

CONSULTATION RESPONSES 8/18/3263

Historic England (07/11/2019)

1. On the basis of the information available to date, we do not wish to offer any comments. We suggest that you seek the views of your specialist conservation and archaeological advisers, as relevant.

Environment Agency

2. Comments received **11/12/2019**. We **object** to the proposed development on **flood risk grounds**. We have reviewed the supporting statement and Flood Risk Addendum, May 2019, Odyssey, Ref AK/AK/Reports/15-167 -17_RevA . We acknowledge that the flood risk information has used the Councils latest Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and this confirms future flood risk to the site. Please note that we have local flood risk standing advice that can currently advise what appropriate finished floor levels (FFL's) should be set, in accordance with the future tidal flood levels in Christchurch Town Centre. This advice confirms to your Authority that if finished floor levels of new residential development are set at or above 3.6 metres above ordnance datum (mAOD) they will be above the design flood level for their lifetime, therefore we consider them acceptable. However, we note that in section 2.11 of the FRA that the proposed finished floor levels on elements of the scheme are below 3.6mAOD, so are not above the design flood level with an appropriate allowance for climate change.
3. The FRA states: Currently proposed FFL's for dwellings marked as:
 - 'A' is 3.145m AOD
 - 'B' is 3.370m AOD
 - 'C' is 3.570m AOD
4. Therefore, we would recommend that the finished floor levels of the development are raised above 3.6mOAD. If the developer cannot achieve this then they will need to justify the planning reasons for why this cannot be achieved, as elements of the scheme can be considered unsafe for its lifetime therefore contrary to National Flood Risk Policy. The FRA confirms that using the SFRA climate change allowances that flood water could enter the ground floor flats, with water depths of up to 275mm (dwellings 'A') and 50mm (dwellings 'B').
5. If the applicant cannot design flood risk out of the development than it would then be for your planning authority to determine the wider planning merits of scheme, and the acceptability of any reasons for not meeting the advised 3.6mAOD FFL

EA comments received 14/01/20)

6. Following review of the updated documents that confirm that the finished floor levels will be set at or above 3.6mAOD we can **withdraw our objection**. The

plans submitted confirm that all of the habitable accommodation will be set at or above 3.6mAOD. This therefore confirms that the development will accord with our Local Flood Risk Standing Advice for this part of Christchurch.

EA comments received 07/10/20.

7. We can confirm, as per our letter dated 14 January 2020, that we have no objection to the proposed development providing that that the finished floor levels will be set at or above 3.6mAOD, and the recommended informatives.

South West Water (03/11/19)

8. **Asset Protection**
9. Please find attached a plan showing the approximate location of a public 3"CI water main in the vicinity of the above proposed development. Please note that no development will be permitted within 3 metres of the water main. The water main must also be located within a public open space and ground cover should not be substantially altered.
10. Should the development encroach on the 3 metre easement, the water main will need to be diverted at the expense of the applicant.
11. The precise position of water mains must be ascertained by hand digging trial holes after first contacting Bournemouth Water, who will give such information as is available regarding the general location of the mains in the area. No liability is accepted for the accuracy of any information given as to the position or existence of water mains. In particular, service pipes are not generally shown on mains records, but their presence should be anticipated and precautions taken to avoid damage.
12. Clean Potable Water
13. South West Water is able to provide clean potable water services from the existing public water main for the above proposal. The practical point of connection will be determined by the diameter of the connecting pipework being no larger than the diameter of the company's existing network.

Natural England

Comments received 04/01/2019

Objection, further information required

14. The application site is within the vicinity (within 5 km and beyond 400m) of Town Common which is notified as a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs) for the special interest of its heathland habitats and associated plant and animal species. Town Common is also part of the Dorset Heathlands Special Protection Area (SPA) and Dorset Heaths Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and Ramsar.
15. Natural England's advice to the authority is that the proposal will have a Likely Significant Effect on the European and International wildlife sites arising from the

increase in residential units and hence increase in urban related pressures, such as recreational access.

