

Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment ID	Question 2 - Poole's seafront requires considerable investment in infrastructure. Doing nothing is not an option. Do you consider that the opportunities that have been identified provide an appropriate balance of facilities to improve Poole's seafront? If not, why not?	Key Points
Mr David Stapleton		38	Absolutely not. Poorly thought out. It is to the council as either landowner or public servant to carry out the remedial works to the infrastructure and by their own admission they have failed to do so. The neglect is their fault and their responsibility.	No. The Council's responsibility.
Mrs Jacqueline Reining		147	After many years it was such a relief to see the IMAX eyesore pulled down. How on earth does Poole Borough Council think that Poole residents would like their very own copy erected at Shore Road. Have they not learned from Bournemouth's mistake? The drawings of the restaurant/cafe complex looks like a bus without wheels; an eyesore. There are plenty of eateries already. However improving toilet and shower facilities would be good. I would also like to add that I know of no-one who was consulted on this process even those who live very nearby . So I would be most interested to know who you did consult. Surely all residents should be canvassed by post if you are to get an accurate view of tax payers thinking on your ' over the top' proposals. After all it is their money you will be spending.	No. New building at Shore Road an eyesore, though improved toilets and showers would be good. Inadequate consultation.
Mr David Segal		35	Agreed. I note the term " appropriate balance of facilities" although did not see mentioned anywhere the breakdown of current customers nor proposed demographic markets. Typical flaw in council grand plans. Compare with a business plan. This plan seems to concentrate on eating and beach huts catering for more people rather than better offers for current level, which would lead to increases anyway. Year round residents and daily beach users like me do not seem to figure. Major issues for us are developing further parking rather than trying to bus in tourists into a bottle neck area that already seizes up at peak times. Earlier car park full / overcrowded warning signs needed at ENTRY POINTS of Lilliput, Canford Cliffs and the Wessex Way. Land train / small buses from Whitecliffs to Sandbanks using road. Increase parking at Whitecliffs. Develop Baiter slip with a small pier and run a Water taxi to Sandbanks from there. make it easier for the elderly and disabled to access the beaches down the Chine, spreading the access load. Using a impressive cable car or glass covered escalator. Create a boardwalk /wider prom along the whole seafront length to separate bikes from people as much as possible. More modern cubical toilets, shower stands, changing bays and so forth. Create a children's playground on the beach with some imaginative huge, tide impervious structures. etc etc.	Yes. Lacking stats on demographics and types of users, or business plan approach. Focus on new users not right. Require better car park signage, land train/buses, water taxi, cable car, boardwalk, wider prom, to improve access. Also required: toilets, showers, changing area, children's playground.
Mrs Helen Hughes		22	Although the (existing) infrastructure needs to be maintained and updated, that is as far as I agree with the statement that 'doing nothing is not an option'. The proposals are very costly and money would be better spent on education/social support/locating new facilities such as a music venue and "Go Ape' style trails proposed for Branksome Dene Chine further inland. The beaches are already well used to the extent of overcrowding in good weather and extra facilities such as these that are unrelated to beach leisure would merely add to the overcrowding, queues of traffic and overheated car drivers wildly searching for car parking spaces - public transport links would need to be much improved to reduce car use and also many people would find it hard to cycle in from outside the area. (I do agree with the proposal to encourage more cycling/use of public transport in theory.)	Infrastructure does need maintaining but costly proposals unrelated to beach activities would lead to overcrowding. Improved transport links required.

Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment ID	Question 2 - Poole's seafront requires considerable investment in infrastructure. Doing nothing is not an option. Do you consider that the opportunities that have been identified provide an appropriate balance of facilities to improve Poole's seafront? If not, why not?	Key Points
Mrs Tara Bird		71	<p>As a property developer for a number of years, I have read your recent proposal with great interest from both a business and personal perspective. I have been visiting Sandbanks Beach for many years and always enjoy spending time on your beautiful beaches with my young son and other family members. I am in agreement that some investment needs to happen on your coast line to bring it up to modern day requirements and some of your proposals for the whole stretch of beach are desperately needed; e.g. more public toilets, modernisation of beach huts, more seating areas. However there are a few of your proposals that I feel need to be readdressed. Parking problems and congestion into Sandbanks gets increasingly more noticeable and problematic year after year and I cannot see how any of your proposals are going to improve either severe problem, only add to them. Surely before increasing any facilities on the lower end of Sandbanks, the parking issues have to be addressed first. I am absolutely speechless as to the proposal of putting up a 4/5 storey monstrosity on the corner of Shore Road and the Promenade and cannot believe that the council would be seriously considering this proposal. I support completely new modern buildings, however one on a coast line with that many floors will affect the skyline forever and will look completely out of place. This particular part of the beach has the most number of residential houses that will be affected, so surely this must be taken into consideration when bearing mind that it is these residents who pay their taxes either directly to the council or to the government through Stamp Duty. I feel extremely sorry for the residents in and around Shore Road and Chaddesley Wood Road, who will not only have to contend with the increased number of tourists, severe lack of parking and then to top it off a possible 4/5 storey eyesore. Perhaps a nice modern single storey longer building could be built to house new toilets, showers, lockers, even family changing rooms for hire would be more appropriate. A visitor centre needs to be accessed by all the public either via foot or car and needs sufficient parking to accommodate it. Things like top floor restaurants or public function room should be kept for the other visitor centres you are proposing further down the beach where proper allocated parking is available. Sandbanks is known throughout the world and its reputation is second to none, I think that Poole council need to think very carefully before they overdevelop the area and devalue it for everyone, themselves included.</p>	<p>Investment required to bring facilities up to modern standards, but current parking problems must be addressed first. Lower scale and height of development is needed at Shore Road without blighting existing residents.</p>
Mr Will Robbins		51	<p>Yes the seafront could be made far more attractive but pick the right locations. Develop Sandbanks car park which has space. Please do not overdevelop tight little character areas like Shore Road and Branksome Chine/Dene. These are already choked and don't need increased density of development. Please don't put 2,3,4 storey blocks on the seafront - look at IMAX and learn. Best replace toilet blocks at Shore Road and Branksome with modern SINGLE STORY, attractive, washrooms and combine with RNLI/visitor centre. Please don't block the views - WINDOWS for the masses please so we can see our beaches and headlands. This is what this coastline is all about. There is no need for more restaurants at Shore Road or Branksome.</p>	<p>Opportunities for a more attractive seafront but in the right locations. Develop Sandbanks car park not Shore Road or Branksome Dene. Buildings should be single storey and should not block views.</p>
Dr Alan Fisher		151	<p>As Poole residents living close to Branksome Chine and Branksome Dene Chine we would make the following observation about the proposed developments in these two locations. Parking in Branksome Chine is limited so at peak times users of the chine park in surrounding streets. It tends to be used mainly by people who want to use the beach or walk on the promenade. Leaving a car at some distance from the beach would make it difficult to participate in water sports so we would anticipate it would not be a good location for such activities. Branksome Dene Chine has been the natural choice for those participating in water sports. It is less congested and there is more parking close to the beach for people wishing to unload and carry windsurfers and kiting equipment to the water. Wind and paddle propelled water sports offer entertainment to both participants and observers. Powered boats are obtrusive and would be detrimental to users of the beach and local residents so please do not facilitate their use in these areas. Hotels, with their associated parking, generally have a large footprint which would dominate Branksome Dene Chine. A hotel combined with a performance venue would almost certainly drive out those who currently use the chine as a base for water sport and would overwhelm the natural setting and</p>	<p>Branksome Dene is a good location for watersports, (but not powered boats), but a hotel would not be compatible with watersports activities and tranquillity and natural setting would be lost.</p>

Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment ID	Question 2 - Poole's seafront requires considerable investment in infrastructure. Doing nothing is not an option. Do you consider that the opportunities that have been identified provide an appropriate balance of facilities to improve Poole's seafront? If not, why not?	Key Points
			tranquillity of this much valued chine.	
Mr & Mrs Christopher & Ruth Orme		90	As residents of a development bordering the edge of Branksome Dene Chine we are particularly concerned about: Increased traffic and parking problems in our and neighboring roads to cope with added facilities and new events in the Chine. Increased noise levels from any live music and extra facilities in the Chine. Security issues to residents with gardens adjacent to the Chine if the area is opened up to tree-top adventure trails etc. This would necessitate high railings to partition the flats/houses off from likely intruders, presumably at the residents' cost. The proposed commercialization would interfere with the present unspoiled natural beauty of this Chine and is in opposition to one of the three key themes identified in your draft document, namely "maintain, respect and enhance" the natural environment. My husband and I have always regarded Branksome Dene Chine as an area of outstanding natural beauty. In fact, a few years ago, we joined in with a hands-on project of planting trees in the Chine in an effort to maintain and enhance the already magnificent area. Please do not plan to desecrate this rare natural haven for wildlife and peace. Once it's gone, it's gone forever!	In relation to Branksome Dene, there is concern about increased traffic, parking problems, threat to security and noise pollution. Commercialisation would harm current unspoiled natural beauty.
Mr Stephen Bailey		24	At Shore Road the facilities are tired to put it gently. However the proposal to build a three to five storey building out onto the beach (page 50) is not the answer. The excessive scale, bulk and footprint of the proposed building is inappropriate and would not be in character with the area. This proposal would block the view of the beach in both directions. I would also seriously question the environmental and economic sustainability of such a project as well as the impact on transport and parking. I believe that it would be better to demolish the toilet block and surrounding beach office and set back a new modern single storey shower and toilet block to give a greater area of open space and enhanced views. It would also be much cheaper to construct and maintain.	At Shore Road the facilities are tired, but the illustrated proposal is excessive in height and scale and would block views. Replacement building with open space would be preferred.
Mrs Joanna Walker		97	Canford Cliff Chine sleeping pods...ridiculous idea. Who will monitor them and it may well encourage people to sleep in their beach huts. How are the roads at the Esplanade suddenly going to have increased parking capacity when there is already parking along as much of the road as is safe.	The Canford Cliffs sleeping pods would not be well served by on street parking and they would encourage overnight sleeping in beach huts. Would require monitoring.

Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment ID	Question 2 - Poole's seafront requires considerable investment in infrastructure. Doing nothing is not an option. Do you consider that the opportunities that have been identified provide an appropriate balance of facilities to improve Poole's seafront? If not, why not?	Key Points
Miss Nicola Bailey		177	<p>Certainly money needs to be spent on improving the toilet facilities along the sea front, but improving the facilities for visitors during good weather should not spoil the natural beauty and charm of the beach and coastline for those residents and others who wish to enjoy the area all year round. The proposal to build a hotel and apartments on the car parks at Sandbanks and Shore Road and reduce the already inadequate (in good weather) parking seems ludicrous and a very short-sighted proposal for raising funds. There are plenty of hotels further inland without the need to spoil the facilities currently enjoyed by day visitors to Sandbanks. Increasing the parking on Banks Road by adopting angled bays must surely be too dangerous to be an option, with the volume of vehicles and cyclists using the road. Introducing Park and Ride schemes, which can be flexible depending on the time of year and even the weather, would surely help. The proposed 'Landmark Building' at Shore Road projecting onto the beach (reminiscent of the Imax in Bournemouth) would be an eyesore as well as spoiling views of the sea from inland and of the beautiful curve of the beach from East and West. A low level more attractive building further back here would be much more appropriate. (It seems strange that such an intrusive building in such a position could be considered, in view of the strict planning policies for private owners on Sandbanks who even have to get permission to cut a dangerous branch off a tree.) Any changes to the beach huts should take into consideration the wildlife corridor along the cliffs, and make sure that an adequate amount of habitat is preserved. During the low season and in poor weather a high proportion of beach users are dog walkers. If the new cafes are not dog-friendly, they are unlikely to have sufficient trade during the winter to be sustainable.</p>	<p>Toilet improvements are required. Hotels and apartments should not incur loss of parking, and echelon parking would be dangerous. Shore Road landmark building would be an eyesore, lower level building required. The cliff wildlife corridor must be encroached by beach huts. Cafes should be dog friendly to ensure winter trade.</p>
Mr Clive Andrewes		37	<p>Certainly not. The underlying reason is that, although understanding commercial need, this is far too commercial - a hotel etc. This is a glorious part of the beach and coastline and so many of our family who came to two events at the community centre - my mothers 90th birthday (over a 100 people from across UK, and from abroad) and her wake - all commented on the natural beauty of the views and cliffs. This is all too easy to destroy. There are a good range of facilities towards Bournemouth to cater for those who want food and "entertainment".</p>	<p>No. Too commercial.</p>
Mr Jerzy Krol		87	<p>Clearly something has to be done about the ageing, predominantly ugly and inappropriate existing infrastructure. There are many ideas in the plans that can be commended such as better placed toilets, showers, bike parking, more seating, better signs and access. Let's however also try to correct the mistakes of the past not compound them. Apart from commercial reasons, is there a need for further beach huts, in particular multi storied ones. Most of the existing are unused a lot of the time and these concrete structures are a particular eyesore. Let's replace them with a reduced number of a more sympathetic design. Then use the freed up space, improve the ability of a larger number of visitors to rent lockers to store their beach gear, whether just a set of clothes or windbreak, tables, chairs etc. Please let's not entertain the idea of another hotel in the Sandbanks area, outside of the summer season are the existing hotels really struggling to cope with demand? Where has the mini golf gone, the only popular attraction when the weather is inclement! Improve the landscaping by all means but maintain the current level of off street parking. There is suitable and available space here to be imaginative and create additional facilities mentioned in your plans. Single storey please! Improve access and encourage visitors without cars, be it by public transport by foot or bicycle. Consider some form of road congestion charging at peak times. Let's however get away from the idea that building 3/4 storey buildings off Shore Road, multistorey beach huts and overnight beach studios (houses) overlooking the beach or in the Chines will somehow enhance this environment.</p>	<p>Clear need for improvements to infrastructure. Correct previous mistakes not compound them. Question need for beach studios, more beach huts and at 2 storey height. Provide lockers. Maintain current level of car parking. Improve access and attract visitors by alternative modes to the car. Consider road congestion charge at peak times.</p>

Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment ID	Question 2 - Poole's seafront requires considerable investment in infrastructure. Doing nothing is not an option. Do you consider that the opportunities that have been identified provide an appropriate balance of facilities to improve Poole's seafront? If not, why not?	Key Points
Mrs Cary Wicks		163	<p>CONCERNS RE PARKING: I understand that the SPD has been drawn up to conserve, improve & invest in Poole's Seafront. My greatest concern is that some of the proposals will remove parking spaces eg at Shore Road. The proposals for increased 'on road' parking will mean narrow roads with reduced access in what are already overcrowded roads in the height of the summer season. If they went ahead these proposals will definitely increase traffic congestion in the summer at places such as Shore Road and in and around the Canford Cliffs & Branksome Beach area.</p> <p>CONCERNS RE BUILDING PROPOSALS: The proposed construction - hotels, overnight accommodation, apartments, would alter the unique character of the area and possibly even affect Poole's reputation as a family friendly place to visit.</p> <p>CONCERNS RE MATERIALS: Buildings using natural materials look beautiful when they are new, but are costly to maintain and quickly look 'tired' when exposed to the elements and salty sea air. eg the examples of Wooden Studios, contemporary beach hut designs, etc. These would need regular maintenance - would the Borough have the capacity and the budget to increase its maintenance programme?</p> <p>CONCERNS RE GROUND MAINTENANCE: There is mention of revealing the chine landscape which would be expensive to do, but would also need maintaining afterwards - Branksome Dene Chine has never been maintained since all the rhododendrons were removed and continues to be an eyesore every time I walk down this way. Would the Borough have the capacity and the budget to increase its maintenance programme to look after all the chine & dune landscapes?</p> <p>POSITIVES: I applaud the idea for increased lighting along the promenade, additional seating, additional toilets at beach level, increased play areas for children, better disabled access, upgrading of showers. (I am unsure about a "Go Ape" style playground - but if it can be shown to be self financing, why not, as this is something that would appeal to the teenage & family market). I understand it is a difficult balance to find ways of generating income whilst still preserving the environment, so making single story blocks, two story blocks, increasing all year round food & drink options, providing additional facilities - eg water sports & children's play areas, will attract residents and visitors to use the beach at other times - not just in the summer, which would bring in more revenue and help conserve our amazing environment.</p>	<p>Loss of parking will add to road congestion. New building would harm unique character. Regular maintenance required for new buildings that weather and landscaping of chines and dunes, ensure budget for this. Applaud new lighting, seating, toilets, play areas, disabled access and showers. Support generating income from new beach huts and food outlets to bring about all year use.</p>
Mr Mike Gardiner		156	<p>Doing nothing is actually an option. It isn't perhaps the best option, but it is most definately an option. The opportunitis identified will line the pockets of a very, very few (developers mostly I expect or am I being too cynical?) The single biggest 'opportunity' which should be addressed is not to allow the beach to effectively close at around 5.00pm. Every kiosk and stall and cafe simply closes up. This of course presumes that they are open to begin with. Out of season, there is no opportunity to buy a coffee on the beach or a bag of chips either. This was a major factor in us renting a beach hut: with a portable cooker, we could have a cup of tea or a bacon sarnie at any time of the day...or year! Mind you, I guess all the 'fancy' beach huts you advertise in the plan will cost so much more than they do now (already not cheap) that we'll be priced out and lose that too.</p>	<p>Doing nothing is an option even if not the best option. An opportunity is to keep beach (i.e. kiosks) open beyond 5pm and not to allow new beach huts to be more expensive than those currently available.</p>
Mrs Gill Kirby		160	<p>Far from improving the seafront, many of the facilities proposed would spoil it forever. The idea of a 'landmark' building incorporating a cafe/restaurant/bar/visitors centre on the Shore Road promenade is ill-conceived; we would be creating the Imax of Poole! Beach users sitting on the promenade or using beach huts to the east of this complex would have the view of the Purbecks replaced with that of the side of a potenitally 5 storey- high building. Moreover, considering there are already two existing cafes/restaurants at the Shore Road beach, I feel it would be unnecessary to build another. Whilst I agree that there is a need for more beach huts to be made available, I feel that we already have enough overnight accommodation in this area; there is an adequate number of hotels, guest houses, and holiday flats near the beach. I was shocked to see the Branksome Dene Chine Pavillion described as 'tired' and 'no longer fit for purpose'. This historic building should be preserved rather than demolished.</p>	<p>No more cafes required and Shore Road building is inappropriate. More beach huts may be required but not overnight accommodation. Community Room should be preserved not demolished.</p>

Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment ID	Question 2 - Poole's seafront requires considerable investment in infrastructure. Doing nothing is not an option. Do you consider that the opportunities that have been identified provide an appropriate balance of facilities to improve Poole's seafront? If not, why not?	Key Points
Mr Tim Potten		181	Focussing on Sandbanks: Why do we need more shops and restaurants except to provide developers with the chance to put in yet more £million flats on top - at the expense of regular holidaymakers Why do we need a "boutique" hotel or wedding venue using up more of the beautiful beach and promenade How will diagonal parking fit along Banks Road - there is little enough room to pass now what with the dangerously positioned cycle path - and how will reversing drivers leaving the space see cyclists approaching along that path? Accidents waiting to happen. Loss of crazy golf - a popular diversion for ordinary families during a day on the beach looking for a change from sandcastles Water taxi - apart from the tidal issue, how much will it be used for most of the year; how many people can it take; where will the masses queue on busy days; will it (including the parking fee in Poole) be cheaper than parking on Sandbanks. Beach huts - people want to sit outside their beach huts, for which they pay through the nose, and see the beach/sea, not the front or back of someone else's beach hut! If a second layer of parking was added - as used in many railway car parks - it could add another 50% or more spaces, giving more revenue, greater access and fewer queues on most days of the year. It would not block anyone's views and could even provide somewhere cool for the polo ponies to stand rather than baking in direct sunlight as this year on one of the hottest days of the year. Free up the beach huts to get more revenue - many appear never to be used and the cost of maintenance must be considerably less than the fees which have risen by almost 60% in 3 years for those that are available.	Shops and hotels not required, nor loss of mini-golf at Sandbanks. Diagonal parking on Banks Road will be dangerous. Beach huts should face the sea, and vacant huts should be freed up. 2 storey car park at Sandbanks would provide more parking. Sceptical about water taxi use
Mrs Anna Robinson		18	For the same reasons I've suggested above, the plans focus on many areas, those that concern me are situated mainly in the Branksome Dene Area, albeit attractive to the tourist, I would want confirmation that lack of existing parking facilities would be greatly improved... Especially taking into consideration the plans that are being put forward for this area.	More parking required at Branksome Dene Chine.
Mr Philip Segelman		109	Generally the proposals are in keeping	Proposals are generally in keeping.
Mr Robert Lister		40	Hotels, Shops and restaurants are all closing and struggling in this climate, so there will not be the capital investment to fund any of these projects for ten years or more! Beach Studios are a definite no no! So is the Water Taxi pier idea. We need to make better paths down Chines, like Branksome to encourage, cyclists, mobility scooters and Mums with buggies for better access. We need a land Train, there is no bus from Poole to Branksome, there is not enough parking. To consider loosing 70 bays for a water sports facility is sheer madness at Branksome Chine.	No capital investment for projects identified. Water taxi idea, beach studios and watersports and Branksome Dene Chine are not favoured. Better access required in Chines, land train and improved bus service.
Mrs Tracey Bethell		43	I absolutely do not agree that a hotel in Branksome Dene Chine is in any way appropriate, no matter how 'boutique' it is. The community space should be actively used by schools, colleges and performing arts bodies as suggested to enrich the experience of the locals.this particular part of the beach is held dear to local residents including the elderly, young families and dog walkers who take delight in frequent walks here.	No hotel at Branksome Dene. Community Room space should be used by locals.

Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment ID	Question 2 - Poole's seafront requires considerable investment in infrastructure. Doing nothing is not an option. Do you consider that the opportunities that have been identified provide an appropriate balance of facilities to improve Poole's seafront? If not, why not?	Key Points
Mrs Fiona Marlow		31	I absolutely do not agree with your suggested plans, especially those for Branksome Dene and Shore Road. Branksome Dene chine is not cluttered as you suggest, but is natural and is home to a variety of wildlife- including Tawny owl, kestrel, woodpecker, not to mention a myriad of smaller birds. Clearing it to put in a treetop trail would have a huge negative impact on the wildlife and surely cannot be consistent with the Chine's status as an SSI. It would also impinge on the security and privacy of residents whose gardens back into the chine. The community hut is a wonderful, quirky, unique venue available for everybody and definitely IS still suitable for purpose. There are plenty of more "up market" venues available in the area without the need to replace this much loved and landmark building. Replacing it with a hotel is an appalling idea- it is supposed to be for the community!!! Making it more elite and expensive would prevent many locals from being able to use it. This chine is fabulous and unique - don't homogenise it. I remember a bird sanctuary used to be in the wooded area at the top of Canford Cliffs before this area was cleared. Why not put one in at Branksome Dene chine? Use the money you would have spent on the treetop trail on other more useful things in the Poole area. I can see that more benches and better toilet blocks would benefit everybody, but your other suggestions will ruin the very beauty and character you claim to be keen to preserve. The building you propose to put over the beach at Shore Road is an eyesore and has to be one of the worst ideas ever- probably on a par with the recently demolished Imax. Again, why are you taking away everything that is lovely about the area?	Tree top trail would have negative impact upon wildlife and natural setting. Hotel here is inappropriate and community room is still suitable for use. Toilets and benches are required though. Building proposed at Shore Road is an eyesore.
Miss Claire Harris		53	I agree investment and work needs to be done to existing facilities to maintain and repair and this is certainly not being done at the moment - as I write this the branksome Dene toilets have had 2 cubicles in the Ladies out of action for over a week, covering the bank holiday and the airshow, causing long queues - such instances are hardly a good advert for the Council and its ability to provide and maintain the extensive facilities proposed in this document. My concern is not the balance of the facilities proposed but whether they are truly necessary. People come to this area because it is relatively unspoilt. These plans together with the proposed wind farm will serve to detract and put off visitors.	Investment required but are proposed developments necessary? Visitors will be put off coming if area becomes spoilt.
Mrs Penelope Samuel		146	I agree that doing nothing is not an option but please take residents/rate-payers into consideration. We are here all year round and do not want to be forced away from the beach because of inappropriate noise or behaviour.	Fear of inappropriate noise and behaviour. Accept doing nothing is not an option.
Mr Roy Knott		23	I agree that doing nothing would only result in a steady decline in the quality of a wonderful asset. The debate revolves around the need for a balanced development that does not alter or detract from the fundamental charm of the area. Various ideas for change have been correctly identified. However, in my opinion, some of these changes may not achieve a positive result in that they would change the character of the area. Specifically, a major increase in the number of beach huts would create a 'built effect' to the promenade and change the look of the natural cliff faces. Similarly, I do not accept the rationale for a new private dwelling on the small plot of land adjacent to 24 Cliff Drive. Why should yet another private property in Canford Cliffs be beneficial other than providing an opportunity for the Council to raise funds from the sale of public land? Currently, this tree-lined plot provides an attractive corner to a part of Cliff Drive facing the sea. Another property would partly obscure existing views and change the skyline unnecessarily.	Agree that doing nothing would lead to steady decline. Some of the changes would harm character, for e.g. the additional house adjoining 24 Cliff Drive and additional beach huts could create a 'built effect' to promenade.
Mr Peter White		123	I agree that investment in the seafront infrastructure has to be ongoing but do not agree that an appropriate balance of facilities is being achieved by your plan. I would like you to add my support to the response you have received from Allison King of Branksome Dene Road, Poole. I believe that the ideas put forward in her response are more suited to the needs of both residents and visitors to this beautiful part of our coastline.	On-going investment required but there is not an appropriate balance of facilities. See Alison King response.

Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment ID	Question 2 - Poole's seafront requires considerable investment in infrastructure. Doing nothing is not an option. Do you consider that the opportunities that have been identified provide an appropriate balance of facilities to improve Poole's seafront? If not, why not?	Key Points
Miss Lindsay Etherington		25	<p>I agree that some parts of the seafront at Poole require considerable redevelopment, and therefore doing nothing at all is not an option. However, the proposals do not in the major part, fit with your description of not destroying the 'essential natural setting'. My family has been visiting the seafront on an annual basis for the last twenty years, with Studland as our holiday base. We have used the beach, the crazy golf, the watersports, and the facilities on regular occasions during that time. Your sketch of the possible development at Sandbanks beach/Shore Road (p58) frankly horrifies us. How can a 3-storey building possibly maintain the natural environment. Equally, 2-storey beach huts appear to be a contradiction in terms. Surely the point of a 'hut' is just that - it is a simple structure on one level, which does not include overnight accommodation. That has always been a condition of the use of beach huts. I entirely agree with one of the comments made at the 2012 consultation (" Overall I would wish for the facilities to be improved without removing the natural charm that currently exists. I would hope for an upgrade but I still want to recognise the beach"). The beachfront would be unrecognisable from the plans we have seen. I would have great concerns about increased noise from overnight accommodation. Do we really want to add to the number of people staying in the area overnight? There is clearly a need to upgrade the ugly, concrete beach huts and certainly a small addition to the changing facilities and cafe structure, but this can be done far more sympathetically, so as not to threaten your existing businesses and with one-storey buildings. Please please let us avoid the sprawling beachfronts in other seaside towns. No matter the architecture, we want to see the beach and sea line as we approach it - not from a glass window On a small, but important point for children, the crazy golf is one of the best we have ever used - and this is to go in place of another car park. That has left us speechless. Traffic into Poole Harbour is already high and a considerable bottleneck at times - why make this worse? In short, the plans do not provide a balance of facilities and simply satisfy the wishes of developers who have no feel for the beautiful Poole seafront environment. We are not averse to development for its own sake, and would support a more sympathetic, less-expansive and low-rise approach.</p>	<p>Agree that doing nothing is not an option, but require a less expansive more low rise approach. Buildings do not maintain the natural environment. No loss of crazy golf or provision of overnight accommodation. Traffic problems already.</p>
Mrs Kathleen Berkin		111	<p>I agree that the infrastructure of the seafront has to be attended to and that it requires investment to do this but I cannot see that another restaurant, for example, at Canford Cliffs is a necessary addition. Decking over the sands and dining outside sounds a romantic idea but how often would it be used or could it be used? It would be a white elephant. The Sandbanks beach cafe is a beautifully decorated place but it is too expensive to use.</p>	<p>Investment required but not in form of a restaurant decking at Canford Cliffs. Limited seasonal use.</p>
Mrs Marian Steele		158	<p>I agree with making the beach accessible and improving facilities especially toilets which are a disgrace. There is space to build more beach huts but that should be limited. The proposals for canford cliffs would demolish the unique character . The area would no longer be a haven for local people. It would be a shame to make the whole of the seafront into a commercial area for visitors. Local people should be considered, and it is good for the area to have a mix of busy and not so busy places.</p>	<p>Facilities need to be improved and the beach needs to be more accessible. Canford Cliffs would loss unique character by proposals here. All the seafront should not be commercial.</p>
Mr Peter Standish		144	<p>I am aware of the contents of the submission made by the Sandbanks Association and fully endorse the points made therein.</p>	<p>Support Sandbanks Association comments</p>
Mr Nigel Reeves		19	<p>I am concerned that increased development and decreased car parking are options. I currently cycle to the beach and the route from Whitecliff is not a pleasant experience . it is not clear where additional beach huts will be accommodated.</p>	<p>Concern about increased development and decreased parking.</p>

Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment ID	Question 2 - Poole's seafront requires considerable investment in infrastructure. Doing nothing is not an option. Do you consider that the opportunities that have been identified provide an appropriate balance of facilities to improve Poole's seafront? If not, why not?	Key Points
Mr Michael Harrington		116	<p>I am mainly concerned with the proposals for Canford Cliffs Beach. The central area at the foot of the Chine is very poor giving a totally wrong first impression to visitors and I feel that virtually anything can only be for the best. I appreciate the Council's desire to provide additional beach huts but I am totally against the proposal to build on top of existing huts as seems to be shown on plan at No. 31 - I suspect an ulterior motive to obtain possession of the existing huts as was earlier being put forward by the Council. No doubt it would form the thin edge of the wedge for doing something similar on the east side of the Chine. Anyway I question the practicality of such an operation bearing in mind the need to extend to the rear of the line of the back walls of the huts on land not within the Council's ownership. This leads on to the proposal Nos. 30 and 32. The land upon which the later built promenade linking Canford Cliffs with Branksome Chine was acquired from the freeholds of the blocks of flats fronting Martello Park. Part of the transaction agreed placed a restriction on the Council not to build beach huts or carry out other development on that land. Furthermore the plan seems to show that the beach studios would have to encroach on land which the Council does not own. Item No. 33 on plan shows 'Public car parking'. How is access proposed?</p>	<p>At Canford Cliffs building on top of existing huts is not favoured. Legal restrictions exist here for building huts on the land between Canford Cliffs and Branksome Chine. Car Parking is shown (no:33) on the plan (page 61) but this relates to Cliff Drive and annotation on the promenade is a mistake.</p>
Mrs Adele Provan		174	<p>I am not against all of the proposals. I recognise there is a need to invest in the infrastructure and improvement of facilities such as the toilets / showers is much needed, I am also not against innovative thinking but what I am opposed to in particular are the following : the scale of the changes which will make a wholesale change to the look and feel of the area and destroy much of its charm, Sandbanks is badged by you as the dune landscape but you are proposing to destroy the nature and feel of the dunes with beach huts and people staying overnight. You have badged Shore Road as the Social urban area with bustle & busyness & a youthful crowd - WHAT ! Have you even been there - it is residential and attracts young families, dog walkers and middle aged couples, just go and sit outside Jazzies for an hour and you will see what I mean, I live in Chaddesley Glen, the last thing I want is for this area to be badged as a young hip & trendy place to come & party. I also do not see the need to build a 4 or 5 storey iconic building on the promenade, residents will lose their privacy, it will be an eyesore and it has been aligned to the Imax in look / feel - well hasn't that just been demolished. Yes build something but 2 or 3 storeys is more than enough, all we really need is better toilets. Removing car parking will only exacerbate the terrible congestion in summer and changing the parallel parking to echelon parking along Banks Road will put cyclists lives at risk as they will not be able to see cars pulling out and car drivers certainly will not be able to see cyclists as they reverse out. Building more beach huts, yes replace those which have seen better days but we do not need any more, or two storey ones or overnight stay ones. On the hottest day of the year only about 1 in 30 beach huts is used along the front between Sandbanks & Bournemouth, in fact probably less than that so why do we need more? Finally more commercial shops and restaurants and hotels - if you can encourage local independents then yes, but if you are planning national chains such as Wetherspoons and Tesco then no to that too, because our local businesses struggle enough as it is to keep going without being undercut and losing all their trade to those they cannot possibly compete with.</p>	<p>Accept there is a need to invest and some innovative thinking. Objection to the badging of beaches, scale (incl. height) of change, loss of parking and use of Banks Road, more or 2 storey beach huts. New premises should be local not national chains.</p>

Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment ID	Question 2 - Poole's seafront requires considerable investment in infrastructure. Doing nothing is not an option. Do you consider that the opportunities that have been identified provide an appropriate balance of facilities to improve Poole's seafront? If not, why not?	Key Points
Mr Patrick Marlow		32	I am really not sure what the objectives are here, is it revenue generation from drawing an increased number of tourists to our beaches? commercial gain for PBC from the franchise of new cafe's/Hotels/retail outlets etc? or an enhanced, environmentally sustaining beach infrastructure for local people and visitors, favourably balanced towards the natural beauty of the area. I hope and trust that it is the latter, but I am fearful due to the overwhelming commercial elements identified. Branksome Dene chine for instance has local nature reserve status, it constitutes the largest semi-natural open space situated directly on Poole's coastal wild life corridor. The range of native trees, shrubs and wild flowers provides the habitat for a multitude of diverse wildlife species. The area is surrounded by private dwellings and is served with limited residential road access (currently very congested on hot 'beach' days) How can a multi-storey hotel, Tree Top trail, an Open air music venue or a Pub here be anything but catastrophic to this 'green jewel' of Poole's coastline. A revised beach hut plan, better toilet facilities updated seating etc would be great. Sympathetic renovations/improvements to the community hall would be well received and serve the community well, Demolishing it has to be ridiculous! We should be considering to locally list the building as a heritage asset, Your plan here seems intent on rubbing out what remains of the quaintness / history of the area which for families, dog walkers, swimmers etc is currently a great attraction.	Overwhelming commercial elements would detract from natural beauty of the area. New beach hut plan, better toilets and renovated community room at Branksome Dene are welcome. Quaintness should be kept.
Mr Thorwald Jensen		101	I believe all improvements must be welcome. It is necessary to move forward. I'm not a planner, but I see leisure to be the future, and has been for decades.	Improvements are welcome, leisure is the future.
Mrs Nicky Chilcott		65	I believe that improving facilities, like the public toilets, is a necessity. The community centre at Branksome Dene Chine could be improved to incorporate its own facilities and renovate it to make it more appealing for events such as weddings. However, I feel this land should not be sold for a hotel due to the protection of sand lizards, which we are incredibly lucky to have in this area as they are so rare nationwide. In addition, I have come across numerous seaside towns which have been crowded with tourist facilities, which takes away from the natural beauty of such a place. As we are lucky enough to have a world recognised natural harbour and a beautiful beach that has been improved to high standards (added groynes and sand) it would be a shame to take away from this striking environment by erecting large, unnecessary buildings. I strongly feel that it is the beauty and serenity of the beach itself that draws people to holiday here, not man-made renovations that only spoil the landscape.	Improving facilities (like toilets and community room) is a necessity, but not at the cost of the natural environment (e.g. sand lizards). It is the unspoilt beach and Harbour that attracts people here so don't lose it.
Miss Emma Hann		26	I believe that the above statement is wholly incorrect. The seafront has evolved naturally over the years to an environment that is used and loved by many. This kind of forced development would ruin the more natural progress made. Look at the mistakes Bournemouth have made over the years when attempting to enforce seafront development...ie the surf reef and imax building. Should we not learn from their mistakes?	No- Forced development would ruin natural progress.
Mr Nick Chetwood		100	I do agree that there needs to be investment across the whole Poole seafront, I am particularly interested in Branksome Dene Chine where we live. Branksome Dene is a Chine with real character and a unique feel. The facilities do need updating but the proposals are not in keeping with the surroundings and feel. Creating an entertainment music venue as proposed would generate a lot of noise, the natural bowl shape of the chine would funnel the sound up the chine to the houses surrounding. I don't know who thought of the Woodland Go Ape idea! One of the drawing show the rope course going into an area of the chine owned privately by myself! I am against this for several reasons - it encourages people to venture into the chine, the trees are unstable and it would be dangerous, extra noise would be created by users and it would affect security for all residents backing on the chine. We have a Go Ape located just up the Spur Road... the place for these courses is in a large open forest, not a chine. Has any consideration been given to parking in the surrounding roads from extra visitors attracted? During the summer beach days our road (cassel ave) and surrounding roads become dangerously congested with many cars, the proposals would only attract more people to the area and exasperate the problem.	Investment required but proposals are not in keeping. At Branksome Dene the music venue would be too noisy, and the Go Ape course is inappropriate as on private land, trees unstable, dangerous and threat to neighbours security. Parking problem would be exacerbated.

Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment ID	Question 2 - Poole's seafront requires considerable investment in infrastructure. Doing nothing is not an option. Do you consider that the opportunities that have been identified provide an appropriate balance of facilities to improve Poole's seafront? If not, why not?	Key Points
Mrs Julie Bailey		48	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. This building, shown in the diagram in the plan as being 3 storeys high, could be up to 5 storeys high 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. The landmark building is also unnecessary. There is plenty of room to extend or rebuild the toilet facilities within the existing promenade area. Jazzy's and the Sandbanks Hotel already provide the cafe and restaurant facilities.	Shore Road Landmark building is inappropriate and unnecessary. There is enough room to extend and improve existing buildings on the promenade.
Mrs Geraldine King		61	I do not consider that building ANOTHER hotel in this area is the appropriate balance of facilities? Currently, on any sunny day in the summer it is not possible to park and enjoy the beach and facilities. I see that the car park spaces are to be reduced and I do not consider that the intended change to parking on the road is going to provide enough extra spaces or to be SAFE for any of the road users. It is always a very busy road and I believe the plan is that parked cars will have to back out of spaces into the main road and on-coming traffic, some of which will be cyclists. Something that Poole councils own road and traffic department actively discourage. Local householders have been encouraged to change the layout of their front gardens in order to accommodate a turning area, within their own property in order to be able to drive forwards onto the main Sandbanks Road. They have been told that it is "illegal" to back out onto a main road! I understand that there is a need to update the facilities on both Shore Road and at Sandbanks and that funds have to be found to achieve these improvements. I do not believe that selling the car parking areas to build another hotel is the way to achieve this. Is the sale of this land available to any buyer or only to a few favoured local companies?	Another hotel is not appropriate. Reduction in parking is not favoured and further parking on street will not be safe and contrary to highway engineer advice.
Mr Philip Crocker		129	I do not consider the opportunities as identified to be an appropriate balance: Frequent references to 'quality', 'boutique', 'designer' etc, and illustrations of facilities, food and interiors give an impression of affluence. As visitors to such facilities invariably arrive in (luxury) cars (as can be seen parked outside similar existing venues), and are unlikely to be enticed onto public transport, private parking has been identified for them. Although disabled access is mentioned often, I could see no indication of improved car parking provision for disabled badge-holders.	Identified opportunities do not provide appropriate balance. Affluent visitors will not be enticed to sue public transport. No indication of specific improved car parking for disabled drivers.
Mr Russell Merry		131	I do not understand why doing nothing is not an option. There is no competition to have the most commercial development. The goal is highest quality of life. Increased development is not necessarily the way to improve quality of life.	No - increased development does not improve quality of life.
Miss Julia Furbey		130	I feel that some of the proposals are not in keeping with the area although facilities such as toilet blocks do need improving.	Some proposals are not in keeping though improvements are required.
McNally		165	I feel that the proposals are too "brash" and assume that people are unable to entertain themselves while at the beach. Out of season facilities like toilets and refreshment kiosks being open would help encourage year round usage.	Proposals are too brash - toilets and refreshments kiosks would encourage all year round usage.

Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment ID	Question 2 - Poole's seafront requires considerable investment in infrastructure. Doing nothing is not an option. Do you consider that the opportunities that have been identified provide an appropriate balance of facilities to improve Poole's seafront? If not, why not?	Key Points
Mr C Darley		84	<p>I feel very strongly that a sports area is not for Canford Cliffs beaches. I feel that the parking facilities which are being looked at are very imposing and I believe losing sight of the green areas which will be used and again lost for ever! No matter how many parking spaces you provide you will always need more according to those who cant find a parking space! So please do not ruin such a beautiful area as Canford Cliffs it would be a drastic mistake. As far as the building of a house is concerned that would be a very expensive thing to do and how long would that take to reimburse monies spent on it I think it is a very bad idea and seems to me to be a total waste of tax payers money. As far as the doubling up of beach huts at Canford Cliffs is concerned. Does this mean that you would be demolishing the huts which exist? Then building two layers of huts, or does it mean that you will be building new huts on top of the old huts? Either way should you not build in the unbuilt up area further along towards Branksome Chine where you can build a lot of double storey huts. I believe that this would be sufficient for the requirements of the people on the waiting list. Once all of the people on the waiting list know the price you will be annually charging them and then taking a deposit for being on the waiting list. I strongly object to demolishing existing beach huts. We have had a very unusual hot summer this year and thats when peoples minds turn to beach huts but if/when we have a few more dreadful summers their minds will soon turn away from beach huts and beach facilities meaning that cafes/restaurants will certainly not bring in much revenue. Is the proposed sports area going to be a permanent fixture on the sand? At Canford Cliffs - what for? I suggest that it is put much further up towards Bournemouth where a younger set of people gather to do their drinking and partying (and break glass bottles which one sees after every public holiday on the promenade at Canford Cliffs). I do not believe that Canford Cliffs should be turned into a youngsters partying area which is what will happen if you make it into a volley ball (or otherwise) area. I believe this would be a big mistake. I believe that one beach area (i.e. Canford Cliffs) should be left to be a quieter, safer area for all and not, yet another commercial enterprise, thereby ruining what is a beautiful, peaceful and not overpopulated area, which if these plans were to be allowed to go through would happen.</p>	<p>Sports area not appropriate for Canford Cliffs. New parking is too imposing and new dwelling not a good idea. New huts should be in the vacant area not upon those existing or in place of demolished.</p>
Mrs Alison Frawley		142	<p>I have been visiting this area of the coastline for many years with friends and family. Our reasons for returning year after year are the fact that the area retains a natural and slightly old fashioned charm, despite fairly extensive development, plus a range of facilities. These facilities include the crazy golf course, which I was horrified to see would disappear in favour of a car park. Why get rid of something which is enjoyed by all ages all year round? Obviously, improvement to essential facilities such as public toilets requires a great deal of investment and funds must come from somewhere. However, what concerns me most is the prospect of blighting the seafront with two storey beach huts and a four or five storey restaurant. This is totally inappropriate and goes against the desire to "conserve the beauty of the natural environment". Less concrete and low level wooden structures would enhance the area and this is what I should like to see (ideally in place of the existing concrete huts). I think that the emphasis should be on enhancing rather than removing the facilities which are currently bringing visitors to this particular part of the seafront. The major redevelopment which is proposed would in my opinion take away the charm which attracts so many. Surely the foremost consideration in planning for the future of any part of our coastline should be to maintain its natural beauty as much as we can.</p>	<p>Keep natural and old fashioned charm, like crazy golf at Sandbanks. Toilets require investment, but 2 storey beach huts and restaurant would blight seafront. Less concrete and low level wooden structures preferred. Enhancement rather than removal of facilities.</p>
Mr Nick Kendall		2	<p>I have had a weather dependent business for 20 years, and I know that whatever you do, enjoyment by the public of the beach is weather dependent. There is a danger that you spend lots of money building facilities that remain empty when it rains; - because nobody wants to go to look at a beach in the rain, and the same facilities remain empty when it is sunny, because the principle reason people went to the beach was ...to enjoy the beach. The other objection I have is on the grounds of scale.... specifically of the proposals for Shore Road and environs, and I promise you here and now that I will happily bankrupt myself paying planning lawyers fees to make life as difficult for the authority to implement these plans, and if unsuccessful - I will throw myself under the first digger in front of the world's media before seeing such wasteful and</p>	<p>New facilities can fail because of the weather, as people visit beach when it is fine. Plans are too large scale, especially at Shore Road.</p>

Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment ID	Question 2 - Poole's seafront requires considerable investment in infrastructure. Doing nothing is not an option. Do you consider that the opportunities that have been identified provide an appropriate balance of facilities to improve Poole's seafront? If not, why not?	Key Points
			inappropriate development.	
Mr Richard Dimbleby		178	I have particular concerns about Branksome Chine and Branksome Dene Chine where the proposal for hotels and a tree top walk seem undesirable in destroying the current environment. I endorse the responses made by Mr and Mrs King of Branksome Dene Road.	Hotels and the tree top trail would destroy current environment.
Mrs Allyson Bailey		141	<p>I image that the proposals that are coming forth are for someone to buy the council land for hotels which raises revenue for the expenditure. However the revenue lost to existing hotels and food retailers within the area will only decrease and have all businesses struggling. Long term we could turn around but short term are we prepared for businesses to go under for the benefit of more rental revenue for the council.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. angled parking on Banks Road, being Australian angled parking is the heaven of parking. However Banks Road is not wide enough to accommodate the parking this way without encroaching upon the road. The number of vans (length) that need side access to take off their equipment from above will not be enough to ensure the safety of the car next to it. Families removing things from the boot of their cars will need again extra room from the road allotted for safety. Angled parking is only good for the people that wish to sit in their cars and admire the view. If this is the avenue you wish to go down. Use the Aussie method for sure, but allot behind and side space for safety. 2. Loss of parking in all carparks. Have you not been down to any of our beaches to find that you have not been able to find a park. This is a stupid idea to lose parking. Who are you kidding in your proposal at Shore Road to suggest a block of flats (reducing carparks) to then say that the remaining can be used by the flats as well, reducing the availability further. Proposal at Sandbanks to lose a whole block of parking to a hotel and block of apartments, this is madness unless you suggest a carpark level of 4 floors to not only replace but to increase. Would this be in keeping? 3. I believe research into food retailers and the hotel sector, are they fully booked and overloaded therefore the request for Poole to Boom, does it need to be on the beachfront not within the town areas in need of regeneration. 4. No hotel at Branksome Beach. If we are in need of more accommodation then let it be elsewhere. Loss of carparking, safety to it being only a carpark and access is precious to bringing people to the beach locally. To sustain the accessibility to our beaches for the council paying town people must come first not to tourists whom could bed elsewhere and visit like us. We pride ourselves on welcoming tourism but it should not be on the backhand of council paying people who wish to visit our own areas first. 5. Branksome is listed as large plots and you pay a hefty price for property to be on such, if refusal to make these plots many and lack of flats being agreed for planning then so should the hotel proposals be refused. 6. New Beach Huts proposals. I think the proposal for more is a shame as everyday that I walk, summer or winter the percentage that are used part or all day is below average. Has the council come up with a solution of making unused ones recycled. How about spending money on photographing blocks twice a day for a year and find out the percentage unused and have them relinquish their contracts, this would remove the waitlist substantially. 7. Sleeping Pods - I think this is a Hengisbury Head delight but it should not be allowed in Sandbanks to Bournemouth area. This could turn into a permanent home for the young leaving home. 8. Replacement Branksome Community Hall. I have had many events for NCT, personal and school events at this Hall and like its position, facilities. Upgrading it and its toilets would be welcomed to ensure its community success and pleasure to users. 9. Landmark Building - another restaurant, try it and there is always another new one to try. Please don't agree to this you say 2/3 storeys but all residents know councils then slip in the extra with consultation. It would 	Proposals would jeopardise existing businesses. Banks Road not wide enough for angled parking and loss of parking a bad idea. Hotels should be in town centre not seafront (or Branksome). New beach huts may not be required as so many appear empty/unused. Pods not a good idea as they could become permanent residences. Community room needs upgrading but use retained. Landmark Building at Shore Road is too tall. Do not compete with Bournemouth, have own identity.

Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment ID	Question 2 - Poole's seafront requires considerable investment in infrastructure. Doing nothing is not an option. Do you consider that the opportunities that have been identified provide an appropriate balance of facilities to improve Poole's seafront? If not, why not?	Key Points
			<p>look great but your trying too hard to make us a Bournemouth town centre when we are known and celebrated as a family beach area. Bournemouth and Poole are almost one, a lot walk to Bournemouth to be part of their celebrations, but to compete is a silly selfish thing. Make Poole something else and bigger. Science Museum, make it big make it proud like Birmingham, bring something for winter.</p>	
Mr Jack Crewe		125	<p>I think some of the plans are totally unnecessary. This is not Las Vegas. Any development which intrudes on to our sands should not take place. The plan for Shore Road says "it could be suitably bold and marked in a significant way". Why?? The area is small and in danger of overdevelopment. This needs to be scrapped before it gets out of hand. The residents won't stand for it hopefully. We don't need another IMAX</p>	<p>Plans are unnecessary- area is small and there is danger of overdevelopment.</p>
Miss Christine Kenton		30	<p>I think that what has been suggested fits with future requirements needed to keep up to date with demand and commercial opportunities that will benefit the area for locals and visitors. I think it will be very important to liaise with current beach hut tenants to ensure they are not disadvantaged by any development.</p>	<p>Plans would meet future requirements in terms of demand and commercial opportunities. Important to liaise with beach hut tenants.</p>
Mrs Bea Littlemore		41	<p>I think the balance is too far towards creating noisy, traffic heavy entertainment in what is presently a quiet, unspoilt residential area. I believe the natural environment should be respected, preserved and available to all to enjoy in its natural state. This includes visitors.</p>	<p>Balance too much towards heavy entertainment, traffic and noise and not quiet and unspoilt residential neighbourhood.</p>
Miss Averil Brown		159	<p>I think there is too great an emphasis on hotels and building up the waterfront. we have beautiful natural sandy beaches which need to be preserved. there can be some improvements to the waterfront without the large scale change envisaged in this document. we do not need more hotels and I cannot see how the current car parking could be maintained with all the new building in the plan. I would like to see better facilities - toilets, bike areas, improved sympathetic catering to a higher standard and some of the ideas it his regard look good. It is the sheer scale I object to.</p>	<p>Too much emphasis on hotels and building up the waterfront, excessive scale. Inadequate parking provision. Support for improved facilities and higher standards catering.</p>

Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment ID	Question 2 - Poole's seafront requires considerable investment in infrastructure. Doing nothing is not an option. Do you consider that the opportunities that have been identified provide an appropriate balance of facilities to improve Poole's seafront? If not, why not?	Key Points
Mrs Jennifer Saunders		114	I was horrified when I saw what was proposed for Sandbanks, I have had a beach hut there for 20 years and so far cannot see a provision for us beach hut tenants. Are we to be just swept aside, they say they want to build more beach huts but all I can see is huts built without a sea view, and will we be able to afford them. This doesn't seem to consider us locals but only to be for visitors. However they aren't here all year round how is it going to be possible to sustain shops, hotel, and cafes when others struggle to do so now. In the winter there isn't enough people apart from dog walkers to make this profitable, as for more flats there already 10 for sale at present I counted them today.	Beach huts should face the sea. Plans for visitors not locals. New enterprises will struggle as current facilities do. Questionable market for flats.
Rev David Butcher	Chairman Poole Harbour Watch	102	Ideas are good but cutting down the car parking spaces is a disaster waiting to happen. People not able to access the car park will simply go elsewhere. The car is part of the holiday experience, take a look and see what families bring to the beach, then try to imagine them getting onto a bus with that amount. Also for boat owners, with moorings near by. Will the bus allow them to carry on fuel, outboards, fishing tackle?	Good ideas but reduction in parking a mistake. Parking experience is part of the holiday experience. Will buses allow boat owners to bring all their equipment? (eg fuel).
Mr Brian Tustain		80	If doing nothing is not an option, and I don't necessarily believe that, then improve the current facilities. For example, the Sandbanks Beach area could be developed tastefully, creating better visitor facilities than what is currently there. Sandbanks is one of the finest beaches in the country. Please don't rush to spoil it.	Improve current facilities. Create tasteful development at Sandbanks including better visitor facilities. Don't spoil one of finest beaches in the country.
Miss Barbara Andrews		49	Improvement is necessary, but not at the expense of any car parking. There needs to be more parking so that more people can enjoy the facilities. Cafes and restaurants are excellent, but another hotel is not, neither are more apartments. They do nothing for local people or the majority of people visiting the seafront. It would also spoil the 'look' of the area. The visitor building proposed at Shore Road is a monstrosity and not in keeping. The building on the seafront at Lyme Regis would be very suitable here.	Improvement is necessary but loss of parking is not acceptable. More restaurants are welcome but not apartments or a hotel. Shore Road proposal is not in keeping.
Mrs Rosemary Drayson		106	Improvement is the operative word, if doing nothing is not a option improve the current facilities, Car Parking, Toilets. Install Lockers. Is there not a covenant attached to Sandbanks Car Park against building. Maybe the Sandbanks Pavillion should be classed as a Listed Building.	Improve current facilities. Sandbanks Pavilion could be listed. Restrictive covenant on Sandbanks car park.
Miss Julie Gregory		155	Improvements need to be made to the beach huts and where single storey this could be two storey. There could be better signage for the beaches and alternative parking. Hotels on the beach are not required as this would spoil the views available to local and there are already hotels in the area. Changing facilities along the seafront would be beneficial together with bicycle parking areas/facilities. There are sufficient bars/restaurant areas along the beach and not required at each beach. Overnight accommodation/huts facility is not needed at the beach as this is not suitable for the area. It would be helpful for free parking to be made available in the winter season for parking at Sandbanks main car park. Many of the changes proposed will remove accessibility to areas that are now available to us.	Improvements to beach huts required (including making some 2 storey), signage, alternative parking, changing facilities, bike facilities. No need for overnight accommodation, hotels or further restaurants. Parking problems will reduce accessibility. Sandbanks car park should be free in winter.
Mr Gary Lawton		249	Improving is one thing, but the proposed developments go too far. Too many hotels and developments on the sea front will ruin the character of the sea front. If the beach huts need investment, then perhaps replace with huts similar to Hengisbury Head rather than building multi-storey hotels.	Proposed development goes too far as existing character will be ruined. Replace beach huts rather than increase height.
Cllr May Haines	Borough of Poole	67	In parts yes. Some of the proposals will permanently take away the natural unspoilt beauty of the beach areas. Regard must be given to local residents view not just visitors who do not live in the immediate area.	Partly yes - some proposals would spoil natural beauty and regard should be paid to locals as well as visitors.

Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment ID	Question 2 - Poole's seafront requires considerable investment in infrastructure. Doing nothing is not an option. Do you consider that the opportunities that have been identified provide an appropriate balance of facilities to improve Poole's seafront? If not, why not?	Key Points
Mr Paul Denham		77	<p>Investing in improvements should be commended and whilst overall it looks very nice, it appears some basic points have been overlooked, some mentioned by others already but remarkably missed by those in the driving seat? Developers won't be interested as they will be more likely looking to make a fast buck and move on to the next money spinner. As a resident on Sandbanks I feel it more appropriate to comment on plans for this area as I'm sure residents closer to other areas planned for re-development would be better placed to make comment on matters affecting them. Traffic flow remains critical during peak visitor times, but that's how it has been and will be, with nowhere to go other than onto the ferry or around the peninsula and off again. Encouraging more visitors would be fantastic but what will you do with 'more' traffic, present measures cannot cope with current numbers and the urgent and very overdue road repairs cannot take place for another year at least as it was said you didn't have the money for it this year? Car parking is inadequate now, and your plan is to reduce on street parking and the number of spaces available in the car park, how does that work for the increased visitor numbers being targetted, more like frustrated potential visitors and less getting here to enjoy what is a fabulous area already? Whilst the theory of a shopping focus area may seem like a great idea, 4 storey high buildings opposite 2-16 Banks Road could potentially create the feeling and look of an enclosed shopping area similar to any such area anywhere else and far away from the open and sunny aspect enjoyed currently and lets not forget, towering over 2-16 Banks Road properties which are only two storeys high? Has any consideration been given to the effect and indeed very survival of businesses currently at 2-16 Banks Road and the beach cafe's? Choice, competition, all very nice but has anyone taken a moment to think this through? There is a 6 to 8 week 'peak' window for any business here to make money which will carry them through the rest of the year and even that is subject to our rather erratic British weather! What happens when schools restart, everywhere on the coast goes very very quiet with little to no trade for those currently trading, even Tesco at Sandacres is about to get a major surprise with business decreasing dramatically, but with your proposal of even more shops to compete for less business due to less visitors getting their cars here, you could potentially end up with empty shops which would look very nice I'm sure. Trade at 2-16 Banks Road must also be negatively affected with these 4 storey structures directly opposite, as trade will be lost from those no longer parking their cars there seeing those businesses and their being hidden from visitor view too? Is there not a covenant attached to the car park area forbidding building on it or at least restricting what can be considered? The 'need' to create year round facilities in Sandbanks as you state would be great if visitors did come here all year round, which they don't. What little business is available will be spread so thinly amongst so many shops, restaurants and cafes you plan to create in addition to existing businesses, there won't be enough income for any and your plans have the potential to backfire. There is so much we, Joe Public, don't know or have access to, often these projects end up going ahead through ignorance rather than openness.</p>	<p>Investing in improvements is to be commended but there are some oversights. At Sandbanks more visitors is good but what about the increase in traffic which is already an issue? Principle of shopping is good but a 4 storey building on Banks Road would be imposing. Impact upon existing trade is an issue with new premises, and the effect of erratic English weather. Uncertainty for the public on what is deliverable etc.</p>
Mr David Lack		63	<p>Investment on the scales proposed are a nonsense and will lead to increased council tax bills to residents, the majority of which will not benefit and/or will generate expensive exclusive entertainment and social centres for the rich and famous to the exclusion of the majority. Much more public consultation is required I suggest by every household receiving copies of the proposal, together with fully detailed cost implications, with each area sectioned for comment, and vote. This consultation document and method is wholly inadequate.</p>	<p>Scale of investment is nonsense. Facilities for rich and famous not the majority. Inadequate consultation and details of costs.</p>
Mr Peter Marley-Shaw		68	<p>My comments here relate only to the dog walking community. I will express my views on other matters in the plan elsewhere.</p>	<p>Support for dog walking.</p>

Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment ID	Question 2 - Poole's seafront requires considerable investment in infrastructure. Doing nothing is not an option. Do you consider that the opportunities that have been identified provide an appropriate balance of facilities to improve Poole's seafront? If not, why not?	Key Points
Mr Andrew Silver		167	My Company operates the Restaurants and catering facilities along Poole's beaches. My comments are based on the experiences learned over this period. For Poole's beaches to be improved, upgraded, and remain welcoming for all, it is fundamental that the infrastructure is updated. An electricity supply along the Promenade is a priority. This will allow for lighting to make walkers feel safe, and will also help to protect the beach huts. To help pay for this, it would make sense to focus initially on improvements which can be made relatively easily. At Shore Road, the toilets could be re-located to enable a cafe/restaurant to take its place. At Branksome Chine, the existing ice cream and beach goods kiosk could be extended to create a larger and more welcoming facility. Additionally, the existing kiosks can be modernised and upgraded - presently their electricity supply is very limited - and further kiosks could possibly be introduced along the front. All this would help generate income for Poole. Any development would need to be in keeping with Poole's vision for the future, but development will be required in order to offset and contribute towards the cost of replacement infrastructure.	Infrastructure (e.g. better electricity supply) needs to be updated to improve and upgrade the seafront. Easy wins would be new kiosks and cafes at Shore Road and Branksome. Development will be required to offset cost of replacement infrastructure.
Mr John Martindale		69	My concern is for the stretch between Shore Road and Flaghead Chine. Some of the proposals are welcome but I am concerned about the plans for the Shore Road Car Park because of the reduction in near-beach parking which will affect the less mobile and families with young children. In particular, if more on-street parking can be found why has it not already been made available? And the addition of more beach huts will increase the need for parking in the vicinity. Any redevelopment of the Shore Road Promenade facilities is to be welcomed. The toilets need replacing and there is plenty of scope for a beach shop and a council run cafe to provide a less formal/expensive service as is offered by nearby premises. Finally, it is not clear from the plan how so many extra beach huts can be provided at Shore Road and particularly at Flaghead Chine. When these plans are drawn up in more detail I would want to be consulted again about the impact on the promenade and shore line.	Concern about limited car parking close to Shore Road, especially following more beach huts etc. Development of Shore Road promenade facilities is welcomed. Toilets need replacing and scope exists for café and a shop.
Dr Roger Turner		136	My objections refer mainly to some of the proposals at Branksome Dean Chine, to which I am a regular, year-round visitor. The character of this Chine is unique and it is undeveloped, aside from the community building. This is what attracts many visitors to it. To develop a bespoke hotel here would not be a good use, and surely to use the area as a performance venue would further detract from its unique character.	At Branksome Dene a hotel is not favoured in the unique character area here.
Mrs Diane Vincent		173	Need to keep up standards.	Keep up standards.

Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment ID	Question 2 - Poole's seafront requires considerable investment in infrastructure. Doing nothing is not an option. Do you consider that the opportunities that have been identified provide an appropriate balance of facilities to improve Poole's seafront? If not, why not?	Key Points
Mr Brent Horder		128	<p>No - 1.The waterbus / taxi from sandbanks - this is impractical. there is very shallow water that is tidal which will restrict the useability considerably either side of low water springs, and possibly even make it impossible to run at neap tides with a high atmospheric pressure.. There are also moorings in the close vicinity and bordering the moorings is a designated windsurfing area - this cannot be good for the safety of recreational boat users in designated areas. There would also need to be a jetty of some description for boarding. How long would this jetty need to be to get into a suitable depth of water? what is the environmental impact, ie Nature Englands views, what about a marine conservation study to assess the impact of a jetty on tidal flow and marine habitats? These would all be very costly and time consuming exercises that would ultimately waste money. 2. car parking - to reduce the car park from 550 to 450 is ridiculous. in the height of summer there are precious few parking spaces available anyway. reducing this will restrict boat owners at the local yacht club from accessing their boats and other visitors from using the local facilities and workers getting to and from there place of work. If people are visiting the beach it would be impractical to assume they could carry equipment, food, prams etc. and everything else they would need for a family day out on the beach by public transport. Also the boat owners carrying fuel, oars, fishing rods, safety equipment etc. and also business owners who transport goods and stock could not rely on public transport. 3. cafe's and restaurants. - there is one bar and a couple of cafe's in sandbanks. whilst fairly busy in the summer and whilst the weather is good, there are 5 months of the year when trade is almost non existent due to the nature of tourism and visitors to the area. adding more food outlets and bars would simply put a strain on existing businesses and mean that ultimately all would be unable to sustain a healthy and profitable business. 4. I would agree that the beach huts need updating and investment made to the roads and verges. But this has to be done tastefully and practically. We don't want to make Sandbanks something it isn't. It is one of the most spectacular places in the world with fantastic views of the harbour, the bay and the purbecks. Lets keep it that way. It has its own merits for what it is and what it does. It is the beach and the beach only that attracts people. I dont see why there is consideration to build a monstrosity of retail outlets that aren't needed. If people want nightlife and shops and restaurants there is the town quay, and for those that want the beauty and simplicity of one of the best beaches in the world there is sandbanks. Catastrophic mistakes have been made already with road alterations - there is now no dedicated lane for the car park so traffic grinds to a halt every sunny holiday morning. The cycle lanes are dangerous and approaching from studland there isn't access to the main car park without having to drive well past sandbanks in order to turn around and sit in a queue going the other way. Is that good for the environment? Practical? With a great deal of emphasis these days being put on our 'carbon footprint' this just seems outrageous. Somebody at the town council thought that was a good idea so it goes to show what they know.</p>	<p>No - Water taxi is impractical due to shallow waters and neap tides and proximity to moorings and windsurfers. Car parking at Sandbanks car park should not be reduced. Public transport can't carry all the equipment required for a family day out. Additional cafes etc. would put a strain on existing businesses and this isn't the place for nightlife and retail outlets. Beach huts and paths need to be upgraded tastefully. Existing traffic movement is already difficult in Sandbanks to the ferry and car park and the proposals will not address this.</p>
Mrs Joy		96	<p>No - Disruption to Holiday makers would be immense. There is no demand for more Hotels.The Water Taxi would not work as the tide is out twice a day. The Sandbanks Beach office was only built two years ago waste of money rebuilding and resiting. The existing cafe at Sandbanks was only built recently - the idea of building Beach Huts at right angles to the sea is ridiculous. The protected wildlife area at Sandbanks would dissappear. Suggested car parking facilities are not fit for purpose. Banks Road is already at gridlock most days during the peak period. The loss of the Crazy Golf facility at Sandbanks would not please Holiday Makers, it is well used at present.</p>	<p>No - disruption to holiday makers would be immense. Water taxi won't work because of tides. Huts at right angles to the beach is ridiculous. There would be loss of wildlife. Crazy golf should be kept. Beach office and sandbanks café only built recently, don't need change. Parking is not fit for purpose and Banks Road is already often gridlocked.</p>
Miss Jacqueline James-Bryan		126	<p>No - I think that the proposed plans will spoil the existing beaches by over development. Sandbanks could be developed with new buildings, restaurants etc. as it is already commercialised but why spoil the rest of Poole's beaches? Yes we need tourists but they don't all have children and want cafes and shops and games on the beach. Some people crave tranquillity and an unspoiled environment - they can find this at Shore Rd, Alum Chine, Canford Cliffs and Branksome. These beaches just need decent loos and showers.</p>	<p>No - Overdevelopment. Sandbanks is already commercialised, other beaches don't need to be, just need showers and loos.</p>

Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment ID	Question 2 - Poole's seafront requires considerable investment in infrastructure. Doing nothing is not an option. Do you consider that the opportunities that have been identified provide an appropriate balance of facilities to improve Poole's seafront? If not, why not?	Key Points
Mr Colin Hession		47	No - self serving, grotesque. Why is status quo not an option?	No
Mr William Keats		134	No - These are an overdevelopment. As a regular beach user I NEVER see queues outside toilets or ice cream stores. There is no problem to solve in this respect. Re-building existing infrastructure is agreed but current operational scale seems sufficient.	No - overdevelopment. No queues for toilets and ice creams noted so not an issue. Current operational scale of rebuilding infrastructure is sufficient.
Mr David Wilson		78	No because it involves the development of a conservation area and is also residential - not a leisure park.	No. Unacceptable development in a residential Conservation Area
Mrs Debbie Hudson		132	No I do not consider that what's been proposed is a balance. There is no doubt in my mind that the hotels, private dwellings and restaurants that are being proposed will be very expensive and thereby limit the use to those with money. The beach is a place that should be available to anyone - not just certain sections of it. I do not doubt that those areas where there are hotels will expect to have their own private beach areas thereby limiting access to the general public.	No - plans not inclusive of everybody.
Mrs Patti Hegarty		105	No I do not. Whilst some facilities need updating such as toilets, lighting, seating and shaded areas, you are planning on too much overdevelopment in an area which is special because of the lack of built up areas and over cramming on the beach. That is what makes Poole Beaches different to Bournemouth. This needs to be preserved. The improvements mentioned that are very welcome are: 1. The water taxi - this is an excellent idea and would be well used 2. Improved signage from Haven road for access through the chines to the beaches - It is hard to find your way to the beaches if you are new to the area. 3. Improved comfortable seating along the promenade with canopies for some shade. 4. Better low level lighting in the chines, such as Flaghead Chine. 5. Improving facilities such as at Canford Cliffs Beach, turning the Blue beach building into a small coffee/ snack bar is welcome. Likewise, changing areas at Branksome, that is already busier and more built up. Unwelcome "opportunities ": 1. Why would a Dune hotel sticking out over the sand obstructing the view of the expanse of beach and Purbecks be considered an improvement in Sandbanks /Shore Road beach? 2. Doing away with parking spaces in an already quick to fill up car park at Sandbanks is ludicrous. The echelon parking scheme along Banks Road would be a nightmare and not safe at all. 3. The addition of more beach huts and adding extra storeys to existing ones is horrible and will spoil the look of the cliffs. They are not attractive beach huts and could be updated and improved aesthetically, however, I do not agree with adding more. At times in the summer, users spill out on to the promenade using the beach wall in places as a table for BBQ's. It gets congested enough in this way without adding more beach huts or another storey to existing ones. It's overkill! Also, there are plenty of huts that do not get used so I don't see why more are needed. 4. The addition of Overnight Beach studios is poorly thought out and not an improvement. Currently camping and overnight staying on the beach is not allowed and rightly so. These will not be good for the area. There are plenty of B&B's and guesthouses for staying overnight. The location of these in the chines is awful - why spoil a natural area with 2/3 storey huts? 5. The decked area over the beach at Canford Cliffs is not an improvement. It is a family/quiet beach - keep it this way. 6. NO - to building a holiday let house on Cliff Drive! This area of green is a haven for many, young and old, locals and visitors, to take in the views with shade provided by the trees. This is overdevelopment gone mad. My property is directly opposite this site - I strongly disagree and object to anything other than improved seating here. Leave this beautiful area well alone. This is not "maintaining, respecting and enhancing the natural environment". 7. The current parking arrangements in Cliff Drive would not allow for more spaces - As it is, the spaces are full during peak months by 8-8:30am with other cars circling the surrounding roads looking for spaces. It's not a satisfactory situation. 7. Council owned flats at Sandbanks and on the Shore Road car parking site - Why? There is plenty of accommodation already available and you are doing away with key parking spaces where they needed most.	No. Overdevelopment. Favoured ideas include the water taxi, better signage, seating (incl. in the shade), low level lighting, café at Canford cliffs. Unwelcome ideas include Dune Hotel, loss of parking, Cliff Drive parking, more beach huts and more storeys, overnight studios, decking at Canford Cliffs, new dwelling on Cliff Drive, additional accommodation.

Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment ID	Question 2 - Poole's seafront requires considerable investment in infrastructure. Doing nothing is not an option. Do you consider that the opportunities that have been identified provide an appropriate balance of facilities to improve Poole's seafront? If not, why not?	Key Points
Darley		75	No I think it will be over-commercialisation. The toilet updates are a good idea. However, if the beach at Canford Cliffs is to be turned into a commercial area then with the lighting on at night, even more damage will be done to the beach huts and broken bottles, from groups of drinkers spending evenings down there etc. Is the waiting list so long still that double beach huts are required at Canford Cliffs, as to build doubles would involve tremendous expenditure and I do not feel that it would be warranted. As for a car park area I feel that this would be an abomination and would be a very expensive venture and one I would have thought that Poole Council can ill afford. I agree with the building of the new beach huts between Canford Cliffs and Branksome Dene Chine where there are currently none. I do not approve of all the beach huts having to be rebuilt and doubled up. I feel that the expenditure to achieve this would not cover the additional fees gained by the council. I agree with the lockers idea. I do agree that a small restaurant/cafe could be advantageous although I dont believe that the average visitor would use it much as they can always go up to the restaurants further towards Poole, people take their own packed lunches with them when visiting a beauty spot they dont want commercialisation ruining the mere thing they have come to visit, because it is so beautiful without all the commercialisation. All I say is beware Poole council you could ruin something which is a treasure to Poole, it should not be viewed as a money spinner and there to be abused and ruined. I do not feel that Poole Council or the community as a whole would benefit from such commercialisation.	No - over commercialisation. Toilet updates are a good idea. Beach huts should be provided in the gap and not built on top of each other. New car parking not favoured. Be careful not to ruin what Poole is renowned for.
Mrs Jeannette Aston		94	No!! Extra car parking on the road, NO. What happens to the cycle path. We lose trade because holiday makers turn away because of the congestion now!! WE WANT TO WIDEN THE ROAD BY TAKING AWAY PART OF THE HARBOUR GREEN LAND BETWEEN THE HIGHER AND LOWER FOOTPATH ON THE SPIT ROAD FROM THE SANDBANKS HOTEL AND THE EXISTING CAR PARK. There then could be an off set road into the carpark, a road for the residents and a road for the ferry.	No - Currently loss of trade from congestion at Sandbanks. Would like to widen road with lanes of traffic for ferry, residents and car park.
Mr Frank Tanner		119	No!!! more seats, more toilets, better car parking needed not commercial ventures and high rise buildings that would serve absolutely no purpose except to generate rental taxes. No to more buildings on the seafront...no to more Beach Huts.....no to re-development....but a big yes to leave it alone please!!!! I love the case the council have put forward as to 'Beach Huts on the move.....I've rented those huts for the past 50 years and they are still there!! Tired Buildings? paint them often then as you would the Civic Centre or shall we replace that as well? Steps and barriers??? one ramp will do the trick...now that wasn't too costly was it!!!! Doing nothing IS the option because we don't have the money to throw around do we so drop this nonsense and threats of doom for the Beachfront...it's fine as it is for years to come!!! A built up area is not what the tourists and locals want to see...invest in parking and toilets and everyone can get to the Beach and stay there for longer!!	No. Doesn't need commercial ventures and high rise buildings and more beach huts, but do need more toilets, seating and better car parking.
Mrs Lesley Stacey		29	No, as stated above.	
Mr Albert Jackson		107	No, definitely not, for the reasons outlined above.	No.
Mrs Hester Cribb		85	No, do not approve. No new hotels required, current excellent hotels are never full. There will be insufficient parking spaces as car park is already full on many occasions.	No. New hotels not required, existing ones are never full, and there is insufficient parking.
Miss Katie Dominey		57	No, for the reasons detailed above. BDC is a local beach and substantial investment will not enhance the beach experience.	No. Investment and Branksome Dene will not enhance beach experience.

Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment ID	Question 2 - Poole's seafront requires considerable investment in infrastructure. Doing nothing is not an option. Do you consider that the opportunities that have been identified provide an appropriate balance of facilities to improve Poole's seafront? If not, why not?	Key Points
Mrs Suzanna Harris		127	<p>No, I do not consider that there is an appropriate balance of facilities to improve the seafront. There is no transport strategy. Reducing parking places is unfair on people with low incomes who cannot afford to live or stay near the beach, but bring their families for the day. The Landmark Building is a monstrous glass box which would ruin the beach view for miles. It is quite unnecessary. The Boutique Dune Hotel at Sandbanks Pavilion is also intrusive, too big and unnecessary. The apartment block on Shore Road car park would block the harbour view from Chaddesley House and the Stable Flat, 9-11 Chaddesley Wood Road (in which I have an interest). I am completely opposed to any building on the car park. And the on-street angled parking idea is potentially very dangerous. It is no substitute for car park places. Lighting in the chimes would affect the wildlife adversely. The amount of woodland and green-covered sandy cliffs are valued features of this neighbourhood and should be preserved. Any scheme should feature transport as important. It should include encouraging people to use buses instead of cars, by having buses run later and more often. I agree with water buses from Baiter to Sandbanks Ferry. Shuttle buses and park & ride should be incorporated. If building is to take place at the Pavilion I think it should be on the footprint of existing buildings, to 2 or 3 storeys in total. At Shore Road, new toilets, changing rooms and lockers could be situated back from the beach at the bottom of Chaddesley Wood Road, and the Jazz Cafe extended towards the sea but leaving a width of promenade, using traditional building materials, not glass.. The space just east of the toilets is under-used and could be utilised. There is room for more cafes, especially for sandwiches and hot drinks, but these can and should be constructed to harmonise with the beachscape.. I believe it is quite wrong to demolish the Branksome Dene Community Hall. The local public have a right to keep it. The Royal Norfolk Hotel site could be used for a new hotel instead. Residents should be given much more respect and consideration than these proposals are doing. The priorities here are all wrong.</p>	<p>No. Priorities are wrong. No transport policy, reducing parking is unfair on those on low incomes and angled parking is dangerous. Dune Hotel and Shore Road developments are inappropriate. Lighting is damaging to wildlife. Buses, park and ride and water taxis should be encouraged. Use traditional buildings and set development back from the beach and low level. There is room for cafes but they must harmonise with beachscape. Branksome Dene Community Room should be kept.</p>

Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment ID	Question 2 - Poole's seafront requires considerable investment in infrastructure. Doing nothing is not an option. Do you consider that the opportunities that have been identified provide an appropriate balance of facilities to improve Poole's seafront? If not, why not?	Key Points
Miss Ann Simmons		170	<p>No, I don't consider it appropriate. Certainly more beach huts would be appreciated by residents and visitors alike and it is good that areas where these could be added to the present stock have been identified. The plans for food/retail outlets is vague and needs more careful consideration. There used to be a very good beach cafe at Branksome Chine always busy and brilliant for people on the beach. Poole changed it to a beach restaurant which is used by people who want to take people for special lunches or dinners where the champagne is half price on Wednesdays and those popping in for a quick coffee are not particularly welcome . It is not used by the mass of people on the beach as it used to be. That is what happens when you try to go 'upmarket'! The cafe at Sandbanks was good too and then that was upgraded and the prices doubled. Branksome Dene does not need to be developed in this way! People who go there take picnics or food to cook in beach huts. That is the joy of that place. There is a kiosk where you can buy ice creams, coffee etc. and that is fine. Parents know their children will not be pestering for extras. The idea of an hotel at Branksome Dene is abhorrent ! Who would stay there - visitors in August - in winter very few. It would be shut! The plan mentions the ecology of the area which needs protecting. Putting an hotel there which would necessitate road widening for access and destruction of trees etc. with the desecration of the whole aspect is indefensible! You say the Community Hall is not fit for purpose. However, you extol its virtues in your advertising of it and it is extremely popular and well used, with little complaint of the facilities, except perhaps when two of the female toilets have been out of use for over two weeks! It blends well with the setting and the low height is appropriate below the cliffs.The car park is fine and the beach hut arrangement is good. A couple of showers at beach level would be useful and maybe more seating along the front. There is no need for a restaurant along there and if one began it could well fail. There was a very good restaurant on the quay, Fishy Fishy, which had to close because out of season the footfall on the quay was insufficient to sustain it. Footfall at Branksome Dene would be even lower. The idea of small numbers of people sleeping in beach villas at beach level seems fraught with danger. It would be very lonely down there at night. Lighting would have to be improved considerably and people rather isolated might be at risk from those who go to the area for nefarious purpose ! Returning to the ecology of the area, how would ropes through the trees help this? Would this be managed by some operator? If so there would presumably be a charge. If not, how would safety be ensured and what would prevent daft people swinging down ropes in the middle of the night? Again, parents go to Branksome Dene for its simplicity and safety. Once on the beach the children are settled. They don't want them leaving the safe area to go to tree ropes, particularly if they have a number of children where you need them in one place to be watched over. Watersports are quite well provided for in Poole already. There are opportunities at Sandbanks and at Shore Road and in Poole Park and at Rockley. At Branksome Dene and other more secluded beaches people make their own water sport entertainment. They go to those beaches because they can take their own boards, canoes etc and are not excluded from any area by an operator who charges. At Sandbanks also there are already other activities - crazy golf, volleyball and others. if people want activities they go to the appropriate place. You don't need to pack everywhere with excitement and retail. People need opportunities to make their own excitement. We don't want Poole to be turned into a 'Spanish Costa'.</p>	<p>No. More beach huts required. Retail plans are too vague. Upgrading has not been good up to now at Branksome Chine and Sandbanks. Hotel would harm Branksome Dene Chine, and insufficient demand for restaurants. Overnight accommodation is not favoured. Community Room should be retained. Watersports are already well provided for at other beaches (not Branksome Dene Chine) and therefore additional facilities not required. People make their own entertainment at the beach, so upgrading not needed.</p>

Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment ID	Question 2 - Poole's seafront requires considerable investment in infrastructure. Doing nothing is not an option. Do you consider that the opportunities that have been identified provide an appropriate balance of facilities to improve Poole's seafront? If not, why not?	Key Points
Mrs J Prett		62	No, I believe that by making some type of beach huts available to stay in overnight is inviting trouble - especially at the Shore Road 'social' part of the beach - causing extra noise late at night, extra litter and alcohol fuelled related problems. The artist's drawing of the suggested 3 storey building right on the beach at Shore Road looks like an eyesore. I think it is a really bad idea to decrease the car parking spaces at the main Sandbanks Road and Shore Road car parks and even worse idea of creating more car parking on Banks Road by allowing cars to park at an angle to the pavement. This would be dangerous, reduce the width of the road and would detract from the beautiful views across the harbour - ruined by a load of cars and vans with surf boards etc. There are already bottle-neck traffic jams along by the main Sandbanks Beach car park because the separate lane for the car park has been taken away - this leaves all vehicles that wish to continue onto the peninsula queuing along with the people waiting to gain access to the car park.	No. Overnight accommodation is a bad idea - noise, litter, alcohol fuelled problems could result. Shore Road illustration is an eyesore. There should be no reduction in parking. Existing problems on Banks Road would be exacerbated.
Mr Chris Lee		164	No, the proposed balance allows a development that is too intrusive, a less impactful approach should be considered.	No. Too much impact.
Mr Peter Edginton		117	No, what is suggested is overkill. Use the car park fees to fund upgrade of existing facilities. All new development on Sandbanks should fund the upgrade of sewage/surface water and any new sea defences required.	No. Overkill. Car parking charges should fund new infrastructure.
Miss Imogen Parker		110	No. 'Doing nothing is not an option' This may be so, but any improvements that are needed certainly don't require a complete change to the character of the area. Poole's seafront is a very special, mostly unspoilt, landscape. Why jeopardise it and spend all this money when the only thing really necessary is a bit of an upgrade to the toilets? I see no coherent reason, apart from short-term profit for private property developers, either for the boutique hotel at Sandbanks, the flats at Shore Road or the overnight beach studios. Occupancy of the existing hotels in the area is at best patchy; the Shore Road area is already crammed with high-price real estate accessible only to a tiny, wealthy elite, overnight studios would create new problems for the council, such as noise pollution and increased waste. I do not believe the plans for restaurant outlets are necessary or practical. The existing restaurants along the beach clearly don't find it viable to stay open full time except during the very high season. I doubt the few extra visitors brought in by an expensive hotel and a few high-priced second-home flats would compensate for the people who could no longer easily access the area because of a lack of parking. Having identified the car as the method of access most likely to be used now and in the future, the plan then proposes to reduce overall car-parking. The suggestion to increase parking spaces on Banks Road and on the roads near Branksome Chine (a conservation area already dominated by a car park) is impractical and potentially dangerous to cyclists and pedestrians as well as to other car users.	No. Improvements required to toilets but not a complete change to the area's character. Hotel, flats and beach studios are not favoured. Reduction to car parking is impractical and potentially dangerous.
Mr Ronald Stracey		152	No. Boutique Dune Hotel, new block of apartments, Landmark Building, new hotel on Branksome Dene site. All these developments will destroy the character of the sea front. Local people do not want them neither do visitors from elsewhere, parking spaces will be lost and the appalling idea of having a 5 storey building on the end of Shore Road is reminiscent of the Bournemouth Imax fiasco. I have conducted a "straw poll" amongst friends both here and in other parts of the UK and all say that they love coming to Poole's sands because of "the unspoilt nature of the environment". The only requirements would be better loos!	No. Hotel, apartments and landmark building would destroy seafront character. Only requirement is improved toilets.
Stehrenberger		180	No. I don't feel that such a massive project is needed. Obviously toilets need attention and, of course pipes, but please don't change this beautiful area into another Bournemouth or Blackpool. We are so very lucky to have such a wonderful stretch of soft sandy beaches, and treelined chines. I really don't think with all that nature has given us that man can improve on it. Sleeping pods do not sound a good idea. It sounds like a campsite to me or Butlins beside the sea. And building on the cliff top in Cliff Drive. This is a very small area - how long before someone thinks what a marvellous idea (and money spinner) it would be to build further along the road? That would mean, pulling down those beautiful holm oak trees, the roots of which help to hold the cliff up. Cliff Drive has already had problems with the cliffs and vast amounts of money had to be spent to strengthen the cliff and narrow the road about 20 years ago.	No. Project is too big. Toilets and pipes need attention but beach and nature should be left alone. Pods and house of Cliff Drive are not good ideas.

Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment ID	Question 2 - Poole's seafront requires considerable investment in infrastructure. Doing nothing is not an option. Do you consider that the opportunities that have been identified provide an appropriate balance of facilities to improve Poole's seafront? If not, why not?	Key Points
Mr John Brameld		39	No. I think the proposals will not enhance our wonderful seafront & seem based on commercial profit rather than enhancing our wonderful natural coastline & beach for the benefit of Visitors & Residents (the people who pay the Council Tax & have to pay to park even in the Winter !)	No. The commercial profit would not enhance the seafront.
Mr Bruce Jackson		89	No. In Poole (and Bournemouth) we are fortunate to have some of the best beaches in the country, and naturally we should make best use of these. Anyone visiting will likely remember the wonderful stretches of sand - on a sunny day it's truly comparable to anywhere in the world. However, what will put people off coming again isn't the facilities available, but the terrible transport infrastructure to get in and out of the town(s). Every bank holiday (or weekend in summer) the roads are blighted with huge delays caused by a lack of proper road planning, with speed pinches on every stretch into or out. The council(s) should really sort this out as a priority before spending lots of additional money on the seafront itself.	No. Wonderful stretches of sand but blighted by terrible transport infrastructure, not the facilities available.
Mr Christopher Mort		169	No. Please see the above. What I would agree is required is: 1.Refurbishment of the local toilet and shower facilities. If a beach-side visitor centre was essential (its not!), the current toilet facility at Shore Road could be converted in to a visitor centre (single storey) and new toilets could be located near the junction of Shore Road and Banks Road. However, the better plan would be to refurbish the current toilets along the promenade where they are currently. 2. Refurbishment of the beach huts.Several of the beach hut areas are in need of refurbishment.The beach huts near Shore Road should certainly not be increased in height (why damage the environment further in this area?) and they should not be converted into overnight accommodation. If further beach huts are required they could be located in the existing free space nearer to Branksome but this would have to be done very sympathetically - a whole seafront of beach fronts is soon going to become very unsightly. 3. Protection of the sea walls and beach. The area has already been designated as suitable for protection from erosion from the sea. This work is obviously essential. If the Council is looking to attract visitors, when the harbour is dredged and further sand added to the beach it should be filtered more finely as parts of the beach have far too many stones, and can no longer be played on by children in bare feet. This has discouraged families from visiting some of the beach areas because the propensity for stones that have been added from previous replenishment exercises varies along the beach. The draft plan tries to link protection of the sea front (which is essential) with commercial development of the area (which is not) but the two are very different issues and unnecessary and unsympathetic development would be very damaging. The thread running throughout the draft plan is a desire by the Council to make money from the Sandbanks area. Although some of the proposals do not reflect economic reality, the desire of the Council to find money-making schemes presumably reflects its own economic position. Two suggestions to help with this would be (i) to joint venture with the owner of the local hotels to improve their offering - for example the swimming pool and gym area at the Sandbanks Hotel is in desperate need of upgrading and it would attract people to spend money in the area if the facilities were nice enough to attract non-resident paying customers, and an upgrade funded jointly by the Council and the hotel owner (for a financial return to the Council) could help to achieve that and (ii) revisit the pricing of both the beach huts and the car parking at the peak of the season as, while neither is required overnight, the demand during the day is considerable during the peak summer season. If the Council thinks there is a good prospect for more commercial activity on Shore Road, it could offer to acquire the Compass Restaurant building from the Sandbanks Hotel, as that building is so underutilised currently. It would also be preferable for that building to be turned in to a visitor centre than to have a new building constructed. However, the fact that the restaurant is closed even in the summer months (save for occasional weddings) shows that additional commercial activity on Shore Road is not a sensible suggestion.	Toilets and beach huts refurbishment required, rather than new buildings, raising heights and overnight accommodation. The plan tries to link essential works (like sea defences) and commercial development, but the 2 are unrelated. Stones have remained in previous sand replenishment works to the detriment of beach users. Suggest a joint venture with existing Hotel owners to improve offering to attract people, and revisit parking and beach hut pricing.
Bloomfield		154	No. See above why don't you save money by merging with Bournemouth. Most government departments have had to do it in order to save money. Why are you being so precious?	No. Merge with Bournemouth Council instead.

Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment ID	Question 2 - Poole's seafront requires considerable investment in infrastructure. Doing nothing is not an option. Do you consider that the opportunities that have been identified provide an appropriate balance of facilities to improve Poole's seafront? If not, why not?	Key Points
Mr Roy Lemon		83	No. The balance is not right. The natural beauty of the beach, cliffs and chines makes Poole special. It is the main attraction and differentiation from Bournemouth. That is what generates economic activity locally and by changing the ambiance you will merely substitute one economic generator for another and less attractive one.	No. Balance is not right, natural beauty is main attraction.
Mr David Wicks		162	No. The large number of new buildings would irrevocably change the nature of this place. It will become as noisy and tacky as so many other coastal towns. The division of the plan into sections implies a far greater degree of separation between these areas than actually exists. I do not believe that the distinct characters of each section can be preserved as you imply.	No. Would be noisy and tacky as a result changing the nature of the place. The Plan's divisions imply greater separation than currently exists.
Miss Catherine Wall		140	No. The plans do not enhance the natural beauty of the area but are designed only to appease property developers. The idea of building on the beach and the chines will do nothing other than to devalue the beauty of this area. There is no problem attracting people to the beach. The problem is the provision of a transport infrastructure and parking facilities. The plans do nothing other than detract families and attract groups of youngsters.	No. Development will devalue the beauty of the area. Transport infrastructure and parking are problems not attracting people to the area.
Mr Andy Collyer		271	No. The proposals fail entirely in one of the draft SPD's own stated aims to 'conserve the beautiful natural environment'. The suggestion that a hotel and 'Go Ape type experience' are suitable for Branksome Dene Chine or 'woodland by the sea' is just one of the most extreme examples of this failure but there are many more within the document. The Adopted Core Strategy (Feb 2009) PCS23 section F states provisions for sites containing or adjacent to trees. The draft SPD fails test against these provisions.	No. Proposals fail to "conserve the beautiful environment", e.g. Go Ape idea and impact on trees.
Mr Henry South		64	No. The suggested plans for the "improvement" of Branksome Dene do not provide the required balance and would involve the destruction of the environment which is so important to the area. The plan would require the removal of trees and an increase in parking which would completely destroy the Dene.	No. At Branksome Dene the right balance would not be achieved with destruction to the environment, removal of trees and increase in parking.
Mr John Seabrook		124	No. The suggestions envisage too many projects. These are likely to over-urbanise the otherwise naturalness of the shoreline. They also imply handing over to commercial interests sites which ought to remain in the ownership and under the control of the people of Poole and their elected authority. The Report begins by acclaiming the 'asset' the seafront represents for Poole. It will no longer be an asset if sites are sold for development and thus pass into private hands and commercial control, limiting public access and use.	No. Too many projects will over-urbanise and loss of Council control would be the loss of the seafront asset.
Miss Alice Murgatroyd		113	No. This appears to be a plan to vastly over-build on a natural beauty spot. Also, the intention to increase lighting in the area is unnecessary whilst being costly to establish and then run. More importantly to the public and the environment as a whole, extra lighting would increase the notable light pollution which the beachfront already suffers.	No. An overbuild on natural beauty spot. Unnecessary and costly increase in proposed provision of lighting.
Mr John McNutt		88	No. Whilst I agree that some of the proposals will improve the area. The emphasis is very much based on peppering/spreading the area with car spaces to gain development land - of course this doesn't improve the area. I do not believe these proposals will help to extend the season.	No. Plans will not extend season or improve the area.
Mrs Lynn Allen		66	No. Sandbanks needs to be kept an area of beauty. Lovely uncrowded beaches, fantastic views, pavilion area is one of the finest features. People who come to Sandbanks do so for the beauty of the area - they don't want hotels built. Studio beach huts will just be for the very rich - not local residents. The toilet facilities could be updated with little inconvenience and cost. That is the only thing I would change at Sandbanks. Oh and change the road lay out back. Everybody agrees that it is dangerous and makes no sense. Who came up with that?	Hotels and beach studios not favoured, toilets need improving, otherwise Sandbanks should be left as it is. Road layout should revert to previous arrangement.
Mrs Barbara Lemon		82	No. The balance is not right. The natural beauty of the beach, cliffs and chines makes Poole special. It is the main attraction and differentiation from Bournemouth. That is what generates economic activity locally and by changing the ambiance you will merely substitute one economic generator for another and less attractive one.	No. Balance is not right. Natural beauty is main attraction and provides the difference to Bournemouth.
Mr Michael Hudson		133	No I do not. I am fed up of the over commercialisation of Sandbanks and big money paving the way to over develop what is the finest natural resource in the UK.	No. Over-commercialisation of Sandbanks.

Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment ID	Question 2 - Poole's seafront requires considerable investment in infrastructure. Doing nothing is not an option. Do you consider that the opportunities that have been identified provide an appropriate balance of facilities to improve Poole's seafront? If not, why not?	Key Points
Mr Ben Rayner		182	On the whole I do I have a few concerns though - I would like to see a focus on improvement of current facilities (tidying up of buildings) rather than glass and steel vanity projects - I don't think Poole Seafront needs a statement building (or buildings). The focus should be on function over form. I feel the low key character of the seafront should be preserved. I feel that some or all of the the unlit sections of the seafront should be preserved - they provide a much more intimate feeling and a feeling of more connectivity with the beach, sea and sky.	More focus on tidying up current facilities than a statement building. Focus on Function over form. Low key character and unlit sections of seafront should be preserved, connecting beach, sea and sky.
Mr Christopher Goldthorpe		143	Only cost quoted in the document is £7m which is totally inadequate for what is proposed? Where is the full business case including programme for the works and cost? You had a QS as part of your team why weren't costs included in the document?	£7m inadequate for what is proposed, costs should be included in the document.
Mr Richard Logan		172	Overall the plans seem well-thought out. I do have some concerns about the emphasis on "contemporary" or "exclusive" designs. The seafront and it's facilities such as shops, bars, cafes, hotels etc should be accessible to all and not targeted at the super-wealthy, "yacht-owning" types. Where possible I believe it would be best to preserve or recreate the "art deco" design style.	Well thought out plans overall, but concern about contemporary and exclusive designs not accessible to all but aimed at wealthy. Art Deco style favoured.
Miss Priscilla Timoney		92	Please don't change for changes sake!! This is a lovely quiet area not a noisy flashy town.	Don't change for the sake of it.
Mr Malcolm Harrison		60	Please renovate not desecrate. The community hut at BDC is a viable asset heavily used and enjoyed throughout the year by a large cross section of local individuals and organisations. The quiriness of the building gives the chine its individual identity - do it up don't knock it down. Car parking is inadequate currently in the summer - I assume residential roads would be jammed even moreso by incoming guest/muso/ape vehicles....an extra 13 spaces isn't anywhere near the solution.	Community Room is quirky, it should be done up not knocked down. Car parking is inadequate.
Mr & Mrs Barry & Allison King		104	Please see the third consultation box	
Mr Robert Lister		44	Pointless exercise as no one for the next 10 years will invest in Hotels, Shops or Restaurants, so where will the Capital Investment come from? Ring fencing the Beach hut income of £1.165m for three years would fund most of the remedial work, like making the toilets useable, they are mainly disgusting. Put some showers on the beach etc.	No-one will invest in the next 10 years so now source of capital investment. Beach hut income would fund a lot, including toilets and showers.

Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment ID	Question 2 - Poole's seafront requires considerable investment in infrastructure. Doing nothing is not an option. Do you consider that the opportunities that have been identified provide an appropriate balance of facilities to improve Poole's seafront? If not, why not?	Key Points
Mr Edward Wilton		161	<p>Poole's seafront only requires "considerable investment in infrastructure" if it is regarded as an asset to make money from. While it would be short sighted to ignore the valuable income generated by this major asset; I have grave concerns that any possible future developments are driven purely by return on investments for the Council than they are on preserving the incredible natural beach and seascape that Sandbanks beach provides (and as outlined above in my comments regarding the SPD/SPS being at odds with 'enhancement' and 'conservation' of the natural environment.) People visit Poole for that very reason, to spend time on its fantastic stretch of blue flag beach and pristine white sands; for the fun of building a sandcastle with their children, swimming in the sea or strolling along the prom. I would like to see much more detailed investigation into understanding what locals and visitors need. I would suggest its more car parking and alternative methods of transportation (such as water taxi's from Baiter/Poole Quay); not 'visitors centres' situated in the middle of the beach causing a blot on the landscape (as is proposed at Shore Road). Therefore I do not believe the existing SPD has the appropriate 'balance of facilities' to improve Poole's seafront and here's why....</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Redevelopment of the Sandbanks Beach car park - will destroy valuable existing car parking space and disturb the existing natural dunes. It is also in danger or creating a development (if a hotel were built) that is a self-styled 'Centre Parcs' and therefore becomes a place where a day at the beach is no longer a 'free' day out for a family, but turns it into an exclusive 'luxury' that will no longer be accessible for all. However I do believe there is scope for concentrating new, limited commercial and leisure developments at Sandbanks Beach where there is greater car parking and access and less intrusion for existing occupiers. 2. Shore Road Apartment complex - will result in a loss of car parking when the SPD clearly states "no net decrease in car parking overall is envisaged" (Accessibility - Section 4.3 - pg.16). It is unclear from the SPD that the alternative car parking solutions suggested if this space on Shore Road were to be lost to private development would really provide a feasible working solution. In fact it states in the 'Shore Road Success Criteria' (pg.47 - Section 6.0) that "enable the provision of around 56 on and off street parking spaces reduced from 97". Where exactly on Shore Road are cars going to park 'on street'? This is an access for not only emergency and public services, but also for the numerous residents of Chaddesley Wood Road (at the end of Shore Road). Parking on this street would cause chaos and be a danger to pedestrians. It is a miracle that there hasn't been a road traffic accident at the beach end of Shore Road this busy summer and the traffic management here needs urgent review, particularly as during peak hours it has become a pick up and drop off point that is always congested. Water/Sewerage infrastructure - would be majorly impacted as the area of the Shore Road Car Park that the Apartments are proposed for development sits directly underneath the Sewer outflow. How sensible would it be to build on this, contaminated land? With the potential for majorly impacting Poole Harbour / Sandbanks beach Blue Flag status? 3.) Shore Road - Development of the Cafe/Restaurant/Bar/'Visitor Centre'. This is totally ill-conceived. If our major asset is the beach then why destroy it by building a monstrosity of a building in the middle of it? I have no argument with the fact that the existing loo-block at Shore Road, Beach Office and huts need attention and investment but why Poole Council's answer is to always stick a big, unsightly building up?...This area needs much more careful planning and consideration. I strongly oppose any building on the beach. However, I do believe the idea of possibly linking up Shore Road beach with Sandbanks to the West with some form of natural 'boardwalk' that is suitable for buggies and wheelchair users is a step in the right direction. And I must also question how much influence existing local businesses have had to the plans for Shore Road? For example The Sandbanks Hotel and Jazz Cafe, as any new development of cafe/restaurants here would severely impact on their business. Additional and Overnight Beach Huts at Shore Road - they do not seem to have been the success that was billed when they were developed at Boscombe so I would urge caution on this point. I would also urge the Council to consider this point: If they believe we need more beach huts why don't they canvass all the existing 'tenants' to better 	<p>No balance of facilities. More investigation into what people need. Suggest car parks and better transport links and not visitor centres. Development on Sandbanks car park will disturb dunes and create a "Center Parcs" type facility rather than free day out venue. Unclear where alternative parking for Shore Road would be, dangerous already. Proposed Shore Road apartments would be near sewer outflow and would create problems. Boardwalk from Shore Road to Sandbanks is a good idea but not the replacement building at Shore Road that goes beyond the necessary level of development. 2 storey beach huts and development at Flaghead would destroy natural beauty of the area. There should be canvassing of the opinions of beach hut tenants and current businesses in the area.</p>

Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment ID	Question 2 - Poole's seafront requires considerable investment in infrastructure. Doing nothing is not an option. Do you consider that the opportunities that have been identified provide an appropriate balance of facilities to improve Poole's seafront? If not, why not?	Key Points
			<p>understand how often they are used. As a regular on the prom between Shore Road and Branksome Beach, during the peak of the sunshine this summer I would say that still not even 50% of huts were being utilized during this peak time. New double height beach huts located in the current 'triangle' to the right of the current 'beach office' are out of scale and would lead to a completely disproportionate loss of outlook and amenity. This is not acceptable for the residents who own properties on the sea side of Chaddesley Wood Road. Retaining "oblique views" is not acceptable. 4.) Flag Head - Why destroy the natural beauty of this area?....Building a higher row of beach huts on top of what's already there will only serve to take the sunlight away from the beach sooner than it does now. Which would result in this section of beach losing the evening sunshine. Ill conceived.</p>	
Mr Peter Willingham		95	<p>Sandbanks has always had plenty of visitors but still the hotels and shops struggle to make a profit, how can building even more shops and a hotel make things better? All year round parking charges have had a detrimental effect on the area as people don't hang around long to visit shops etc., they go home as soon as they leave the beach to save money. I do not agree considerable investment is needed and I am very much against spending vast amounts of money (our council tax money) on this project.</p>	<p>Don't agree considerable investment required. Sandbanks already has plenty of visitors and existing hotels struggle to make a profit. All year round parking charges have had a detrimental impact.</p>
Mrs Una Reid		108	<p>As well as hotel and sea front activities you need some beaches that are quieter catering for the older population that frequents this beach (chine).</p>	<p>Hotel and seafront activities required but not at every beach, as quieter beaches required for older population.</p>
Miss Suzie New		58	<p>Several suggestions may not be viable. The seafront needs things and facilities that people can use all year. There is always a shortage of places for meetings and conferences that don't charge the earth (such as hotels around here). Can't the council build or allow someone else to build a facility that can be used in the summer as a bar/restaurant, even a hotel, but in winter it can be used as a meeting place, or conference place (a small one) and for parties/receptions etc.</p>	<p>All year round facilities are required, like reasonably priced meeting and conference venues. Council could provide versatile venue.</p>
Mrs Julie Snow		55	<p>Some specific proposals will be contentious. I would personally be opposed to any two storey building at the position identified in the plan at Shore Road. It would completely destroy the view of the bay across to the Purbecks from large parts of the promenade. I do however acknowledge that a Visitor Centre incorporated with new toilet facilities would be a good idea but on one level only.</p>	<p>Some proposals will be contentious. Visitor centre and toilets at shore Road are a good idea without development over.</p>

Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment ID	Question 2 - Poole's seafront requires considerable investment in infrastructure. Doing nothing is not an option. Do you consider that the opportunities that have been identified provide an appropriate balance of facilities to improve Poole's seafront? If not, why not?	Key Points
Mrs Judy Birch		112	Some yes such as increasing the number of beach huts, removing steps to improving access for wheelchairs. However cycle access and car parking needs more thought. I think the proposed cycle way alongside the harbour should be on the inside of the harbour rather than the outside as currently proposed. The current proposal could make cyclists vulnerable to accidents. It would be very inconvenient for those with elderly visitors, children and beach huts to use public transport. Less car parking will make access for these groups extremely difficult. I have no objection to beach studios but am not in favour of the proposed hotels at Sandbanks and Branksome Dene Chine as I think these would spoil the unique character of both these locations. Their charm is precisely because there are currently no hotels in these two locations. The plans for improving cafes and kiosks seem reasonable if there is more variety than at present. It would be good to have more local/Dorset products available alongside the existing provision.	Increasing the number of beach huts and improving wheelchair access is good, but parking, public transport and cycling needs more thought. Beach studios and cafes (with local Dorset produce) are supported but not hotels because they would harm character derived currently from lack of hotels.
Miss Pat Ingram		135	Sorry, I do not think there is balance. It seems curious to build on car parks at Shore Road and Branksome when the place already becomes gridlocked on sunny days with people attempting to park. The options for public transport seem vague and, again, poorly considered. People travelling to the beach are usually carrying towels, beach toys, wind-breaks, food, drink, and the like. Whilst I understand that the council might prefer them to buy refreshments from sellers on the beach, I think people will choose other beaches rather than spending more money. And what will happen to the businesses on the beach during the long winter months when visitors are fewer? I guess they will close down, as happens in many European destinations, creating a desolate, un-loved atmosphere, and, quite likely, an increase in vandalism and other crime.	No balance. Loss of parking and poor public transport not supported, and potential 'close down' in winter.
Mrs Rita Harrison		50	Specifically regarding Branksome Dene of which I am an almost daily user. All of my friends (myself included) are disabled and absolutely need that car parking facility to remain untouched. The Community Hall is used by many care homes, 'Salvation Army' and the like and would be lost without it. This does not mean that the current facilities can not be upgraded ie; the toilets that 'badly' needs moving lower down onto the promenade so the elderly and disabled don't have to make the climb. More Showers would be great and better positioned. There is simply no room for a hotel of any type but upgrading the Community Hall to a modern but similar thing is a good idea with their own toilets etc.	Parking at Branksome Dene should remain untouched. More showers and toilets at promenade level would be supported by disabled. No room for a hotel.
Mrs Julie-Anne Ganner		91	The beauty of Pooles beaches are their natural, family friendly feel, and I think the proposed development - especially to Branksome Dene Chine the secret beach' is too much.	Too much development, especially at Branksome Dene Chine.
Mr Dennis Pedley		81	The general thrust is right, i.e. to improve beach huts, toilets, steps and barriers, high quality toilets, and access. I have heard that tired building and Sandbanks car park and recreation area will have hotels built on them. If that is the case I would be strongly against it. Also having a pub when a Tesco shop has replaced the loss making one there. Above all the beaches should be preserved for family usage and the frontage not spoiled by hotels. They can be built inland.	General thrust is right, improving beach huts, toilets, steps etc. Objection to hotels and pubs.
Freshwater		179	The main facilities appear to be food and drink retail outlets. Moving the beach huts and stacking them facing each other removes the main reason people use them, to sit and enjoy the view. If the plan is to use them only for storage then one option might be to provide large lockers, hidden behind the current huts, capable of holding deckchairs, parasols etc that holiday makers could hire so they could drive to the beach on the first day of their holiday, leave all their belongings safely, using an improved public transport system for the rest of the week. The toilets definitely need improving! Stainless steel toilets and handwash stations feels like a prison. The main attraction of Poole's seafront should remain the sea and the beach. It feels very much like the new development could manage very well on its own, without the views or the beach. It would be a shame if we were to be advertising 'come to Poole and look at our lovely blocks of expensive flats'.	Beach huts not facing the sea remove opportunity to enjoy the view. Lockers and improved public transport favoured. Toilets need improving. The beach and sea must be the main attraction not development.

Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment ID	Question 2 - Poole's seafront requires considerable investment in infrastructure. Doing nothing is not an option. Do you consider that the opportunities that have been identified provide an appropriate balance of facilities to improve Poole's seafront? If not, why not?	Key Points
Mr Richard Samuel		73	The main purpose should be to offer both residents and visitors a choice of different environments to meet the needs of different age groups and families. When there are two adjacent beach areas, such as Branksome Chine and Branksome Dene Chine, they should present different character and environments. In the case of Branksome Dene Chine, it would be a tragedy if the quiet, woody character was lost by building larger structures and allowing music and performances. The reason that we and many others go to Dene Chine is because it is gloriously unspoilt and quiet, and also serves a very worthwhile purpose by providing the Community Rooms, which are well used for Charity and private functions. If new facilities are built that become far more expensive to hire, this would be destroyed. If we want retail shops or restaurants, we can just walk a short distance to Branksome Chine.	Beaches currently offer different environments but Plan suggests changing Branksome Dene from an unspoilt and quiet beach to a noisier one. Can visit other beaches if more facilities required. Community Room serves an important purpose.
Mrs Karen Reed		54	The opportunities identified seem wholly focussed on benefitting and generating revenue from incoming tourists over the limited summer season. They will inevitably result in future restrictions on dog walking along our beaches which must be strongly resisted. Particularly harmful to local people will be the two hotel developments, the 3/5 storey block at Shore Road and the loss of car park spaces and their supposed replacement with roadside parking which is difficult and dangerous in summer already.	Restrictions to dog walking will be strongly resisted. Hotel developments, Shore Road building and loss of parking would be harmful.
Mrs I G Cotterell		225	The phrase " doing nothing is not an option " indicates an existing bias on the part of the Council towards commercialisation of the seafront. It follows that the consultation process may not be a genuine effort on the Council's part to canvass the views of local residents and voters. The proposals as set out represent such an aggressive assault on the seafront's natural aspect, it is reasonable to suppose that it is an opening position from which the Council can offer concessions, but will still inflict an unacceptable degree of damage to the seafront. Nothing could be further from the suggested " appropriate balance " to which the Council should aspire. The term " improve Poole's seafront " makes an implication that only further development will represent an improvement. No consideration appears to have been given to the potential to reduce the present level of commercialisation with the intention of enhancing the seafront's natural environment.	Plan is an aggressive assault on seafront's natural aspect. Not an appropriate balance. Nothing shown to reduce current level of commercialism.
Miss Teresa Walden		33	The plans seem to focus more on bringing people to the area. I would like to see more focus on what is being done for the local residents who are the people who are here all year round, many of whom use the beaches on a daily basis. I would like reassurance that I will not be restricted to walk with my dog on any area of the beach with the exception of some areas during the summer months as is at the moment. With all the water sports and leisure activities proposed I would imagine restrictions being introduced which would certainly ruin many people's enjoyment of the beaches. There was no mention of dog walkers in the document whatsoever which leads me to think that we are likely to be affected by the changes.	Focus on bringing people to the area but more on visitors not locals. No loss of dog walking on the beaches is requested.
Mr Francis David Hudson		86	The proposed development of hotels and restaurants with the resulting loss of car-parking space do nothing to improve the facilities of Poole Seafront - would even make the area less attractive and certainly less pleasing.	Loss of parking and new hotels/restaurants does not improve facilities for the seafront.
Mrs Alison Layton		157	The rather exclusive plans for Canford Cliffs are rather worrying. Yes, of course the toilets desperately need updating, and although the idea of a cafe/restaurant in the old seating area is potentially a good idea - my approval would depend on whether it is going to be a cafe for all, or an exclusive restaurant for the wealthy. ~The plans look like you are trying to make Canford Cliffs a rather bijou little holiday/weekend area - this would be totally unacceptable, as the beauty of our beaches and promenade is that they are for everyone. ~The double storey huts is probably a good idea, but more parking would have to be available, where???? This, if owned and maintained by the council would generate a fair amount extra income. As it has been stated by council members at meetings that the waiting list for beach huts is long, the new huts would be soon rented out.	Canford Cliffs - toilets need updating but café must be for everyone not just the wealthy. 2 storey huts are a good idea if supported by more parking.

Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment ID	Question 2 - Poole's seafront requires considerable investment in infrastructure. Doing nothing is not an option. Do you consider that the opportunities that have been identified provide an appropriate balance of facilities to improve Poole's seafront? If not, why not?	Key Points
Mr James Layfield		36	The seafront requires a large amount of investment due to the lack of it over the years. Rather than a large scale investment now when money is tight and selling out to private companies to fund it do little and often.	Large amount of investment is required, a little often I the best approach.
Mr David Wikramaratna		74	The shuttle service and improved cycling access are both excellent ideas which shows that the council have recognised that encouraging safe cycle routes and public transport use are vital to ensure a better quality of life for town residents. Additionally, identifying that more cafes are needed on the front is another positive step forward, as provisions at the moment at Sandbanks are poor. However, converting land that is currently car parking into another 'small' hotel will only serve to alienate the vast majority of visitors to the area - there are already several very expensive hotels in the area, and there is no need for an extra one. If the land were to be converted from use as a car park it should be used as a public space - perhaps a performance space or better provision for public transport access. Further housing is also not needed, development should be taking place in areas where land is more affordable and providing cheaper housing, rather than very expensive properties outlined here. While the beach is a tourist destination, the focus should be that it is an amenity for all, tourists and locals alike not just a select group of rich visitors.	Shuttle service, cycling access and additional cafes are supported. New hotel in place of car parking not supported though as it would alienate majority of visitors. Houses are not supported in high value seafront areas. Focus should be on amenity for all.
Miss Pat Tempany		28	There are undoubtedly opportunities for commercial development on the seafront such as restaurants, cafes and kiosks, which would help fund investment in infrastructure. However, some of the proposals would not necessarily add to the vibrancy of the seafront. I walk on the beach every day. Over last year I estimate that 80% of the beach huts have been used for less than 5% of the year. Many have not been used since the air show last year - which is the only time I have seen virtually every beach hut open. Including a large number of additional beach huts may bring additional funds for the council but will do little for local businesses, and will just add to beach and cliff clutter for much of the year. Regarding the Branksome Dene Chine proposals I am very concerned that a Go Ape style adventure rope walkway is considered an appropriate way of delivering the aim to "maintain, respect and enhance the natural environment". The Chine is a haven for wildlife - buzzards, kestrels, owls, bats, foxes and lizards to name but a few. How would people screaming through treetops achieve this aim? I suggest it would do the opposite. A forest setting away from residential areas and in a less sensitive natural setting is a more appropriate place for this kind of activity. There is a need to manage the natural environment of the chine, which is neglected, but any proposal, including walkways, should protect and respect, rather than disturb or drive out the wildlife. Car Parking .Unlike some of the other chines BDC and its access points are set in residential areas, already under pressure in summer months from increased traffic and parked cars - any development should not add to this. A hotel in Branksome Dene Chine is likely to bring increased traffic and this needs to be considered in relation to car parking provision. A wedding with a hundred guests on a busy beach saturday would cause chaos, not only through a lack of spaces, but also on the access roads with people driving in and out of the chine in the search for non existent road parking. The illustrative plan for Branksome Dene Chine suggests greatly enhanced pedestrian routes to the beach separate from the road , through Cassel Avenue. How do you intend to achive this - by knocking down houses? Dog Walking. Dog walkers are the main users of the beach in Winter months and I would be concerned that commercial development would result in further banning of dogs. The area of the beach between Alum Chine and Branksome Chine is very well used by dog walkers in summer months, and of course, by dog owning holiday makers and local users, due to restrictions on other areas of beach. Dog walkers are also important customers for cafes & coffee shops. I would have no reason to go to the beach if I could not walk my dogs and therefore unlikely to use beachfront cafes. I would oppose any further restrictions in access to the beach for dogs.	Some opportunities for investment in cafes and restaurants, and beach huts but the latter can add to beach clutter. The Go Ape proposal would disturb wildlife - area needs to be managed. Development at Branksome Dene, especially a Hotel, would exacerbate parking problems. Dog walking should be retained.
Mrs Xena Dion		1	There is a good balance, but there is still more potential to have low-key market type places (on decent days) to bring people in to the area. When the weather is good people would appreciate and spend money on more things than ice creams and crazy golf. People like to browse creative type market stalls - especially locally made/crafted art work, jewellery etc.	A good balance but more potential for low key creative market type stalls exists.

Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment ID	Question 2 - Poole's seafront requires considerable investment in infrastructure. Doing nothing is not an option. Do you consider that the opportunities that have been identified provide an appropriate balance of facilities to improve Poole's seafront? If not, why not?	Key Points
Mr Will Robbins		76	<p>There is no doubt that the seafront can be enhanced but one must retain what makes this location so special and unique. The best area to develop is the large Sandbanks car park - which at best resembles a light industrial site. This location desperately needs landmark, character buildings similar to New England/Cape Cod style rather than yet another modernist complex. Character and charm draws in the tourist and sits well with local residents. We do not need an architectural ego trip in this sensational location. Development in the already congested Shore Road and Branksome Chine areas is sheer madness. These areas are choked with traffic during the season and we should not encourage even more pedestrian/vehicular traffic making it plain dangerous. My daughter had her foot run over outside Jazzys this summer - we were able to make light of it but in this era of litigation many would not! There are enough restaurants and bars in the area around Shore Road and Branksome Chine - The large car park where the majority of people access the beach is poorly served. We only need look at the congestion caused by Tesco Express to see how it has affected the poor residents of the block above!! The proposed 3 storey carbuncle at the end of Shore Road is of particular concern - we often stay at Sandbanks hotel and visit friends in Chaddesley Wood Road - it seems unbelievable that any architect in his/her right mind could propose such a blot. Totally out of line with everything around it and destroying the wonderful views for residents and visitors alike. PLEASE - how did this ever get proposed . The toilet block needs URGENT attention - replace the block including RNLI with an attractive single storey open, landscaped piazza - housing wcs, RNLI and visitor centre. This is not the place to put income generation ahead of what nature has given us. If you are going to "double decker" the beach huts do it in front of a cliff where you are not going to antagonise the residents of Chaddesley Wood Road by blocking the views. I cant imagine any would have purchased their current dwellings if they had buildings blocking their views. It seems cavalier and highly illegal from a planning perspective.</p>	<p>Seafront can be enhanced but not at the cost of its uniqueness. Sandbanks car park is the best place to develop with landmark building, not Shore Road or Branksome Chine that also have traffic/parking problems. Shore Road illustrated development is too big and blights development around. Toilets need urgent refurbishment and single storey only.</p>
Mr Alastair Fraser		46	<p>There needs to be a continuation of the promenade all the way to Sandbanks. At present we have to walk on the sand to get to Sandbanks beaches as the promenade ends at Shore Road. People in wheelchairs cannot cross sand.</p>	<p>Promenade link from Shore Road to Sandbanks required especially for wheelchair users.</p>
Mr Martin Heath		175	<p>This cannot be properly answered without knowing how much income or expense each proposal is likely to generate. The balance seems, however, to be too commercial. Funding could be provided by the Community Infrastructure Levy through the R123 list and/or the 15% that neighbourhoods can decide how to allocate.</p>	<p>Balance appears to be too commercial. Funding could come from CIL or 15% that neighbourhoods allocate.</p>
Mr Roger King		59	<p>This is a one off plan for property development. Is it being negotiated with a particular property developer or is it being prepared to offer to the market? Essential toilet maintenance etc should be funded from car park income and from cafe rents etc. Do not use capital sales to fund maintenance. If you need to increase car park charges or rents including beach huts then do so. Unmet demand shows that the market will bear it.</p>	<p>A property development plan. Essential toilet maintenance should be funded by car park income and rents not capital sales.</p>
Mr Jeremy Retford		99	<p>This seems an over the top way to fund a few new toilets and it is certainly not in balance. I suspect that the only people who will do well out of it will be the developers, who will move on leaving a legacy of poorly thought through and unviable "trendy" ideas that will have destroyed the natural beauty and simplicity that brings us to Sandbanks in the first place. Look at the sacrifices in terms of car parking etc. that Bournemouth made to allow the building of apartments to fund the disastrous surf reef. Look and learn - please!</p>	<p>Over the top to fund toilet refurbishment. Trendy ideas could destroy natural beauty.</p>
Mr Mike Watts		45	<p>This statement is not justified, the opportunities set out are a commercially based exploitation of the seafront. It is possible to maintain the existing infrastructure, investing in more modern toilets and showers - extending lighting along the promenade - resurfacing the promenade, updating existing beach huts and perhaps adding a few. If funding is the issue then the Council needs to look for other options and consider an increase in Council Rates. It is a failure of the Council planning if they have allowed the infrastructure to fall into such bad repair, it didn't happen overnight. The Council should ensure it focusses on maintaining existing green space, flower beds and shrubs are not effectively maintained in the area.</p>	<p>The plan is commercially based exploitation of the seafront. Council should look at other options including increasing rates. Need to invest in modern toilets, showers, lighting, prom resurfacing, updating beach huts.</p>

Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment ID	Question 2 - Poole's seafront requires considerable investment in infrastructure. Doing nothing is not an option. Do you consider that the opportunities that have been identified provide an appropriate balance of facilities to improve Poole's seafront? If not, why not?	Key Points
Mr Alan Trickett		150	unquestionably improvements to the area are needed. New toilets are desperately needed along most beaches, Shore Road, Flaghead are disgraceful. 50% of the ladies toilets at Flaghead have been out of action for the whole of this summer and this fact has been reported to the beach wardens regularly, and nothing has been done. This is not acceptable when Poole is trying to develop tourism.	Improvements needed, especially toilets, especially when trying to develop tourism.
Mr & Mrs Braham		121	We agree that the infrastructure and services can be improved upon and should be for current residents, visitors and future generations to enjoy. This, however, is not achieved by the current plans, which represent an overdevelopment of the area and would spoil the natural beauty of our beaches. That this approach is not sustainable can be witnessed in many beach resorts around the world. Improvements can be made without impacting the natural beauty which is what sustaining is all about. Better and perhaps more toilet facilities would be useful, the service provision of beach lounge hire, more guarded swimming areas would all contribute to improving what is on offer, without spoiling the natural environment that those visitors to Poole's beaches enjoy. I am sure all residents of Poole appreciate the beach for what it currently is, a largely unspoilt environment. The Council needs to be honest with residents and clearly state what the objectives of these extensive developments are. Perhaps: To attract more visitors to Poole to help support the local economy? What other infrastructure and services will be required to support this (roads, car parks, hospital capacity etc). To increase revenue through Council Tax and Business Rates on the newly developed properties? Some of these developments include residential properties. Again, what about infrastructure and services? Poole is already short of school places within catchment. To support local favoured property developers? Ultimately, none of the above will benefit the vast majority of tax payers in Poole and will result in the degeneration of a much loved leisure environment. Amusement arcades and fast-food outlets littering the beach like so many seaside resorts, (Blackpool or even Swanage!) would be a tragic outcome. You only have to look at the IMAX debacle in Bournemouth to realise how councils can get things very badly wrong. In short, the only development which should be allowed on the beach should be on a far smaller scale, which will benefit the local residents, not just visitors. There should be no attractions built on the beach which could go elsewhere. The beach should not be viewed as an un-tapped income stream for the council, but as a natural asset to be treasured and protected.	Current plans are overdevelopment though improvements required. Need better and more toilets, beach lounge hire, and guarded swim areas, without spoiling natural beauty. Small scale development for locals as well as visitors. The beach should not be untapped income for the Council but a natural asset to be protected.
Mr Robert Lister		16	We do not want to be hijacked by developers wanting to make a fast buck in putting oversized and inappropriate developments. Adding watersports facilities to Branksome Chine, but without the loss of 30 parking spaces!!	Do not lose parking at Branksome Dene in conjunction with watersports.
Mrs Irene Pemberton		56	What you have designed is not appropriate for Sandbanks you will attract gangs of youths in the evenings.	Inappropriate development at Sandbanks.
Mr Geoff Allen		70	Which infrastructure requires substantial investment in order to stay up to the required standard? As the SPD states on several occasions, the limitation of Poole's beaches is parking and access. Demand is not a limitation. Therefore, there is little need to invest considerable sums in upgrading the facilities. Otherwise Sandbanks wouldn't have been regarded as Britain's best beach not so long ago. So, no I do not agree that Sandbanks beach should undergo such massive changes. I am completely opposed to the changes where residents of Poole are losing amenities (that they are paying for) in order to create opportunities for businesses to make a lot of money. That seems as if some businesses are encouraging the Council to follow this path. It is well known that several businesses on Banks Road eg. Cafe Shore, have been struggling to attract customers. Why do these proposals suddenly think that creating several more similar outlets in the same vicinity will be a commercial success. The plan appears to be purely a way to generate some short-term income for Poole Council, by selling/leasing off valuable parts of our beaches, to the detriment of the residents of Poole.	If it is parking and access that are the limitations then no need to invest large sums in upgrading facilities. Sandbanks should not undergo massive changes. Existing businesses are struggling as new ones might. Plan will only generate short term income to the detriment of Poole residents.

Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment ID	Question 2 - Poole's seafront requires considerable investment in infrastructure. Doing nothing is not an option. Do you consider that the opportunities that have been identified provide an appropriate balance of facilities to improve Poole's seafront? If not, why not?	Key Points
Mr Andrew Reed		20	Whilst accepting that investment in public infrastructure is a challenge, I consider that the proposed level of commercial development proposed to be excessive. Why should public amenity land such as that at Shore Road "could be developed for private apartments providing useful revenue...."(p47) The development of hotels and overnight sleeping cabins will remove further areas from access by the general public with consequent loss of amenity. Commercialisation of the beachfront is a high risk strategy. Whatever is done will not result in the area becoming a 12 month per year beach holiday destination - there is no such thing in the UK. Efforts to try to achieve this will inevitably lead to inappropriate developments that detract from the charm of the beach as it is currently. I foresee many of the proposed commercial outlets being closed outside the limited high season.	Investing in public infrastructure is a challenge but proposed level of commercial development is excessive. Hotels and cabins would remove land from being publicly accessible. Difficult in UK climate to provide all year round holiday destination without inappropriate development.
Mr Stephen Haupt		42	Whilst I entirely agree with the need to modernise, upgrade, re-place and create new facilities along the designated beach front it is important to ensure the area's do not become overly commercialised and end up looking like any other Resort, many of which end up going down market. Poole beaches are a class apart from many throughout the UK, even those in B'mouth, which we should be proud of and seek to maintain. Let us be different by design not 'the same as' by accident! Also, don't let's forget the car park that was built in B'mouth, the iMax, which the Council quickly regretted and at great cost to the tax payer eventually re-purchased and demolished. We do not need to repeat this folly in Poole! I also have a very serious concern for a clear omission from the current document which will be the very major transport issues that will cause further chaos at Sandbanks. Any resident in the Poole area will be aware of the traffic issues caused throughout the summer/bank holidays by the current lack of parking in this area which coupled with the chain ferry releasing a further 80 cars onto the peninsula every 20 minutes has the roads gridlocked for much of the day. The current document whilst highlighting changes to the parking along Banks Road actually shows a reduction in overall parking from 550 to 450 spaces. When coupled with the proposed development of more retail outlets and an Hotel unless there are major and very significant proposals to deal with this issue it will all be irrelevant, no one will be able to park within miles and enjoy the facilities. A multi-storey car park, which I have heard Council officers talk about quietly and outside of this document is clearly totally inappropriate. More has to be done therefore to improve public transport, cyclists facilities etc etc and keep cars traffic in this area of Poole to a minimum.	Need to modernise but not over commercialise. Existing transport issues at Sandbanks would be exacerbated. More must be done to improve public transport and facilities for cyclists.
Mr John Sprackling		166	Whilst recognising that maintaining the 'status quo' is not an option and that improvement is needed to Poole's seafront, if this vision of large-scale development is realised, it would destroy the unique attractiveness of Poole's seafront which, after all, is its principle tourist attraction. We're told that the Council estimates £7m is required to refresh the infrastructure but there is no mention of this figure in the document and no explanation how this has been calculated.	Large scale development would destroy Poole's principle attraction. £7M required is not detailed in the document.
Miss Hilary Cole		176	With regard to Branksome Dene Chine: for all the reasons given above, I do not believe that the SPD provides an appropriate balance, nor indeed is it compatible with the Council's previously-stated policies. In considering the issue of balance it is odd that there is no specific mention of the needs of parents and young children at Branksome Dene Chine who are amongst the heaviest users of the beach, and the possibility of providing playground facilities close to the beach.	There is not an appropriate balance at Branksome Dene, with no specific mention of parents and young children and the potential for a playground.
Mr John Russell		118	With regard to Branksome Dene, the ideas put forward are not necessarily in keeping with this part of the beach. Access to Branksome Dene has always been a problem and is compounded by cars parked along Pinewood Road/Westminster Road. If more activities are to be provided at Branksome Dene, how can the roadway leading down to Branksome Dene possibly cope with extra traffic, particularly if you build a hotel on the site of the Community Centre?	Access is an issue here, and parking on adjoining residential roads. Additional activity including a Hotel would worsen this.
Mr Graham Banyard		98	With the amount of money the parking must make and the council tax we all pay there should be enough to maintain some toilet blocks and a prom. There are enough facilities on the beaches we don't need these new hotels and other buildings it would ruin the beaches.	No more facilities are needed and the money from parking and Council tax should pay for toilets and prom improvements.

Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment ID	Question 2 - Poole's seafront requires considerable investment in infrastructure. Doing nothing is not an option. Do you consider that the opportunities that have been identified provide an appropriate balance of facilities to improve Poole's seafront? If not, why not?	Key Points
Mr James Pride		171	With the viability of some hotels and guesthouses in the Parish under pressure, will more hotels and accomodation be viable? At Shore Road the facilities are very tired but the proposal to build a three to five storey building out onto the beach (shown on page 50) is not the answer. The excessive scale, bulk and footprint of the proposed building is inappropriate and would not be in character with the area. This proposal would block the view of the beach in both directions. The houses in Chaddesley Wood Road and would suffer a serious devaluation, and the Sandbanks Hotel loose some of its attraction, and the parties might sue the Council taking much of the possible financial benefit away. I also have concerns about the potential loss of parking in Shore Road with the idea of building flats in the car park! What is needed is more car parking not less.	More parking, not less. Shore Road proposal is of excessive scale, bulk and footprint and inappropriate development in this location.
Mr Robert McNamara		21	Yes	Yes
Mr Geoffrey Fairman		52	Yes but we must not lose car parking spaces - there are not enough now.	Yes, but no loss of parking.
Mr Lester Smith		79	Yes it will cost lots! But i'm sure developers will be queueing up to get involved. You need to develop and enhance the large Sandbanks carpark - its pretty bleak at the best of times. Leave the other areas Shore Road, Branksome etc well alone. They are too cramped and overdeveloped as it is. It would be lunacy to put a 2/3 story buiding at the end of Shore Road. You should pedestrianise Shore Road except for residents and disabled. Its a chaotic drop off zone and someones going to get hurt one day. Seems like a great way to wind up the residents by sticking 2 storey beach huts in front of their houses - do it in front of the cliffs then you wont block antones views. Always good to get the locals on your side!!	Sandbanks car park is bleak and needs developing, but not the other areas that would be cramped and overdeveloped. Shore Road should be pedestrianized, current plans alienate the locals.
Mrs Alison Fulford		120	Yes some facilities such as toilets need updating however the balance of a natural beach environment we have will be gone with too many commercial facilities available. There looks like a lot car parks will be lost.	Balance of natural beach environment would give way to too many commercial facilities.
Mrs Isabelle Edward		145	Yes to developing the beach but leave the little bit of nature we still have left to be a refuge for wildlife. No zip wire, no overnight noise.	Develop the beach where natural areas can be left as wildlife refuge. No zip wire or overnight noise.
Mr Richard Stephens		103	Yes, the seafront does require considerable investment in infrastructure. The proposals outlined in the consultation would certainly help to promote Poole's beaches. Each new development would then have to be examined in great detail to ensure it enhances the area and does not detract from it.	Yes, investment required and proposals help to promote beaches. Need to ensure details enhance, and do not detract, from the area.