to Poole, to then pass up Shore Road, before continuing west to join the South West Coast path receives the designation of a Long Distance Walk E9, where this has international significance. Furthermore, the integrity of the chine landscape at Flaghead, Canford Cliffs and Branksome Dene etc with their corresponding PRowWs, PBO (IC), FP 81 (CC) and FPs 63 and 64 (BDC), is importantly enjoyed by residents and visitors alike, protected by degrees of conservation, and of international significance. Yet in the Document no regard is given to the status of E9 or to the clusters of Chineways as PRowWs. Instead, along the Promenade and in each of this trio of chines there are proposed developments etc which are ignorant of conservation, landscape and the integrity of the PRowWs, which will be breached. For overnight cabins imply gross intrusion into sensitive chine areas, impact upon the sylvan settings, flora/fauna, disturbance of quiet parts, also with potential access for the service and other vehicles, let alone possible issues of security, fire risk, litter and rowdy behaviour, and danger to pedestrians. Much the same range of concerns affect the parameters of the west cliff top stretch at Canford Cliffs as well as the buffer zones to the west of Pavillion Beach (the Bund) and the east (High Horse Manager) which are recognised for elements of Conservation (Dorset Wildlife Trust), and significant landscape. (Further, the OSS is at a loss to appreciate why the Chines (unlike B'mth) are not include as SANGS). Whilst the Open Spaces Society recognises the benefits of longterm Strategic Planning, the overall impression is that little of significant worth has been outlined in this document and there are various proposals that threaten the unique character of the Seafront Area for local residents and visitors alike. OSS will raise specific objections to any proposals which will have a detrimental outcome for PRowWs.	Long Distance Walks and integrity of the Chines should be specified in the Plan. Cabins contrary to the setting of Chines, Canford Cliffs cliff top, buffer zones to west of beach at Sandbanks. Chines should be designated SANGS. Long term planning is worthwhile but unique character is threatened.
Mr Richard Samuel		73	The overall approach is comprehensive and well thought out.	Comprehensive and well thought out approach.
Mr Brian Tofield	Poole & East Dorset Art Society	187	The overall plan is meticulous in its detail and appears to place the public as the main concern of BoP. BUT..... its impossible to CONSERVE, and also IMPROVE/INVEST - CONSERVE = protect from harm and or overuse, IMPROVE/INVEST is about improving facilities and profit from investment. Your aims are confusing! Without doubt toilet blocks, pipework and general facilities need improvement/repair but is there really a need for an extra 521 beach huts with the current 683 - is there really a need for HOTELS - in one case 4 or 5 storeys and in the desire to preserve the Dune's you've left it rather late! After WWII when Sandbanks "Island" was reopened to the public the Dune's stretched from close to Shore Road right up to what is now the main car park! In reality the Dune's disappeared many years ago. If the plan is adopted in full POOLE will end up with a "HIGH ST on SEA" where future investment is very likely and what is now an enjoyable stroll by the sea will become a retail exercise! In review; Upgrade toilet blocks; Pipework; Walking surfaces; Add an "ice-cream parlour"; Provide a "SANDBANKS ONLY" bus service to ease parking. But preserving the "WONDERFUL NATURAL SETTING" won't happen if this amount of construction is allowed.	Confusing aims between improving and securing profit. No need for more beach huts and hotels. High Street on Sea may result with too much retail. Instead of construction need infrastructure upgrading, bus service and ice cream parlour whilst preserving natural setting.
Freshwater		179	The over-riding emphasis seems to be on what will bring in the most money in the short-term in order to cover the costs of development. Developers seem to use these high profile projects to make money for their own ends and then move on to the next, leaving the local community to struggle with unsuitable facilities. Many people do not seem to have heard anything about this development and it was not easy to find on the internet.	Emphasis on short term money making and difficult to find details of the consultation.
Mrs Julie Snow		55	The plan is thorough and ambitious with some interesting proposals. It offers guidance to potential investors with vision and capital to consider options for sustaining and improving the beaches we all enjoy.	Thorough, ambitious and interesting plan.

Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment ID	Question 1 - The draft SPD provides an approach to planning for the future of the seafront. Please let us know your views on this approach.	Key Points
Mr Mike Gardiner		156	The planning approach seems to have been devised by a group of people who do not have children. By this, I do not mean that I have missed the references to children's play areas, schools and sports, far from it. In fact, I think those ideas are rather good. But what about families? A family is not just people: it is stuff too. Stuff? Yes, stuff, and lots of it too: picnic, blankets, towels, wind break, football, cricket set, chairs, umbrella. All of that on bikes or a bus? I think not. Buy it at the beach? Have you seen the prices? I can't imagine them being reduced. Your planning approach has failed, almost entirely, to take the realities of 'going to the beach' into account.	Doesn't plan for families carrying beach gear and shops there too expensive.
Miss Imogen Parker		110	The plans seem to be geared towards attracting a few high-income summer visitors rather than sustaining the unique natural environment and maintaining facilities for local people who use the seafront all year round and pay for it with their council tax. The plans have not been adequately publicised.	Plan geared towards attracting high income summer visitors rather than maintaining for locals all year round, and the unique environment. Poor publicity.
Mr Robert Lister		16	The Principle is sound, but very little consultation with the public before these very inflated draft ideas were published	Sound principle. Poor consultation.
Mr Alastair Fraser		46	The proposal to reduce Sandbanks car parking spaces is a huge error; there are too few spaces already. Angled car parking is also an error as it will reduce the width of the road, increase traffic congestion and cause traffic jams at peak times. The proposal for a boutique hotel in Sandbanks is an error. This will spoil the character of the area without giving any benefits. There are enough hotels in the local area within a few minutes drive. Why spoil this unique environment with a building that is unnecessary and intrusive. Adding more shops in Sandbanks is unnecessary. The current shops and restaurants only just manage to be profitable. If more shops are built, we could very well see them vacated after a year or two because they failed to turn a profit. The buildings would then be boarded up and deteriorate - as is seen in many high streets throughout the UK. The proposed two storey cafe/restaurants building on Shore Road would dominate the landscape - most buildings adjacent to that beach area are low rise. It should only be one storey in height. In the current economic situation and with the worsening climate, this enterprise(s) could well fail within a few years and then this building would become an empty eyesore. Is it really a benefit or an improvement? Will it be commercially viable? Doubtful. A water taxi would certainly offer visitors improved access to Sandbanks beaches, however the cost of building a jetty a long way out into the Bay will be very high and presumably paid by Poole Council. Can this expense be justified? Further: it is not clear how close it is to North Haven Yacht Club and the many existing boat moorings. Will either of these be affected by the proposed jetty? (Note that a water taxi may only be able to land at high tide since the water is very shallow in that area.)	Loss of parking, echelon parking arrangement, a hotel and shops would be mistakes. 2 storey element at Shore Road would be too dominant, one storey only. Questionable viability in current economic climate, including jetty for water taxi.

Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment ID	Question 1 - The draft SPD provides an approach to planning for the future of the seafront. Please let us know your views on this approach.	Key Points
Miss Katie Dominey		57	The proposals for Branksome Dean Chine (BDC) clearly demonstrate that the council is out of touch with the local community and residents. The approach does not consider the historical legacy of the Chine, let alone the environmental impact, but seeks to maximise Council revenues with brash infrastructure and attractions akin to a theme park. A boutique hotel at BDC would destroy the intimate appeal of the Chine and would have a disastrous impact on the local beach community. People come to the Chine for the precise reason that it is NOT Bournemouth beach and it does provide a relatively calm environment to enjoy the beach. Learn from the embarrassing mistakes of Bournemouth (the IMAX and Boscombe reef being case in point) and make sure Poole retains its class and sophistication. The proposal for Go Ape and a hotel/music venue to reside at BDC will systematically destroy the history and community feel of the Chine. There are of course environmental concerns as these proposals will have a clear negative impact on the local wildlife (birds, sand lizards, insects etc). Has SSSI status been considered? There also appears to be no consideration of the privacy and security of the residents of the Chine as a result of the increased noise and traffic (car and pedestrian). These proposals will not enhance the beach experience. Did Councillor Julie Butt actually visit BDC prior to published her tome, and if so, does she understand the character of BDC has been built by its regular beach users who love the Chine for its quaint and unassuming appeal? Further, who will fund these developments local council taxpayers who will see little benefit from the proposals. Clarity is required to explain exactly what is proposed to the existing site, include facilities and beachhuts at BDC, including the budget. Conveniently, the Council has decided to publish this document and close its public consultation period during summer holidays. This is a clear effort by the Council to ensure that as few people as possible have the opportunity to review and respond. Further, the advertising of these proposals has been poor (and sneaky at best) - knowing that on balance these proposals would not be favoured by the community, the Council has not physically advertised the proposals in the exact places they would impact.	Object to proposals at Branksome Dene Chine. Approach ignores historical legacy and environment here. Further clarity required, not least on funding. Consultation should not be through summer.
Mr Gary Lawton		249	The proposed approach is far too commercial. It does not appear to be about sustaining the area, more about revenue opportunities that would destroy much of the character in the area. For example, the primary attraction of Branksome Dene at present is precisely the lack of facilities and the hidden location that means it avoids much of the tourist traffic - please don't change this! I see that it's proposed to widen the access road... I don't think that is required, there are only a couple of days a year that the place is busy. On most occasions that I visit the area, I don't encounter any vehicles on the access road.	Too commercial. Branksome Dene Chine's charm is lack of facilities and quiet access road.
Mr Christopher Goldthorpe		143	The report poses more questions than answers. What is the basis of the business plan? What is the benefit to people who live on the coast? Little comment on benefits for residents focus on tourism. Is it to provide more money to support other Council activities in lieu of Government cutbacks?	Business plan is absent. More focus on tourism than residents.
Mr James Layfield		36	The sea front does need a face lift current transport links during the summer are insufficient. the current parking control at the sandbanks car park cause additional queues as vehicles that are waiting for the car park block the road. this stops cars accessing the lanes to get to the chain ferry as they have to wait until they get to the front of the queue for the car park. the vehicles need to be circulated back through the car park. it does not need staff who could be doing other things to stand there saying it is full. A park and ride alternative to relieve congestion in the summer months should be a consideration.	Facelift to seafront is required, but transport links in the summer are insufficient, especially around Sandbanks car park. Park and ride should be a consideration.
Mr Graham Banyard		98	The sea front should remain as unspoilt as possible. To me this means no building on the car parks or the beaches. The council should maintain what is there not sell off bits of land for development. The planning approach should be to keep it as a natural sea front which everyone can use not somewhere with lots of bars hotels and restaurants backing on to it.	Seafront should remain unspoilt, so there should be no building on the car parks.
Mrs Debbie Hudson		132	The seafront at Poole has long been enjoyed by many thousands of people, irrespective of wealth or status. The approach to planning that has been outlined will undoubtedly be favoured more towards those with money rather than the 'working class'. I feel that over the years Poole Council have maintained a beach that can be enjoyed by anyone irrespective of class and that this is how it should continue. It is a natural resource and not one that should be exploited for the benefit of the few.	Plan favours those with money. Should be kept as a beach enjoyed by everyone as has happened up to now.
Mrs Kathleen Berkin		111	There are some good ideas in the approach to planning but there also seems to be too much to spoil the nature of the beaches.	Some good ideas but also too much spoiling of natural areas.

Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment ID	Question 1 - The draft SPD provides an approach to planning for the future of the seafront. Please let us know your views on this approach.	Key Points
Mrs Barbara Lemon		82	<p>These comments relate to the Sustaining Poole's Seafront SPD (Consultation Draft Summer 2013) and in particular to the proposals affecting Branksome Dene Chine . Our property backs onto part of Branksome Dene Chine and is within the conservation area. We object to: Replacement of the existing community hall with a larger venue or a hotel; provision of a performance space for music; provision of beach huts with overnight accommodation, increasing the width of the access road to the chine, reduction in car parking spaces within the chine and to the provision of an overhead walkway/tree top adventures for the following reasons. The Community Room The community room, which sits at the bottom of Branksome Dene Chine, is in keeping with the style of buildings in the adjacent conservation area. The existing building could be updated/extended to provide additional facilities, but the proposal to redevelop this with a large community structure, or a hotel would not be in keeping with the site and would destroy the special nature of a woodland glade setting. The Community Room is described in the Consultation Document as no longer fit for purpose. In fact it is a very attractive building and is described by Poole Council itself in its own promotional material as The Perfect Venue for Any Event. It is understood that the site of the Community Room is very close to a SSSI. Sand lizards are a particular attraction on the walls, steps and embankments around and in front of the Community Room and are seen all up the road to the Chine. The proposed development will adversely impact on this site. Beach huts providing overnight accommodation and Performance Space Sound travels up the chine and there is a likelihood of noise pollution to local residents including sensitive receptors from night time use. Has a noise impact assessment been carried out? Branksome Dene Chine The 5.25 hectares of the Branksome Dene Chine Nature Reserve is the largest semi-natural area on the Poole Bay Cliffs wildlife corridor. The cliff is a geological Site of Scientific Interest featuring a plant bed and large exposures showing river valley development (ref: your boroughofpoole.com Branksome Dene Nature Reserve). The Chine itself is an SNCI . The Chine is the most significant bulwark of natural life and vegetation between Poole and Bournemouth on the seaward side and provides a very significant introduction to the borough when walking along the beachfront. You know you are coming somewhere different and more natural when you get to this point coming along the promenade. This impression will change adversely if substantial development such as a hotel, or accommodation buildings are permitted. Overhead Walkway etc The footpaths leading down to the beach level from the upper parts of the Chine already provide trees level views into the Chine. The proposed tree top adventures would be out of keeping with area and would adversely impact through noise pollution and loss of privacy on local residents including sensitive receptors. The Chine Entrance The road entrance to the Chine emerges onto Pinewood Road most of which, including the lodge entrance at no 23, is in the local conservation area. The road is substantially quiet and residential. The buildings are primarily Edwardian-style detached houses, converted flats in large houses, and several nursing homes in large old converted houses (sensitive receptors). The gate to the Chine road is locked by the Council each night at 11pm. This is at least in part in recognition by the Council of the residential nature of the locality. It is understood that when the Chine was open 24 hrs it attracted misuse involving very considerable noise and disturbance during the night. The creation of a larger community hall or hotel would presumably require 24 hour access which would impact adversely on the noise sustained by local residents including sensitive receptors. Has a noise impact assessment been carried out to consider these issues? The Road The entrance to the Chine and the road down to the Chine car park is very confined for traffic. It is essentially single lane with limited places for passing and then only with real care. Traffic often struggles to pass safely. The road down to the car park is on a very narrow ridge, with steep drops on either side for much of its length. The ridge exhibits signs of continuing erosion. The physical possibility of widening for increased traffic must decidedly limited and any such widening must impact adversely on the nature of the Chine. Any increase in volume of vehicles and in particular delivery vehicles, will impact adversely on the site. Parking Roads around Branksome Dene Chine, including Pinewood Road and Westminster Road are already bursting to capacity on fine summer days. The car parks for Branksome Dene Chine and Branksome Chine are not able to cope with the amount of visitors wishing to park. If 30 spaces are removed as a result of the proposed redevelopment of the Community Room, or a hotel, this will cause an unsustainable increase in parking issues. Conclusion The proposals will destroy, not sustain, something special.</p>	<p>Object to plans at Branksome Dene on grounds of no need to replace community room, no music venue or overnight huts wanted, no tree walkway, loss of parking or widening of access road. Harm to wildlife also a concern and impact upon parking at chine and in neighbouring roads.</p>

Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment ID	Question 1 - The draft SPD provides an approach to planning for the future of the seafront. Please let us know your views on this approach.	Key Points
Mr Roy Lemon		83	<p>These comments relate to the Sustaining Poole's Seafront SPD (Consultation Draft Summer 2013) and in particular to the proposals affecting Branksome Dene Chine . Our property backs onto part of Branksome Dene Chine and is within the conservation area. We object to: Replacement of the existing community hall with a larger venue or a hotel; provision of a performance space for music; provision of beach huts with overnight accommodation, increasing the width of the access road to the chine, reduction in car parking spaces within the chine and to the provision of an overhead walkway/ tree top adventures for the following reasons. The Community Room The community room, which sits at the bottom of Branksome Dene Chine, is in keeping with the style of buildings in the adjacent conservation area. The existing building could be updated/extended to provide additional facilities, but the proposal to redevelop this with a large community structure, or a hotel would not be in keeping with the site and would destroy the special nature of a woodland glade setting. The Community Room is described in the Consultation Document as no longer fit for purpose. In fact it is a very attractive building and is described by Poole Council itself in its own promotional material as The Perfect Venue for Any Event. It is understood that the site of the Community Room is very close to a SSSI. Sand lizards are a particular attraction on the walls, steps and embankments around and in front of the Community Room and are seen all up the road to the Chine . The proposed development will adversely impact on this site. Beach huts providing overnight accommodation and Performance Space Sound travels up the chine and there is a likelihood of noise pollution to local residents including sensitive receptors from night time use. Has a noise impact assessment been carried out? Branksome Dene Chine The 5.25 hectares of the Branksome Dene Chine Nature Reserve is the largest semi-natural area on the Poole Bay Cliffs wildlife corridor. The cliff is a geological Site of Scientific Interest featuring a plant bed and large exposures showing river valley development (ref: your boroughofpoole.com Branksome Dene Nature Reserve). The Chine itself is an SNCI . The Chine is the most significant bulwark of natural life and vegetation between Poole and Bournemouth on the seaward side and provides a very significant introduction to the borough when walking along the beachfront. You know you are coming somewhere different and more natural when you get to this point coming along the promenade. This impression will change adversely if substantial development such as a hotel, or accommodation buildings are permitted. Overhead Walkway etc The footpaths leading down to the beach level from the upper parts of the Chine already provide trees level views into the Chine. The proposed tree top adventures would be out of keeping with area and would adversely impact through noise pollution and loss of privacy on local residents including sensitive receptors. The Chine Entrance The road entrance to the Chine emerges onto Pinewood Road most of which, including the lodge entrance at no 23, is in the local conservation area. The road is substantially quiet and residential . The buildings are primarily Edwardian-style detached houses, converted flats in large houses, and several nursing homes in large old converted houses (sensitive receptors). The gate to the Chine road is locked by the Council each night at 11pm. This is at least in part in recognition by the Council of the residential nature of the locality. It is understood that when the Chine was open 24 hrs it attracted misuse involving very considerable noise and disturbance during the night. The creation of a larger community hall or hotel would presumably require 24 hour access which would impact adversely on the noise sustained by local residents including sensitive receptors. Has a noise impact assessment been carried out to consider these issues? The Road The entrance to the Chine and the road down to the Chine car park is very confined for traffic. It is essentially single lane with limited places for passing and then only with real care. Traffic often struggles to pass safely. The road down to the car park is on a very narrow ridge, with steep drops on either side for much of its length. The ridge exhibits signs of continuing erosion. The physical possibility of widening for increased traffic must be decidedly limited and any such widening must impact adversely on the nature of the Chine. Any increase in volume of vehicles and in particular delivery vehicles, will impact adversely on the site. Parking Roads around Branksome Dene Chine, including Pinewood Road and Westminster Road are already bursting to capacity on fine summer days. The car parks for Branksome Dene Chine and Branksome Chine are not able to cope with the amount of visitors wishing to park. If 30 spaces are removed as a result of the proposed redevelopment of the Community Room, or a hotel, this will cause an unsustainable increase in parking issues. Conclusion The proposals will destroy, not sustain, something special.</p>	Object to plans at Branksome Dene on grounds of no need to replace community room, no music venue or overnight huts wanted, no tree walkway, loss of parking or widening of access road. Harm to wildlife also a concern and impact upon parking at chine and in neighbouring roads.

Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment ID	Question 1 - The draft SPD provides an approach to planning for the future of the seafront. Please let us know your views on this approach.	Key Points
Miss Teresa Walden		33	these plans don't seem to have been brought directly to the attention of all those who live within the area. Small sections on the local paper haven't adequately highlighted the radical changes proposed. We would have appreciated a letter through the door to explain the proposals rather than reading about it in the paper or through heresay. Whilst we appreciate the need to improve the infrastructure improve the offer the current proposals appear to be a little over the top and will change the character of the beaches and surrounding area significantly. From visuals provided the area will lose its charm and become another ultra modern looking development devoid of personality. I will be keen to see the final designs and hope everyone will have the opportunity to comment on them before they are built.	Postal consultation letters should have been sent to advertise SPD. Need to improve infrastructure but proposals would change character as over the top. Ultra modern would harm the area's charm.
Miss Jane Morris		227	THESE PROPOSALS ARE POOLE'S BEST KEPT SECRET . THE BOROUGH OF POOLE HAVE NOT PUBLICISED THESE PROPOSALS AND THE TIME SCALE FOR RESPONSE ADEQUATELY IT IS PERFECTLY UNACCEPTABLE THAT YOU HAVE NOT DETAILED POSTERS IN & AROUND ALL THE CONCERNED BEACHES . WITH ALL MY LOCAL CONNECTIONS IT STILL TOOK A RANDOM DOG WALKER TO BRING THIS TO MY ATTENTION AND ONLY JUST LAST WEEK, IT IS ONLY SPREADING DUE TO WORD OF MOUTH - YOU HAVE FAILED YOUR RESIDENTS WITH YOUR LACK OF PUBLICITY ON THESE SUGGESTIONS - PROBABLY IN FEAR OF THE OUTCRY?!! THIS I FEEL IS UNACCEPTABLE. AFTER PREVIOUS MEDIA PUBLICITY FOR "THE AREA" ON NATIONAL TV AND PRESS - I HAVE SEEN THIS AREA INCREASE WITH VISITORS TEN FOLD IN THE LAST 5 YEARSTHEREFORE THE MOST IMPORTANT THING IS CAR PARKING AND PUBLIC TRANSPORT - HOW ON EARTH CAN YOU SUGGEST ALL THESE EXTRA FACILITIES AND INCLUDE THE REDUCTION OF PARKING. AND THE RESIDENTIAL PARKING IN DOMESTIC ROADS TO BECOME METERED AFTER ALL THESE YEARS IS GOING TO CAUSE UPROAR - AS ALOT OF THE AREA IS FLATS AND THEY ONLY USUALLY HAVE ONE DESIGNATED (SOMETIMES 2) PARKING SPACES ON SITE LEAVES 2 PLUS CAR FAMILIES STRUGGLING TO KEEP MOBILE - BEARING IN MIND THE EXCESSIVELY HIGH NUMBER OF SENIOR CITIZENS IN THE AREA - THIS WILL ALSO LEAVE VISITORS TO THINK TWICE IN COMING TO THE AREA - YOU SERIOUSLY MUST RETHINK THIS. Common sense, I am sure, WILL prevail - I trust the councillors and council representatives will actually spend several days living the Poole beach life before finalising the decisions UNLIKE the traffic/road changes to the approach to the Sandbanks car park which was quite clearly changed by a man in a suit who sits in the office and thought it would be a good idea without living the roads several time - this has proved to cause massive traffic issues and blockages in the peninsular which obviously your man in a suit would not have a clue of!	Poor publicity. Transport and parking are the most important issues. Visitors will be deterred and parking in residential streets will worsen. Must rethink.
Mrs Hester Cribb		85	This appears to be an ill conceived idea, in particular the proposed Landmark Building to be constructed out over the sand, the reduction in car parking availability and the unnecessary Boutique Dune Hotel.	Ill conceived. Landmark building, Dune Hotel and reduction in parking are bad ideas.
Mrs Fiona Marlow		31	This approach requires a lot of public money to provide things that are not necessary and will not enhance the area. It seems to be aimed more at tourists than residents. When the weather is hot, the beach can already be unpleasantly crowded, especially at weekends - how is it possible to accommodate more people?? When the weather is poor, the people using the beach are cyclists, joggers, walkers and dog walkers. I doubt that more cafes and retail outlets would encourage more people to the area, it is the weather that draws them and the beauty of the Poole beaches- which are far better than Bournemouth's beaches. Your plans would change the character of our beaches, making them more like Bournemouth and consequently less attractive.	Its a lot of public money to provide things that aren't necessary, for tourists rather than residents. The weather and beautiful beaches draw people not the facilities. Character would be harmed.
Miss Catherine Wall		140	This consultation is extremely important to this area and yet it has been hidden away on your website. For such a fundamental plan, this should have been widely publicised. Why have there not been roadshows and contact with council tax payers.	Poor publicity.
Mr Robert Lister		44	This Consultation is seriously open to question, most comments are either not uploaded or are not registered, with only a week to go! The Pre consultation prior to the £60,000plus document being created was virtually nil, no Residents Groups affected were consulted This is a case of BoP ticking the boxes, but not really interested in the methods or replies	Poor consultation now and before.

Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment ID	Question 1 - The draft SPD provides an approach to planning for the future of the seafront. Please let us know your views on this approach.	Key Points
Mrs Rosemary Drayson		106	This draft SPD should of been made more publicly aware. This is not preserving the beaches, but development for a fast buck that cannot be sustained. Sandbanks has a great reputation throughout the world. Poole Council need to think very carefully before they overdevelop the area and devalue it for everyone.	Poor publicity. Could overdevelop and devalue the area.
Miss Averil Brown		159	This is not a consultation. I have found out about this consultation one week before the consultation ended. The Council should be sending details to all those holders and ensuring everyone is aware of the ideas given the impact to our town.	Poor consultation.
Mr Alex Hensher		206	This looks like an excuse to build a load more beach huts all down the coastline. Including plastering them on the last remaining dune area at Sandbanks and down Branksome Dene Chine where it will have a significant impact on the woodland setting. I can understand that beach huts are a profitable earner for the council and there is demand for more beach huts from the public but have strong reservations about the externalities involved in building further beach huts. The last lot of beach huts built at Branksome (219A-229A Ground Floor) are a hazard and accident waiting to happen as it has narrowed the promenade creating a pinch point between cyclists, pedestrians and beach hut users. Strong concerns on the proposed 'Banks Road parking on street' angled parking: There is a safety issue with the cycle lane, when reversing out of the angled parking visibility is very restricted and it is going to be difficult to see cyclists approaching in the cycle lane, especially smaller/younger cyclists. The following is excerpted from the 1995 Oregon Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan: "Diagonal parking causes conflicts with bicycle travel: drivers backing out have poor visibility of oncoming cyclists and parked vehicles obscure other vehicles backing out. These factors require cyclists to ride close to the center of a travel lane, which is intimidating to inexperienced riders." The proposal also requires concreting over the strip of grass adjacent to the harbour, this space is essential for windsurfers rigging up, without it there will be conflict between windsurfers blocking the pavement with their kit and pedestrians. Are extra car parking spaces needed here to counteract the spaces that will be lost by building beach huts and the apartment plaza at Sandbanks? (Sandbanks car park reducing from 550 to 450 spaces ref page 39 of consultation). Angled parking will also cause more congestion along Banks Road. It is already difficult in the summer to pull out when parallel parked, with angled parking every time someone needs to reverse out it will mean all the traffic has to stop on probably both sides of the road as they give way to the reversing motorist. Proposals to reduce traffic speed on Banks Road are much needed, there is large problem in the summer with the Sandbanks car park queue blocking the road despite the signs. The playground at Sandbanks is very popular, why are you seeking to move this next to the beach, its current position behind buildings is sheltered from south westerly winds, also it looks like it is being shrunk, is this to make way for yet more beach huts and the apartment plaza? Page 72 of consultation - What are overnight beach studios, why don't you just call them holiday flats? Is Dene Chine really an appropriate place to build accommodation? It will mean a loss of publicly accessible amenity space.	Too many beach huts. Last ones built at Branksome narrow the prom dangerously. Echelon parking on Banks Road is not safe for cyclists and will add to congestion, and would incur loss of grassy bank that windsurfers rig up on and conflict with pedestrians. Loss of playground or its relocation not a good idea as popular there. Overnight studios could be holiday flats.
Miss Ann Simmons		170	This seems to be a very ambitious plan which depends a lot on financial input from various developers and 'facility' providers which could prove pretty disastrous as has been seen in even small projects in neighbouring areas. The plan aims to change Poole from the beautiful place that people enjoy and appreciate into some hive of activity for entrepreneurs to gain from those with plenty of money. As your plan says, the six beaches are varied in aspect and facilities which is why people choose to go to them. If you want activity and the possibility of buying things you go to Sandbanks, Shore Road or Branksome.Chine. If you want to appreciate the beautiful view, enjoy the beach and know the children will not be lured to places where money is required, you go to Branksome Dene or one of the other two! To develop as the plan describes would destroy Poole's iconic status as a place of outstanding natural beauty with wide unsullied vistas and aspects.	Ambitious plan that depends on developers and facility providers. Plan would destroy the characters of Poole's beaches with their unsullied vistas and natural beauty.
Mr William Keats		134	This seems to represent an overdevelopment of the currently beautiful beachfront - people are drawn to the area as it represents an escape from suburbia - we shall destroy this feel if we bring town development to the sea.	Overdevelopment - currently an escape from suburbia. Resist town development at the sea.

Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment ID	Question 1 - The draft SPD provides an approach to planning for the future of the seafront. Please let us know your views on this approach.	Key Points
Miss Dee Curtler		238	<p>Through a local friend, I was told of your plans in upgrading the seafront. Could I just mention that whilst being aware that you advertise such details on your website and in the council offices many of us with busy lives do not access this source, nor take the Evening Echo. Additionally with the increase in multiple occupancy buildings such as mine we do not have the Advertiser delivered, another lost source of community information. Having so recently heard of this eye wateringly large document you may appreciate that I have not taken in the minutiae of its contents, but do have some comments to make. I love Poole and have (with the exception of recent travels) lived here for more than 30 years and part of that reason is I consider the beach area one of the most beautiful places in the world - Poole High Street is hardly keeping up the image! We are custodians of this and you our representatives, think Imax and Kiss Me Quick Blackpool. Having said that I can understand the need for improvements and bring to the table my travels abroad and what can work well from a user point of view rather than a developer. Since I live over Branksome Chine promenade I understand that the range of people using the beach is diverse and this is far from a not in my back yard e-mail. I applaud many of the proposals. Sandbanks is the trendy area of younger "glitzy" people which could probably well sustain that type of development. The promenade is used by walkers and cyclists, not always to the advantage of both. Could specific cycle tracks be included? Water taxis work so well in other parts of the world extending enjoyment of a great day out to a chosen destination. Young families are increasingly drawn to such activities as tree climbing etc. another engaging idea which seems to work well and could extend the "summer season" with additional revenue for the area. Whilst not mentioned in the document I should say I am totally opposed to the idea of a Tesco supermarket on Sandbanks Road. If one is really needed, which I think questionable, could either the council or a local organisation set one up, if not M&S or Waitrose is more the type of outlet surely for this particular area. Tesco is already operating in Lilliput successfully. There is no doubt that the toilet facilities/seating arrangements along the beach need upgrading and should be given a high priority. I am far less convinced about hotels being built on the seafront with occupancy in existing hotels struggling to fill rooms. Upgrading existing stock might prove more efficient. In general terms I favour an approach which retains a natural, complementary approach to the wonderful landscape we have here in Poole. As your document mentions transport cannot be ignored when thinking of increasing use of the beaches in Poole. Car parks during the summer months are already at capacity, in fact holiday makers park in the car park for residents in my own building when others and roads are full and I imagine this happens in other places too! Without extensive advertising for use of park and ride, increasing the regularity of local buses such as 20 and the Breezer etc, plus water taxis the roads and other inventive ideas for transport Poole could become a place to avoid rather than applaud. I hope to watch with interest your ideas for the future.</p>	<p>Poor advertisement. Applaud many of the ideas. Prom used by many, some conflict between cyclists and pedestrians. Cycle tracks, water taxis, park and ride and tree climbing could work well. Upgrading benches and toilets must be a priority. Questionable need for hotels. Transport solutions are important.</p>

Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment ID	Question 1 - The draft SPD provides an approach to planning for the future of the seafront. Please let us know your views on this approach.	Key Points
Mr Alun Brown	Building Design & Planning Consultants Plan & Site Services	287	<p>To me, Poole's beaches are much better than Bournemouth. However, I do understand the concerns. I have few comments to make other than to say that the Poole beaches themselves have evolved commercially over a period of time but there is nothing cohesive or independently noteworthy from a tourist point of view. In the early 1970's there used to be outlets where normal individuals could buy fresh fish. That still exists at Mudeford and that gives a connection between what we eat and part of the purpose of Poole Harbour. One or two or three of those might help. I don't know whether it will work commercially but if there is an outlet available that doesn't need to be anything flash or expensive but comply with the necessary Health and Safety Laws perhaps with some reasonable parking, I think that would go quite well. Having recently been to Padstow in Cornwall and had a stroll around and that is the home of Rick Stein, he has taken the basic English food item of fish and chips of which we are all familiar and seemingly without too much effort has turned it into an empire. You can't control a potato and you can't control the fish so all he has done is changed the batter and upmarketed it, but the actual Restaurant is like a shed (it is probably down to Planning because it is on the docks) but there is not that much to it but you couldn't move down there. Maybe it will be worth contacting him to get a concession or something like that and then you would have a connection between the sea, the land and what people eat, and the term "historic" for the Borough of Poole or the Town of Poole which it certainly is, with a very nice conservation area and eating fish is quite historic and I think it would help to square the circle whereas at the moment you have got just sand, people selling buckets and spades, some fish and chip outlets, a few pubs and then Sunseeker which in itself is magnificent, but if you said to someone, Bournemouth, they would think of the Pier, if you would say Brighton, they would think of the Pier and Brighton Rock and Lyme Regis they think of the 'French Lieutenants' Woman' and so it goes on but if you say, Poole, people say, where is that? If you could forgive the pun, if it had something more of an anchor that might help. The shape and form and number of beach huts and stuff like that can be argued about forever and probably will be up until the point where there is no petrol left for people to visit anyway, but if you have something like that, I think it wouldn't be over commercial, it will be known by everybody and be useful and it wouldn't be a hollow sham.</p>	<p>Appreciate concerns - Poole has evolved commercially over time and it is not cohesive or particularly noteworthy. Its identity could be made with simple selling of fish on seafront.</p>

Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment ID	Question 1 - The draft SPD provides an approach to planning for the future of the seafront. Please let us know your views on this approach.	Key Points
Mr Christopher Mort		169	<p>Unfortunately, the approach suggested in the draft plan is flawed in numerous respects: 1. The draft plan is not sympathetic to the natural environment of this area. For example, to suggest a new 4 or 5 storey building near the Shore Road beach is extraordinary. It may be bold but it would be a disastrous step in the wrong direction for conservation in the area. A private developer would not get away with such an abuse of the natural environment so close to the beach and there is no basis on which the Council should suggest it may do so. No new buildings of that height should be contemplated if the area is not to be spoiled by developers. Similarly, the introduction of two storey beach-huts would harm the visual appeal of the area, in light of the considerable number of huts already on offer. When people buy a house in this area they accept the local covenants in place to prevent people from building higher buildings and the local council should not be acting as though it is not bound by the same covenants, which are in place to protect the natural environment. 2. The draft plan does not reflect the economic realities of running a consumer-facing business in this area. While some summer days are very busy, even on the busy days most families do not visit the English sea-side because they are looking to spend large amounts of money. While some cafes and some stores do well for a couple of months in the summer, for most months of the year the area is very quiet and that is not going to change because of new developments. In the last year or so we have seen Cafe Shore (a wonderful local restaurant) go in to insolvent liquidation; Sandacres (the local pub) give up its business after struggling for several years; Jazzies Cafe is almost dead throughout the winter, and generally shuts early outside the peak season and the Compass Restaurant at the Sandbanks Hotel (ironically almost next door to where the draft plan suggests a new 4/5 storey development should go) has now shut as a restaurant, even in the peak summer season, as there is insufficient demand and it now only opens for occasional weddings. The Council may think if it constructs a significant development at Shore Road, or sells a site with planning to do so, the resultant profit will be a successful conclusion to the process but when the businesses there start to fail (like the nearby existing restaurant at the hotel) the rest of the community will have to live with a huge building which gets rundown and in a state of disrepair, as its not what visitors to this area will spend their money on. 3. Additional short term accommodation in the area is not required. The area is so popular because it is not just naturally beautiful but it is also accessible for day-trippers. This is also why the beach huts do well - they get used during the day then locked-up at night. However, the properties available for short-term holiday letting do not generally do so well. Those that do not live in the area see the very expensive houses on Sandbanks and assume the holiday letting market must be booming and there is money to be made. The reality for short-term holiday lets is very different. The draft plans for overnight accommodation on the beach front and a new hotel suggest that the existing Sandbanks, Haven and Harbour Heights hotels, and the local holiday lets, have high occupancy rates and excellent REVPAR (revenue). However, overnight accommodation is almost always available already and any new hotels or overnight lets will merely damage the existing businesses further and the whole area will become rundown. We should learn from Bournemouth's mistakes and not allow a further oversupply of hotels and holidays lets that will damage the local businesses. 4. The draft plan does not reflect the practical realities of visiting the beach area currently. The traffic problems on Shore Road and Banks Road during summer days are extraordinary, with long queues and incredible difficulties parking. The reference in the section on Shore Road suggesting: "This would result in the loss of some parking which could be compensated for by additional on street parking arrangements." was not written by someone who spends time in the area during the summer - parking is horrendous and driveways to private houses on or near Shore Road or Banks Road are already often blocked by visitors to the beach as there is insufficient public parking available, prior to the intended reduction of parking facilities. Offering overnight accommodation where the beach huts are currently and/or turning car park spaces in to accommodation would only exacerbate this problem, and the area will develop an even worse reputation for parking difficulties than it has already.</p>	<p>Plan not sympathetic to natural environment, e.g. Landmark Building and 2 storey beach huts. Covenant in place not being adhered to. Plan does not reflect the economic realities of consumer facing business in this area, e.g. seasonal variations. Additional short term accommodation is not required and hotels etc. unviable. Practical problems like parking and congestion especially during the summer need to be addressed.</p>

Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment ID	Question 1 - The draft SPD provides an approach to planning for the future of the seafront. Please let us know your views on this approach.	Key Points
Mr Robert Lister		204	Very little consultation seems to have been carried out, the following points I think needed including: Chines - Branksome Chine - this is a great way to access the beach, either on foot, with buggy or on a bike. Sadly there is not a proper structured path, it is either muddy or dried ruts in the summer making it impassable for buggies etc. We need to consider making these excellent thoroughways usable with cinder or other materials. Poole Harbour - this was excluded from the report, we have thousands of wind surfers and kite surfers using this shallow water all year round. But what facilities do we give them, nothing! We should consider, toilets, cafe, changing areas, this is a great all year tourist attraction.	Little consultation. Need to consider improving excellent routes to beach down Chines. Need to consider facilities for kite surfers etc. on Harbour side.
Mr Nick Chetwood		100	Very poor & covert public consultation - very surprised to have heard about the proposed ideas so late down the line.	Poor consultation
Mr & Mrs Grahame & Susan Bolton		289	Visiting an old friend recently, I was absolutely appalled to hear about the Council's proposals for development at this beautiful place and wish to place on record my total objection to these plans. I find it hard to believe that the Council is seriously considering destroying the natural beauty of this chine, taking people's beach huts away and constructing a car park! It is also appalling that the Community Hall, a wonderful place for local people to enjoy, will also be removed. I have attended many events at this hall, from wedding parties to Women's Institute Beach Days. What is the Council thinking? I despair at this desire to urbanise and 'manage' our beautiful, tranquil beach side at a time when the rest of Poole is becoming so busy and clogged with traffic. The beach is one place where a person can escape cars, shops, noise and over-commercialisation. I believe there are plenty of amenities at the existing points along the beach front and I also believe that people do not go to the beach to look at car parks or go shopping. As a member of the Poole forum I received a questionnaire about possible 'additions' to facilities at our beaches and made my views known then. I find it hard to accept that a majority of the respondents wished for wholesale changes to our precious beaches. No one I know had heard of these proposals and all are as appalled as I am. Why not publicise these plans widely and have a proper consultation with the people of Poole - or is this a case of commercial interests driving this forward? Some people have commented that the entire business smacks of subterfuge. Once the beauty of this place and others that you plan to commercialise has been destroyed it cannot be replaced. Please do not make the same mistakes that Bournemouth has made with its seafront! We both object to these proposals - leave Branksome Dene Chine as it is.	Objection. Poor consultation. Reduction to car park and loss of community room should be resisted. Branksome Dene is a remaining place to escape from the over-commercialisation elsewhere. No change.
Mr & Mrs Frederick & Sheila Hobbs		286	We approve and wholeheartly agree with your planning details and great improvements with such a picturesque front and key. This magnificent area is a great asset to "Poole".	Wholeheartedly agree with details and improvements to Poole's great asset.
Mr & Mrs John & Clare Duffield		275	We are alarmed at some of the proposals in the "Sustaining Poole's Seafront" draft document. We think beach huts are a blot on the landscape, we don't want any more. Especially "overnight" beach huts. That sets a terrible precedent. And we are opposed to building on car parks. An apartment block on the Shore Road car park is a terrible idea, as is a hotel and a parade of shops on the Sandbanks car park. And building out over the sand at the end of Shore Road will set another terrible precedent. What crazy fool thought up that? Who thought it would be good idea to have a hotel in Branksome Dene? It's a park! Like Judy Butt said, Poole's seafront is breath-taking, precious, fragile and much-loved. It needs to be sustained , not developed. This document reads like something by a grasping property developer out to make money. And it sounds to us as if what Poole needs is an organisation akin to Friends of Poole Park to protect the seafront from its supposed custodian.	No more beach huts, overnight accommodation, building on car parks or Landmark Building, or hotel and parade of shops.

Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment ID	Question 1 - The draft SPD provides an approach to planning for the future of the seafront. Please let us know your views on this approach.	Key Points
Mrs Michelle Cutler		272	<p>We are broadly pleasantly surprised by the proposals, which we felt had significant attention to preserving natural beauty and tranquility. We particularly liked the beach library idea, an increase in food and facilities, no increase in parking and the use by schools. We felt that the addition of a hotel at Branksome Dene Chine stood apart though - it felt to us like an architect's idea to ensure some building work in the plan. It's not necessary (local and visiting people value the peacefulness of this chine), the artists rendering depicts an ultra modern angular building not at all in keeping with surroundings and there is plenty of alternative choice (e.g. refurbishment or expansion of a plentiful choice of existing buildings, furthermore also supporting local businesses and NOT big hotel corporations.) The idea of a wedding venue was nice, it would bring more visitors to the area and be a credit to the seafront but we would hope this could be done in a discreet and fitting building less conspicuous and big as a hotel. We also would not welcome an outdoor or open live music venue - we already hear the Pier Approach in Bournemouth quite well enough. Leave big and loud to the city centres! With regards to the woodland area we think that a woodland walkway would be a good compromise between untouched woodland area and a method for numerous visitors to safely explore. You can Go Ape almost anywhere these days but with a walkway you can include nature information/activities in the pathway, even suspended picnic areas for people to linger longer. I appreciate this consultation has been open for some time but I do think that it would have been easier for you to get residents on side with this plan if they had been proactively told it was there and invited to respond. We are at Branksome Dene Chine all the time, it's only five minutes walk from our house, and we never would have known a thing about it had someone else not mentioned it to us. Aside from the hotel, it's a very laudable plan which you could have residents support on.</p>	<p>Proposals broadly preserve natural beauty and tranquillity. Support library on beach, school use, increase in food outlets and no increase in parking. But at B Dene there should be no loss of the community room or new hotel, woodland walk instead of a Go Ape course, no loud music. Laudable plan but needs more proactive publicity.</p>
Mr & Mrs John & Ann Jarvis		212	<p>We are not happy with the idea of reducing car parking at Sandbanks by 100 spaces we need more car park space not less. We are not happy with the water taxi being so near NHYC we volunteer for day/night watch to provide security for our club/boats all year round and our thriving children's club have a safe haven to learn sailing, boating and other water sports a water taxi going through the middle of the area will cause hazards and safety issues. We are locals and members of the North Haven Yacht Club we need to be in the car park by 10am in summer time to get a space to use facilities' that we pay for in advance i.e. car park ticket and club/mooring fees with no guarantee of getting a space to use either. The lack of car parking spaces is not encouraging tourists to the area at all and how will a water taxi benefit people who want to spend time on the beach, will it mean they have to pay to park the car in Poole and pay the water taxi to take them to the beach (extra costs) families need to bring chairs wind breaks kiddies beach toys picnic etc; They need to bring a car. Why do we need another Hotel why can't existing hotels provide weddings on the beach etc; Why try to cram more into such a small area how is this helping/saving/sustaining the environment. It sounds to me if this is all geared for the rich folk, and the locals and holiday maker get pushed out.</p>	<p>No reduction of parking, or water taxi or additional hotels.</p>

Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment ID	Question 1 - The draft SPD provides an approach to planning for the future of the seafront. Please let us know your views on this approach.	Key Points
Mr & Mrs Robert & Doreen Cory		267	<p>We are particularly concerned about the proposed developments in the Shore Road area where we are beach hut tenants. We strongly object to the overall plans for the following reasons. The Sandbanks (and Shore Road) beach areas have an international reputation for their aesthetic appeal and their general ambience. We feel that this is largely due to the natural environment and the low-key development of the beach area. To build over the attractive flowerbeds and recreational facilities would immediately destroy that appeal and would be totally at odds with your second key theme - "to maintain, respect and enhance the natural environment". However, we accept that the toilet and shower facilities at Sandbanks and Shore Road clearly need improving and that the car parks (rather than being built upon) need expanding but this can be done in a far more low-key and self financing way. Commenting in detail on your proposals for developing Shore Road as "The Social Beach". You state that the "bustle and busyness of Shore Road is a product of its accessibility, its youthful crowd and its existing facilities". This is simply not true. Instead Shore Road beach (from Shore Road to Canford Cliffs promenade) is a family beach used heavily by local residents who pay a high premium in property prices and rates to use the local facilities. The beach huts are restricted to local residents who pay a premium rental and rates. The 'Framework for Change' seeks to change the existing nature of this environment into one of 'bustle and busyness' (reminiscent of the Imax project in Bournemouth). The detrimental effect of turning the Sandbanks and Shore Road beaches into a commercial seafront would naturally reduce the value of the existing high-class residential property and the accompanying high rateable values (we have already had an offer from a London legal firm on a 'no win no fee' basis to challenge our rateable value). The devastating effect of this commercial development on the Council's income could not possibly be offset by selling the public car parks and gardens. In short these proposals do not provide a viable way of increasing council income and do not meet point 2 (an appropriate balance of facilities to improve Poole's seafront). As local residents who are beach hut tenants in the Shore Road area we accept that the huts and toilets need updating. However, to change the whole character of the beach to achieve this to the detriment of residents is unnecessary and excessive. Clearly a badly thought out plan which could ruin the local area and lead to a loss of council income.</p>	<p>Object to plans for Shore Road because of the loss of flower beds and recreational area to more huts. Toilets do need improving and car parks need expanding not being built upon. Shore Road is a family beach not just for youth. Plans would change whole character of the area.</p>
Mr & Mrs John & Sheila Sanderson		190	<p>We are regular visitors to Poole over several years enjoying mainly the non-commercial area and beach in and around Shore Road. We are therefore shocked to hear, on our current visit, of the Shore Road and Poole seafront development proposals. Having considered your proposals, we can only express that rather than enhance this area of relative tranquillity, that they will only lead to an over commercialisation of the area and spoil what is its natural attractiveness to both visitors and residents. You are proposing to turn something which is authentic, picturesque and inviting into an ugly over commercialised holiday resort resembling the image encountered on many European beaches. It goes without saying that this proposed intensification of this area will attract more traffic, both commercial and visitors, with the net result of more and more air and noise pollution. One only has to see the volume of traffic throughout the summer months queuing for the Sandbanks ferry with congestion on the existing car parks, to realise that any proposals that would increase the volume of traffic would be a disaster to the area. All the existing development has been carried out with sensitivity to its natural beauty, residents, visitors, wildlife and commercial needs. To develop further would be a tragedy and would drive away, rather than attract people and we believe cause irreparable damage to the entire environment, not least to the wildlife. As visitors we urge you to reconsider any development that would not enhance, but spoil this presently beautiful and unspoiled part of the South of England.</p>	<p>Plans would over commercialise the beach and lead to more traffic. People would be put off coming not attracting to the area if plans go ahead.</p>
Mr & Mrs David & Joyce Ward		198	<p>We express concern and alarm that there are proposals to reduce still further the already inadequate car parking arrangements at Branksome Chine. We have a disabled car parking permit but are usually unable to find a space. It also appears that you wish to destroy the beach hut we have occupied for several years (179A) and replace it with "Beach Facilities" (41). This is also a serious cause for concern. We have not been informed about any of the above proposals and we request that we should be fully informed about any future developments.</p>	<p>Inadequate parking at Branksome and loss of certain beach huts a concern.</p>

Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment ID	Question 1 - The draft SPD provides an approach to planning for the future of the seafront. Please let us know your views on this approach.	Key Points
	Natural England	279	<p>We have no comments in response to your three consultation questions however we wish to provide the following specific comments in relation to the draft SPD. 3.0 The Seafront Today 3.1 We welcome the principle of protecting the SSSI and SNCI so that their biodiversity is maintained. Consideration should also be given to enhancement of these sites through appropriate management and we understand that this may come forward as there are ongoing discussions between our Land management colleagues and the Borough of Poole in relation to securing a Higher Level Stewardship scheme over the management of these areas. In addition the Chines should be managed to align with your Borough's GI strategy. Page 22: Landscape Management Strategy map This appears to indicate cliff stabilisation running through the designated areas. It is unclear from the rest of the document what this refers to, and what the nature of the cliff stabilisation is. We would advise that the document should be clear as to what methods are to be used and how these will avoid impacts upon the designated sites. 5.0 The SPD Framework Page 23 : We support the statement that implementation of the Sustaining Poole's Seafront (SPS) would involve the comprehensive delivery of all other strategies such as the Shoreline Management Plan (SMP) and the Landscape Management Strategy (LMS). Page 28: Tourism, Branding, Marketing and Events map We note that a zone for wind and kite surfing is indicated. We note that this reinforces the zoning already in place in Poole Harbour and therefore have no concerns. You may like to consider the installation of some interpretation along a key route such as Shore Road which refers to the zoning area and makes reference to the good practice protocol in place for kite surfing. Page 29: Accommodation strategy map The map is unclear with regards to specific proposed locations for accommodation but Natural England advises that no accommodation should be built within designated sites 6.0 Projects - A Framework for Change Page 36 : This details generic visitor facilities to be provided at each location, including various forms of lighting. The SPD should consider the impact of lighting on landscape and biodiversity. The NPPF states (paragraph 125) By encouraging good design, planning policies and decisions should limit the impact of light pollution from artificial light on local amenity, intrinsically dark landscapes and nature conservation". We therefore advise that consideration be given to the lighting used in wooded areas and over and in close proximity to the designated sites. 6.1 Sandbanks Beach Natural England welcomes the statement that biodiversity interests must be protected. Please also see comments above on section 3.1. We also welcome the approach of providing compensatory habitats should open habitats be reduced elsewhere. Consideration should also be given to the use of native species in any structural planting schemes. Page 40: Key development principles at Sandbanks beach The map appears to show an improved pedestrian route through the SNCI at the eastern end. We recommend that Dorset Wildlife Trust be consulted regarding this proposal as they may have comments to make. Page 42: Illustrative plan Sandbanks Beach We recommend that Dorset Wildlife Trust be consulted with regard to the placement of buildings in close proximity to the SNCI. Page 49: Illustrative plan Shore Road We recommend that Dorset Wildlife Trust be consulted with regard to the placement of buildings in close proximity to the SNCI. 6.3 Flaghead Beach We welcome the statement in the success criteria that these include woodland management and biodiversity protection of the SNCI. Page 56: Illustrative plan Flaghead Beach We recommend that Dorset Wildlife Trust be consulted with regard to the placement of buildings in close proximity to the SNCI. 6.4 Canford Cliffs Beach Page 58: Key development principles at Canford Cliffs Beach We recommend that Dorset Wildlife Trust be consulted with regard to the placement of buildings in close proximity to the SNCI, and with regard to walk route improvements across the SNCI. In the same vein any building or development would also need to ensure no adverse effects on the SSSI. Page 59 : We welcome the statement in the success criteria that there will be a contribution to the creation of a coherent landscape and public realm structure including woodland management. We would suggest that designated site management should also be added to the criteria. Page 61: Illustrative plan Canford Cliffs All proposed buildings/car parks would need to ensure no adverse effects on the SNCI and SSSI in this area. Page 66: Key development principles Branksome Beach We recommend that Dorset Wildlife Trust be consulted with regard to the placement of buildings in close proximity to the SNCI, and with regard to walk route improvements across the SNCI. 6.5 Branksome Beach We welcome the statement that biodiversity interest will be maintained in the SNCI. We would also refer you back to our comments on section 3.1 and 6.4 Page 69: Illustrative plan Branksome Beach We recommend that Dorset Wildlife Trust be consulted with regard to the placement of buildings in close proximity to the SNCI. Page 72: Key development principles Branksome</p>	<p>Support higher level stewardship of SSSIs and SNCIs on seafront. Chines should be aligned to GI strategy. Cliff stabilization probably needs more clarification. Zoning of the beach is a good idea and could be supported by signage. Care over the location of lights e.g. near wooded areas. Dorset Wildlife Trust should be consulted on various aspects of the Plan. The SPD should encourage opportunities to incorporate features which are beneficial to wildlife.</p>

Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment ID	Question 1 - The draft SPD provides an approach to planning for the future of the seafront. Please let us know your views on this approach.	Key Points
			<p>Dene Beach We recommend that Dorset Wildlife Trust be consulted with regard to the placement of rope walks in close proximity to the SNCI. 6.6 Branksome Dene Beach We welcome the statement that biodiversity interest will be maintained in the SNCI. We would also refer you back to our comments on section 3.1 and 6.4. In addition we advise that consideration should be given to the compatibility of the proposed rope walks with a local nature reserve/SNCI site. General comments In addition to the above, we have the following general comments to add which may be useful to you in the development of the SPD. Green Infrastructure Consideration also should be given to the ongoing maintenance and management that greenspaces and green infrastructure will require. There may be significant opportunities to retrofit green infrastructure in urban environments. These can be realised through: green roof systems and roof gardens; green walls to provide insulation or shading and cooling; Biodiversity enhancements This SPD should encourage the taking of opportunities to incorporate features which are beneficial to wildlife into final proposals for development. The Council may wish to consider whether it is appropriate to provide guidance on, for example, the level of bat roost or bird box provision within the built structure, or other measures to enhance biodiversity in the urban environment should also be sought. Additionally, we would draw your attention to Section 40 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act (2006) which states that "Every public authority must, in exercising its functions, have regard, so far as is consistent with the proper exercise of those functions, to the purpose of conserving biodiversity". Section 40(3) of the same Act also states that conserving biodiversity includes, in relation to a living organism or type of habitat, restoring or enhancing a population or habitat". The advice given by Natural England in this letter is made for the purpose of the present consultation only. In accordance with Section 4 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006, Natural England expects to be included as a consultee in relation to any additional matters to be determined by the Council that may arise as a result of, or are related to, the present proposal. Natural England retains its statutory discretion to modify its present advice or opinion in view of any and all such additional matters or any additional information related to this consultation that may come to our attention.</p>	
Mrs Karen Reed		54	We need an evolutionary not revolutionary approach. The proposals here are too radical and will result in a commercialism that will detract from the beautiful coastline.	Plans are too radical.
Mr Robert McNamara		21	We need individual lockers on beaches if you go for a swim as an individual there is no where to put your valuables, glasses etc other resorts abroad have lockers you can put your belongings in.	Recommend lockers at the beach.
Mr David Ogborne	Wessex Water	277	<p>We note the objectives to provide a framework and structure for developing the seafront. Chapter 6 provides for a series of projects both short and long term: Sandbanks Beach - 170 beach huts, kiosk, cafe & possible low rise hotel and shops Shore Road - 80 beach huts and apartment buildings Flaghead Beach - additional beach huts & kiosk Canford Cliffs Beach - 119 beach huts, food & drink outlets, new toilets and possible new dwelling Branksome Beach - 120 new beach huts, watersport facility, food & drink outlets & possible "sky cafe Branksome Dene Beach - 13 beach huts, community/leisure facility, food and drink outlets Development proposals at Shore Road appear to conflict with existing plant and apparatus. I refer to section 6.2 and the private apartments shown as item 3 in the development principles diagram. This new building is shown above an existing foul water pumping station with associated sewers and control kiosk. New proposals in this position will be difficult to achieve without directly affecting our apparatus. In the circumstances we therefore oppose the redevelopment of this land. Please refer to the attached extract from record plans for your information. We request that further discussions are held with Wessex Water to examine these proposals in more detail. In general terms we will provide new water supply and sewer connections associated with any necessary capacity improvements to provide satisfactory levels of service. This may require contributions to network reinforcement where appropriate. We will be pleased to participate in any appraisal work for development proposals. We advise that developers/promoters contact Wessex Water to discuss requirements at an early stage to ensure that any infrastructure upgrades are planned to match the rate of development.</p>	Building on Shore Road car park is above a pumping station which would be difficult. Therefore further discussion required with Wessex Water to resolve.
Mrs Julie-Anne Ganner		91	We realise that we need to move with the times - but not to the detriment of the local residents.	Move with the times, but not to detriment of the locals.

Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment ID	Question 1 - The draft SPD provides an approach to planning for the future of the seafront. Please let us know your views on this approach.	Key Points
Miss Caroline Hughes		185	<p>We recognise the need to invest in the beachfront infrastructure and protect the outstanding natural environment but, in our view, these proposals fail to strike the right balance between the different aims of the draft SPD and would jeopardise the essential character of this section of the beach for visitors and residents alike. More specifically we would like you to take account of the following points: We do not recognise the characterisation of the Shore Road area as the 'Social Beach' targeting a 'youthful crowd'. It has long been a family beach on account of the safe swimming area and the proximity to the Sandbanks Hotel which hosts many families, and currently strikes a good balance in maintaining an appeal for all ages. It follows that attempting to create more nightlife would change the character of the area. We cannot see the justification for beach studios that would allow overnight stays. Inevitably this would create noise and disruption for local residents. The proposal to allow additional height and restrict the houses on Chaddesley Wood Road to 'oblique views' of the sea would damage the character of the area and represent an unacceptable impact on residents. Allowing for the possibility of a new 5 storey building jutting out onto the beach and looming over the houses would be disproportionate in the extreme. Two storeys should be sufficient to provide sensible additional facilities and attractions for visitors and we recognise the value of redeveloping the beach station and public toilets and the empty area in front of them on the promenade - a redeveloped restaurant offering sweeping views of the sea and coastline would be a welcome upgrade on present facilities. The proposals for new beach huts in the document are unclear in terms of where the additional numbers would be and the height of the redeveloped huts, but it should be possible to redevelop the existing beach huts without making them higher and causing a loss of outlook. There are examples further along the front of beach huts with gently pitched roofs that would have minimal impact if replicated here. If there is a need for more beach huts, they could easily be located further up towards Canford Cliffs and Branksome Chine, where adding a second tier against the cliffs would have no impact on residents and, at the same time, spreading the usage of the beach and other facilities more evenly along the promenade. Shore Road is already well served in terms of dining facilities with Jazzy's and the Sandbanks Hotel. What evidence is there of a need for significant additional restaurant space here? It would make more sense to extend the capacity on Sandbanks beach where there would be far less impact on existing businesses and residents, and more parking is available. The area already struggles in peak season to accommodate the number of visiting cars and yet these proposals offer an implausible combination of attracting more people with a reduction in the car park capacity and unconvincing proposals to enhance public transport that rely on persuading a commercial operator to subsidise the uneconomic out of season service for the ill-defined kudos of delivering people to the beach. Shore Road seems an odd choice for a new bike hire facility when cyclists are barred from the promenade during peak hours. There are already bike hire facilities on the other side of the Sandbanks Hotel. In summary, we are concerned that these proposals envisage an over-concentration of commercial facilities in an area that will struggle to accommodate additional numbers, and where the developments would have a damaging impact on the environment and local residents. We are not opposed to change - we believe that there is scope to achieve a more limited redevelopment that would enhance the facilities for visitors while achieving a better balanced development across the entire beach front.</p>	<p>SPD fails to strike the right balance between the aims and would jeopardise area's character. Shore Road is a family beach not youthful so new 5 storey building, studios, new restaurants and higher beach huts would harm its character. New huts should be provided further east. Loss of parking an issue and cycle hire wont work when summer cycling prohibited on the prom. Proposals are an over concentration of commercial facilities, should be spread across whole beach front, additional people would harm the environment here.</p>

Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment ID	Question 1 - The draft SPD provides an approach to planning for the future of the seafront. Please let us know your views on this approach.	Key Points
Mr Roger Wiltshire		199	<p>We recognise the need to invest in the beachfront infrastructure and protect the outstanding natural environment but, in our view, these proposals fail to strike the right balance between the different aims of the draft SPD and would jeopardise the essential character of this section of the beach for visitors and residents alike. More specifically we would like you to take account of the following points: We do not recognise the characterisation of the Shore Road area as the 'Social Beach' targeting a 'youthful crowd'. It has long been a family beach on account of the safe swimming area and the proximity to the Sandbanks Hotel which hosts many families, and currently strikes a good balance in maintaining an appeal for all ages. It follows that attempting to create more nightlife would change the character of the area. We cannot see the justification for beach studios that would allow overnight stays. Inevitably this would create noise and disruption for local residents. The proposal to allow additional height and restrict the houses on Chaddesley Wood Road to 'oblique views' of the sea would damage the character of the area and represent an unacceptable impact on residents. Allowing for the possibility of a new 5 storey building jutting out onto the beach and looming over the houses would be disproportionate in the extreme. Two storeys should be sufficient to provide sensible additional facilities and attractions for visitors and we recognise the value of redeveloping the beach station and public toilets and the empty area in front of them on the promenade - a redeveloped restaurant offering sweeping views of the sea and coastline would be a welcome upgrade on present facilities. The proposals for new beach huts in the document are unclear in terms of where the additional numbers would be and the height of the redeveloped huts, but it should be possible to redevelop the existing beach huts without making them higher and causing a loss of outlook. There are examples further along the front of beach huts with gently pitched roofs that would have minimal impact if replicated here. If there is a need for more beach huts, they could easily be located further up towards Canford Cliffs and Branksome Chine, where adding a second tier against the cliffs would have no impact on residents and, at the same time, spreading the usage of the beach and other facilities more evenly along the promenade. Shore Road is already well served in terms of dining facilities with Jazzy's and the Sandbanks Hotel. What evidence is there of a need for significant additional restaurant space here? It would make more sense to extend the capacity on Sandbanks beach where there would be far less impact on existing businesses and residents, and more parking is available. The area already struggles in peak season to accommodate the number of visiting cars and yet these proposals offer an implausible combination of attracting more people with a reduction in the car park capacity and unconvincing proposals to enhance public transport that rely on persuading a commercial operator to subsidise the uneconomic out of season service for the ill-defined kudos of delivering people to the beach. Shore Road seems an odd choice for a new bike hire facility when cyclists are barred from the promenade during peak hours. There are already bike hire facilities on the other side of the Sandbanks Hotel. In summary, we are concerned that these proposals envisage an over-concentration of commercial facilities in an area that will struggle to accommodate additional numbers, and where the developments would have a damaging impact on the environment and local residents. We are not opposed to change - we believe that there is scope to achieve a more limited redevelopment that would enhance the facilities for visitors while achieving a better balanced development across the entire beach front.</p>	<p>SPD fails to strike the right balance between the aims and would jeopardise area's character. Shore Road is a family beach not youthful so new 5 storey building, studios, new restaurants and higher beach huts would harm its character. New huts should be provided further east. Loss of parking an issue and cycle hire wont work when summer cycling prohibited on the prom. Proposals are an over concentration of commercial facilities, should be spread across whole beach front, additional people would harm the environment here.</p>
Miss Jan Moir		274	<p>We think it is important to maintain the charm and simplicity of our seafront. It is always a relief to leave the bustle of the Bournemouth Seafront area and walk back into the calm of our own. Toilet block upgrades would be welcome though. More beach huts and hotels etc would add to the need for yet more infrastructure.</p>	<p>Seafront charm and simplicity should be kept. Toilet upgrades required. More beach huts and hotels would add to the need for more infrastructure.</p>

Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment ID	Question 1 - The draft SPD provides an approach to planning for the future of the seafront. Please let us know your views on this approach.	Key Points
Mr & Dr Mark & Elizabeth Ball & Williams		273	We wanted to add our view, to we are sure the many local voices, outlining our dismay at the councils plan to sell our beautiful local seafront to the already too powerful local property developers without due regard for future generations. We are all extremely fortunate to live in such a beautiful area, the majority of the local population appreciate this and make good use of the local beaches and seafront (as your surveys confirm). We (generically) are happy to support the associated costs through our council tax and also other charges such as beach car parking etc. This is obviously supplemented through income from the many national and international tourists who enjoy the local area. The council's proposed plans do not support the conservation of the local natural environments but will lead to its destruction in an insidious piecemeal fashion. The proposals appear to support the councils unhealthy, intimate and immoral relationship with several local wealthy property developers and to ignore our responsibility to sustain the natural environment for our children and grandchildren to enjoy. The councils 'postcard' is misleading and the actual plans of the proposed developments difficult to find/access and hard to understand for the 'planning novice'. We urge the council to, at the minimum, fulfill its responsibility to consult widely in a honest and accessible way and to consider the long term implications of 'todays' choices.	
Mr John Russell		118	We welcome any improvements to the seafronts of Poole but consider this approach too futuristic.	Approach is too futuristic.
Mr & Mrs Mike & Andrea Williams		221	We would like to express a number of concerns regarding the proposed redevelopment of the Sandbanks seafront. As local residents we fully accept the need to smarten up the seafront. However it is essential that the plan is sensitive to the surrounding area and maintains the much loved character of the beach front. To this end we would make a number of points: One of the differences between Sandbanks and other Bournemouth sea front areas is that residents live on the water front at Sandbanks as opposed to along the cliff top elevated above sea level. As a consequence the redevelopment of beach huts has far greater impact in Sandbanks than elsewhere. The design of any new beach huts needs to be sensitive to this issue (i.e. 2 level beach huts will be inappropriate in many cases) as does their permitted use. Specifically, the idea of allowing overnight use is unacceptable and would risk turning the area into an effective camp site with increased pollution from noise, littering etc. which would threaten the character of this unique environment. It is always sad to see the degree of littering that occurs on a sunny summer's day - this situation would likely be made 10 times worse by the addition of overnight beach huts. The addition of a multi-story block in the area of the current lifeguard station, public toilets and Jazz Cafe needs to be in-keeping with the current environment. The height of the building is a critical consideration and must not exceed that of the surrounding buildings in order to maintain the current character. Failure to adhere to this height restriction would set a dangerous precedent for further public and private redevelopment in the area. Access to the peninsula is already problematic with car parking and traffic queues a constant issue in summer months - the redevelopment risks exacerbating this issue and needs to be fully considered in any plans. Local residents should be offered priority in leasing new beach huts with a view to maintaining the community feel and shared responsibility that exists in the area. Local residents should also be more effectively informed of the development proposals going forward. We have received no direct consultation from Poole Borough, only hearing of the plans via discussions with our neighbours.	Redevelopment of beach huts at Sandbanks has greater impact than elsewhere because residential is nearer the water (not on cliff top). Do not support overnight huts or buildings higher than surroundings (e.g. at Shore Road). Traffic congestion needs considering so it doesn't worsen. Local residents should be involved to maintain community feel.
Mr Peter Edginton		117	What is proposed will totally destroy lovely Sandbanks.	Plans will destroy Sandbanks

Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment ID	Question 1 - The draft SPD provides an approach to planning for the future of the seafront. Please let us know your views on this approach.	Key Points
Mr James Pride		171	While there is no doubt that the beach infrastructure needs to be updated, I believe the money should have come from past and future S106 and CIL money raised from development. I feel that selling the "jewels" is not the answer. Projects that provide long term cash flow, rather than an assets sale would be preferable. I was also disappointed that no financial feasibility has been presented to us so far. I also feel that whatever is done the character of the area should be retained as far as possible. While modernisation is necessary and desirable, overdevelopment will not make the peninsula more attractive to tourists. I am not convinced that the realities of the project have been properly considered. A water taxi service takes in no account of the tidal nature of the harbour side, and the sensitive nature of the eel grass, bird life etc. Car parking improvements and building in the Canford Cliffs Chine area may also have problems with Covenants on the public land gifted to the authority in the 1920's.	Infrastructure should be paid for from CIL and S106. Projects bringing long term cash flow rather than selling assets would be preferable. Lacking in financial viability. Character must be retained and environment protected, water taxi will conflict with this. Car parking and building at Canford Cliffs would conflict with covenants.
Mr Tim Potten		181	Whilst having a strategy is a good idea, the plans are impossible to assess without some estimate of the costs and financial estimates of each of the various elements. It says it will cost £7m to stand still - but how is that cost broken down and how much extra will the changes cost and what increase in income stream will they produce? If the sole benefit is capital from selling off the beach to developers then how long before more has to be sold off in order to refurbish what is left of a diminishing resource? The beach huts already cost an eye-watering £1680 pa to rent - with well over 100 of them and a huge waiting list this should produce large incomes. Why then are so many unavailable? Car parking is packed if there is decent weather - at over £10 per space per day again this should provide income. Where does it go? How can the plan be assessed without this information?	SPS lacks financial justification. Selling off assets is finite, revenue from beach huts and parking must be huge. Where does this money go?
Mrs F Davis		283	Whilst I do understand that the ageing facilities need to be upgraded, and I am in favour of this, it seems to all the plans for development are very heavily biased towards visitors. I do realise that the Council wishes to increase its revenue, but the area's residents are being ignored. Changes on the scale proposed would adversely affect the quality of life in the area. I am referring in particular to the proposed water sports facilities on Branksome Beach, and the possible construction of a hotel and an entertainment venue on Branksome Dene Beach. I do not believe the hotel could be built without quite a chunk of the Chine being sacrificed, something which I would not call "woodland management". As far as the sports facilities and particularly the entertainment venue are concerned, these would create a great deal of extra noise. We currently have a great many power boats racing between Poole and Bournemouth, as well as the occasional parties in the Community Centre. Although very often loud enough to be heard by the Branksome Dene residents, these are infrequent and do not cause much of a problem. We do not, however, need more. Had we wished to have traffic noise and entertainment on our doorstep, we would have bought a property in town.	Appreciate need for upgrade but works biased towards visitors. Branksome Dene should not have a hotel, music venue or water sports as these would reduce quality of life from noise pollution.
Mr & Mrs Steve & Lisa Beynon		247	Whilst the ideas of investment, architecture, facilities and all that is proposed are good; all of these ideas require space and access. The final part of the SPD states, quote 'Pooles beachfront is breathtaking, precious and fragile'. Updating existing facilities is clearly a good idea but adding new facilities, which will just bring in more tourism and people, is not. During busy months the traffic jams speak for themselves - already the infrastructure is under pressure. By adding more facilities, using up car park spaces for development and increasing the commercialisation will just add even more pressure to the current access and sustainability of the area/s. Promoting 'park and ride' style facilities will not work. Tourists use their cars because they contain all that they need for the day (picnic, bbq, buckets, spades, clothing, beach games, boogie boards etc.) - and with this quantity of stuff they will want to park and have access to the car. Keep the area as it is, don't add more concrete or buildings and improve what is already there.	Space and access required to deliver ideas. Updating is good but will bring in more people which is not good as will add to pressure on the area and its roads. Keep area as it is.

Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment ID	Question 1 - The draft SPD provides an approach to planning for the future of the seafront. Please let us know your views on this approach.	Key Points
Mr Will Robbins		51	<p>Whilst there is much that is good in this document there are some suggestions that are so insensitive to particular locations and for that matter the local residents that it is beyond belief . My view as a frequent visitor to the area is that the Sandbanks car park whilst essential is really rather an eyesore. At the best of times it has the appearance of a light industrial site due to the scarcity of attractive buildings. This is the place to develop - there is SPACE and it could be much improved with your suggestions. Something with a bit of tradition and style - Cape Cod/New England. Seven developments/modern has been "done to death". Further development of Shore Road would be sheer madness - traffic is worse than Picadilly circus when the sun comes out. No parking - very difficult for the diasabled and dangerous for pedestrians dodging traffic. My daughter had her foot run over this summer - fortunately she made light of the incident. Best to ban all traffic except deliveries, residents and disabled. Sorry I haven't really answered the above question - I dont think enough people are aware of your proposals.</p>	<p>There is much good in the document but some suggestions are insensitive. Should develop Sandbanks car park as there is space there. Ban all traffic except deliveries an for the disabled. Not enough people know of the proposals.</p>
Mrs Alison Fulford		120	<p>Why spoil the lovely beach that we have and make it over commercialised ?</p>	<p>Over commercialised.</p>
Mr Eric Baylis		230	<p>With regard to your proposals between Shore Road and Flaghead Chine. These proposals have and will continue to blight the value of all the properties on the sea front side of Chaddesley Wood Road. With comments of an oblique view of the sea is acceptable and a 3 to 5 building out onto the beach also 3 storey high beach huts with over night accommodation, the existing inferior structure could not cope with any of this. We put Poole Council on notice that we are taking legal advice, for the purpose of suing Poole Council for loss of value to all our properties. Last year a resident of Poole had a tree removed illegally without permission he was fined £70,000 pounds it was also decided that by removing the tree he improved his view and therefore increased the value of his property it was decided accordingly that he had to pay a further £100,000. I am not certain of the figures they are a matter of public knowledge which you can check. Your proposals are our tree, you have set the president which works both ways we will use this as part of our legal argument in this matter. This action could end up very costly to both parties, but we are prepared to stand up for our rights.</p>	<p>High buildings at Shore Road would blight homes in Chaddesley Wood Road so legal advice being taken.</p>
Mr Jeff Mercuri		228	<p>With regards to the Proposed Development of the seafront at Sandbanks, I am appalled at yet another commercially led development of our lovely seafront. It seems as though commerce and business again has taken precedence over common sense and the conservation of our wonderful English seaside resorts. I have been holidaying in the Sandbanks and Poole area for nearly twenty years now and feel that the proposed changes will take away the magic from the area not to mention create even more of a traffic hazard, which are as bad as they have every been. I would like to see more a pedestrianised area with less built up facilities. There seems to be more area for development further along the coastline in the large car parks. There already seems to be a great number of local, independent restaurants and cafes that will be driven out and exploited by the introduction of newer, more expensive facilities that will inevitably invite large chains to inhabit the area. This will not help or please anyone especially myself or my family. The existing toilet block needs modernisation and could incorporate the RNLi buildings and Visitor's Centre into one subtle, low level building that blends into the beach front. Preferably constructed of ecologically sourced materials. Finally, I am concerned for the disruption of the local flora and fauna with principal attention to the sand lizards. I have noticed that little or no attention has been paid to this and am greatly concerned again with the propositions accordingly. I hope that the Borough of Poole reconsiders these propositions and opts for one that incorporates a less commercial and more quintissentially British Seaside development.</p>	<p>Commerce and business are taking precedence over conservation and common sense. Needs more pedestrianisation and less built up facilities. More development space in large car parks along the coastline. It will drive out the local and independent establishments. Shore Road needs low level modernising without disrupting local fauna and fauna.</p>

Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment ID	Question 1 - The draft SPD provides an approach to planning for the future of the seafront. Please let us know your views on this approach.	Key Points
Mr Frank Tanner		119	<p>Your approach to the existing seafront is gung ho...where have we suddenly raised the money to re-develop sites that are still very serviceable as they are??? Why do you think putting new 'modern' buildings in place of 'character' buildings would be beneficial to the area?? Canford Cliffs Beach Huts are fine...they just need maintenance as the does Civic Centre, in fact as does every building the Council occupy...does that mean that all of Poole Council buildings will be removed and modernised? Please stop messing with Poole Town as if it was a new Garden City...the mess that has been made of the planning job so far should deter anymore re-development in the Town. Poole is a charming harbour and Beach Town with old history attached and that should be maintained throughout the Town as much as possible for as long as possible and with our belt tightening at present I fail to see why this planning is on the radar at all!!! Car parking should be the number one priority in this Town...it's a disgrace in most areas and the Beaches suffer the most....I was dumbfounded how you would let a Tesco Express shop be allowed to trade on the busiest stretch of roads in the summer months with absolute limited parking and entrance and exit onto Banks Road an idiotic decision from a road safety point of view, with that in mind I have no faith in any planning proposals from Poole Council!! sorry but that's how it is I'm afraid.</p>	<p>Gung-ho approach. Maintenance not rebuilding is required. Seafront should not be meddled with as upkeep of other areas like the Quay are more important. Car parking should be number one priority.</p>
Rev John Hainsworth		297	<p>Whilst I applaud your general policy with regard to improving the facilities for Poole's Beaches I am concerned with the proposal to run a water taxi to the Whitely Lake - North Haven Lake Area. The site shown as number 3 is perilously close to the North Haven Yacht Club and its moorings and Whitely Lake is a very busy Wind and Kite Surfing Area. This poses many safety issues for those concerned. In addition any craft would have to be of very shallow draught in order to access the area which is either dry or shallow for much of the time. Those who wish to access the area by water could do so via the existing ferries from the quay to Brownsea Island or the Sandbanks Jetty by the Studland Ferry Terminal. The major issue in providing access is the congestion on the roads and I would have thought that a reasonable way of tackling this without major expenditure would be a Park & Ride System using the existing Creekmoor Site and serving both the town and the beaches. With regard to the suggestion that parking should be rationed by price my concern is that this would severely restrict the use of this area by local families who live outside the Poole Boundary, even as near as Upton, and use the beaches on a regular basis.</p>	<p>Applaud general policy of improving facilities on seafront, but water taxi problematic for safety reasons and shallow water. Existing road congestion could be tackled with a park and ride facility, and not rationed by price which excludes certain people.</p>