16. In the light of the recent ECJ ruling (People Over Wind & Sweetman v Coillte Teoranta (Case C-323/17)) which concluded that the avoidance/mitigation, e.g. as set out in the Dorset Heathlands Planning Framework (2015-2020) SPD, cannot be taken into consideration when considering the Likely Significant Effects of proposals on European wildlife sites (and Ramsar sites as a matter of Government policy). Natural England advise your authority to seek legal opinion of the requirement to undertake an Appropriate Assessment of the application under Reg 63.
17. Proposals to mitigate for the impact on the protected heathland through a contribution to Heathland Infrastructure Projects (HIPs) is a suitable mechanism, however there is no information regarding the specific HOIPs proposed. Due to the scale and localised impact of the development, without knowledge of the specific projects this contribution will go towards Natural England cannot conclude that the development will have no likely significant effect on the heathlands.
18. Natural England has previously discussed proposals to open access onto the nearby common land along the River Avon with the Council and would be happy to provide further advice on this proposal or identifying other suitable HIPs.
19. Natural England welcome the submission of a Biodiversity Mitigation and Enhancement Plan (BMEP), however this is not accompanied by a Certificate of Approval from the Dorset County Council Natural Environment Team (DCC NET). In this case, we recommend permission is not granted until the BMEP has been approved by DCC NET.
20. Provided the implementation in full of a DCC NET approved BMEP is secured through a condition as part of the grant of planning permission, Natural England agree with the opinion of the Natural Environment Team of Dorset County Council that the planning authority will have met their duties under Section 40 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act 2006 and Regulation 9(3) of The Conservation of Habitats & Species Regulations 2017.

NT comments received (19/12/19)

21. **Objection withdrawn, subject to securing mitigation**
22. Natural England welcome the submission of a Biodiversity Mitigation and Enhancement Plan (BMEP), however this is not accompanied by a Certificate of Approval from the Dorset County Council Natural Environment Team (DCC NET).

In this case, we recommend permission is not granted until the BMEP has been approved by DCC NET.

23. Provided the implementation in full of a DCC NET approved BMEP is secured through a condition as part of the grant of planning permission, Natural England agree with the opinion of the Natural Environment Team of Dorset County Council that the planning authority will have met their duties under Section 40 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act 2006 and Regulation 9(3) of The Conservation of Habitats & Species Regulations 2017.
24. Natural England have been working with the Council and applicant to develop appropriate mitigation in the form of Heathland Infrastructure Projects (HIPs), these have been identified in the submitted Heathland Infrastructure Project Scheme document (dated 22 July 2019). This document has been informed by advice from Natural England and BCP Council as the landowner and organisation responsible for the delivery of the HIPs. The BCP Landscape and Countryside Team Leader Mr Ottaway, should be consulted on the mitigation proposals with any changes incorporated to reflect his comments.
25. The submitted visitor surveys provide detail on the current level of relevant use of the sites which has then been used to assess available user capacity. This capacity is based on the levels of use of the Dorset Heaths and aims to recreate a similar experience in terms of density of visitors. Natural England advise that there is sufficient capacity within the identified HIPs sites for the proposed development and that they are located in areas where they will intercept new residents as well as a greater proportion of existing residents.
26. The HIPs measures, including capital works and ongoing maintenance to achieve the objectives set out in the HIP Scheme document are required to mitigate for the impacts and should be secured by your authority prior to completion of the Habitats Regulations Assessment. It is expected that HIP provision should be delivered in advance of occupation of dwellings, as early as is reasonably possible, to ensure that enhancements are as established and that there is no likely adverse effect on the Dorset Heaths.
27. Implementation may be subject to approvals from other authorities (Highways, or Environment Agency for example) and Natural England appreciate that flexibility may be required in the approach to meeting the objectives within the scheme document. The section 106 should make provision for BCP, as the managing organisation, to agree modifications of the HIPs scheme document with Natural England over the duration of 80 years from operation.
28. In addition, Natural England understands that the authority will secure a contribution for Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM) through a suitable legally binding agreement with the applicant, this requirement has been identified by the applicant in section 7.0.

29. Providing that the measures within the HIPs Scheme document submitted are fully secured within a section 106 agreement between the applicant and the authority which ensures the Council will deliver the agreed mitigation prior to first occupation and that the appropriate level of SAMM payments are secured, Natural England advise that the applicant will have demonstrated to the authority that it has mitigated the effects arising from the development on the Dorset Heaths.
30. In the light of the recent ECJ ruling (People Over Wind & Sweetman v Coillte Teoranta (Case C-323/17)) which concluded that the avoidance/mitigation, e.g. as set out in the Dorset Heathlands Planning Framework (2015 – 2020) SPD, cannot be taken into consideration when considering the Likely Significant Effects of proposals on European wildlife sites (and Ramsar sites as a matter of Government policy). Natural England advise your authority to seek legal opinion of the requirement to undertake an Appropriate Assessment of the application under Reg 63.

Millhams North

31. We have been asked by your authority to provide advice on the improvements proposed for Millhams North (Common). The Register of Common Land and Village Greens held by Dorset Council details who has rights to use it, and what those rights are. Natural England advise that the proposals for the enhancement of public access to the Millhams North as complementary to its designation as Common Land by enabling better access for the local people of Christchurch to the Common Land at Millhams North. There is no doubt that this is a high quality area of countryside which is little used by local people. No changes are proposed which would restrict access to the commoners to access and graze the land in line with their rights. Natural England is also aware of the natural function of the land as part of the River Avon floodplain, particularly affecting the site in winter. We do not consider that this would act as a barrier to its effectiveness as a HIP. The proposal for the stepped access will improve the access route onto the Common, providing an alternative to the regularly flooded right of way off Beaconsfield Road.

NE comments received 19/10/20

32. No objection

33. The authority has received an updated Biodiversity Mitigation and enhancement plan (Aug 2020).

Biodiversity Enhancement

34. It is a requirement of all development to enhance the natural environment, as stated in the NPPF (2018 as amended), paragraphs 8, 170 and 175. Without enhancement, the development would not be complying with National Policy (NPPF 2018 as amended). Natural England advise that the document:
- Biodiversity Mitigation & Enhancement Plan (BMEP) 28 Aug 2020

35. Provides evidence of mitigation of identified impacts as well as suitable biodiversity enhancement proposals. Natural England advise that if these measures are secured through a planning condition the planning authority will have met their duties under Section 40 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act 2006 and Regulation 9(5) of The Conservation of Habitats & Species Regulations 2010.
36. In respect of other matters relating to the mitigation of European protected sites Natural England have previously advised that the mitigation measures, if secured by the authority would be adequate to demonstrate no adverse effect on the integrity of the designated sites.

Dorset Wildlife Trust (03/01/2019)

37. The survey report states that "stag beetle records are present within the local area (although no such records exist from the site itself and no individuals have been recorded on site during any of the ecological surveys)". However, we have been shown some photographic evidence of stag beetles (a 'Section 41' species under the 2006 NERC Act) in the scrub area of the site, as well as the immediately adjacent gardens, and whilst we welcome the intention to remove any suitable deadwood found to the ecological corridor, we believe that it would be worthwhile to conduct a specific stag beetle survey immediately before any clearance work is done in the area of scrub, to avoid the possibility of killing any beetles or larvae on the site.
38. With regards to clearance of vegetation and felling of trees, it is stated that if clearance is not possible outside of the bird breeding season then the process must be preceded by a breeding bird survey by a qualified ecologist, and if active nests are found then a work must cease within a minimum three metre buffer until all the young have left the nests. We would suggest that a 3 metre buffer is insufficient to ensure no disturbance so that the adults will not desert the nest, and that this should be extended to a minimum of 5 metres.
39. It is also of concern that certain elements of the suggested mitigation process have clearly already been negated by actions of the developers which have already taken place. For example the garage of 41 Barrack road together with all the derelict outbuildings have already been demolished, and the ecological report states "It is understood that this was undertaken outside of the bird nesting season." i.e. this was clearly done in the absence of the ecologist. Likewise para 6.9 on page 55 states that the pile of rubbish close to the garage of 41 Barrack Road "will be sensitively dismantled by hand /under the supervision of an ecologist, avoiding the hibernation season". However para 5.5 on page 50 states that "During the demolition of the garage, the rubbish pile was removed. It is understood that this was undertaken outside of the hibernation period."

40. Again this implies that the ecologist was not present. This does not give confidence, in the absence of a signed agreement and requirement for photographic evidence from NET that any mitigation work will be carried out as specified.
41. Our major concern is with the proposed 'ecological corridor' which is intended as 'enhancement'. Considering the area of natural habitat which is to be lost under this development we do not believe that the corridor as proposed is nearly adequate to compensate for the overall biodiversity loss. In fact we cannot find any quantitative data within the report or BMP about this corridor. There is no indication of its length or how wide it is, but from the map shown in the appendix of the report it appears to be in the region of 3-4 metres wide, and only runs for part of the length of the western boundary of the site. We would suggest that such a corridor should be a minimum of 10-12 metres wide and should be extended along the north-western boundary. This corridor is supposed to incorporate a number of native and non-native tree species, wildflower grassland planting, plus a native hedgerow and some log piles for invertebrates. These are all laudable suggestions, but it would be quite impossible to incorporate all of those features into a corridor of that width. There is also no mention of how this corridor will be protected and maintained into the future, or how any maintenance work will be funded. It should require a funded management plan which is separate from the cutting of more formal grass and landscaped areas around the development.
42. In our opinion, as proposed, the mitigation and enhancement measures do not adequately compensate for the overall biodiversity loss, and so a further compensation payment may be required as calculated through the Dorset Biodiversity Compensation Framework. This can be resolved by ensuring that the BMP is sent to NET for consideration and a final calculation.
43. Finally we are concerned at the suggested mitigation for potential increased recreational pressure on the Dorset Heaths SAC /Dorset Heathlands SPA/Ramsar Sites. A residential development of this size should require a dedicated SANG, but the proposal states that mitigation will be achieved via securing enhancements to a number of nearby public open spaces, with final details to be agreed through the planning process. Whereas a new SANG can also incorporate many biodiversity features, the proposed enhancement of public open spaces will not necessarily increase biodiversity benefits, but is likely to be largely based on improving recreational and sports facilities. It is imperative that Natural England is consulted before planning permission is granted, and are satisfied that the proposals will be adequate to mitigate any adverse impacts on the nearby international sites.

DWT Revised comments received 23/12/2019

44. We note that an updated Ecological Assessment and Mitigation, Compensation and Enhancement Strategy has been submitted, as well as an updated

Biodiversity Mitigation and Enhancement Plan (BMEP). However, the accompanying BMEP guidance states under Section A, Paragraph 7.2 that BMEPs should not be used or made publicly available to view unless they are accompanied by a Certificate of Approval provided by the Natural Environment Team (NET) at Dorset Council.

45. The NET are listed as a consultee but have not yet provided a response. It is vital that this independent scrutiny of the BMEP is undertaken, to ensure adequate mitigation, compensation and net gains for biodiversity is secured. We therefore urge the council to require the developers to send the BMEP to NET with the appropriate fee. We also recommend that permission is not granted until a Certificate of Approval is provided for any submitted BMEP, and its implementation secured through a planning condition.
46. Although reference is made to trees providing suitable opportunities for nesting birds and roosting bats within the Ecological Assessment, only a safeguarding strategy for roosting bats is outlined in the BMEP. Furthermore, although the bat surveys did not identify roosting bats within the buildings, the Ecological Assessment outlines a suitable safeguarding strategy for demolition works, which again has not been captured within the BMEP. We would therefore like to ensure safeguarding is clearly in place for nesting birds in trees to be felled, as well as for roosting bats in the buildings to be demolished. The Ecological Assessment states that gardens "...will allow usage of the site [by foraging bats] to continue in the future". However, gardens as a foraging resource cannot be relied upon as adequate compensation for the loss of habitat and thus cannot be secured; many people do not have natural greenspace within their gardens, choosing to have gardens requiring little maintenance.
47. Reference is made to a sensitive lighting scheme in both the Ecological Assessment and the BMEP. The former however includes detail which has not been included within the latter. We therefore suggest that the details of a sensitive lighting scheme is secured through a planning condition.
48. The revised Landscape Plan (dated 30th October 2019) includes planting of *Rosa rugosa*, and invasive non-native plant species listed under Schedule 9; Part II of the *Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 (& as amended)*. We would therefore want to see this species removed from the proposed planting list.

DWT comments received 20/10/2020

49. DWT have previously commented on 3rd January and 18th December 2019 outlining concerns regarding the potential impacts of this development upon biodiversity. DWT note the submission of a revised *Biodiversity Mitigation & Enhancement Plan* (BMEP) (Ecosupport Ltd, dated August 2020). However, some of our previous concerns appear to have still not been addressed,

specifically in relation to the width of the proposed wildlife corridor (now termed area) and the inclusion of an invasive non-native species in the planting scheme.

50. Wildlife corridor/area

51. The revised Landscape Plan (dated 5th Feb 2020) illustrates the proposed wildlife area as referenced by the submitted BMEP under sub-section 4.3.1. DWT note the wildlife area has been extended along the north-western boundary as per our previous comment. However, no indication of the width of this area is provided in either document, only that the area measures 696m² in size (or c ha) in the submitted BMEP. Using the scale provided on the Landscape Plan, it appears that the wildlife area is 10m wide in places but appears much narrower for the most part of its length. DWT therefore seeks clarification on the proposed width of the wildlife area and justification provided on the reasons the area is not at least 10m wide along its full length as recommended.

52. Furthermore, no indication has been provided regarding the ongoing maintenance of the wildlife area, only that 'The Wildlife Area sits entirely outside of private ownership and will be managed with all other areas of Open Space on site, thereby ensuring its continued presence and quality'. DWT recommend that a detailed management plan is produced outlining the proposed management prescriptions for habitat features within the wildlife area, to ensure these are appropriately maintained for the benefit of biodiversity as suggested by the submitted BMEP.

53. DWT note that the revised Landscape Plan still includes planting of *Rosa rugosa* and therefore again recommend this species is removed from the proposed planting list.

54. DWT welcome the mitigation strategy outlined in sub-section 4.2.5 of the submitted BMEP in respect of stag beetles. DWT note the proposal to perform stag beetle walkover surveys prior to vegetation clearance and during construction to safeguard against the killing of any adults or larvae on-site, as recommended in our previous response.

55. DWT recommend the implementation of the mitigation, compensation and enhancement measures outlined under Section 4.0 of the submitted BMEP are secured through a planning condition'.

BCP Biodiversity Project Officer received 06/10/2020

56. The details laid out in section 4.0 Mitigation, Compensation and Enhancements and map in Appendix 1 are fine and should be secured by condition for all to be delivered.

Dorset Councils Archaeologist

57. The application is accompanied a document produced by Bournemouth Archaeology that is entitled 'Former Christchurch Magistrates and Police Station Development Site, Bargates, Christchurch - Archaeological Evaluation, Written Scheme of Investigation' (document ref: BUARC/2018/0210.1). This document explains the archaeological background to the site and its environs, including the description of two previous archaeological evaluations on the site, both of which identified archaeological remains.

58. The document then proposes further archaeological work as mitigation for the proposed development's impact on those remains. In my opinion, what is described here is appropriate, and this work should be secured by condition if consent is granted.

59. I would normally suggest the following wording for such a condition:

60. 'No works shall take place until the applicant has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological work in accordance with a written scheme of investigation which has been submitted by the applicant to, and approved by the Local Planning Authority. This scheme shall cover archaeological fieldwork together with post-excavation work and publication of the results.'

61. In this case, though, you may wish to refer more specifically to the Bournemouth Archaeology document as the 'written scheme of investigation'.

NHS Dorset (DCCG)

62. The links between health and the built and natural environment are well established, and we welcome this opportunity to comment on the implications of the proposed development for public health. In doing so I've drawn on a number of resources, in particular Public Health England's ' Spatial planning for Health – an evidence resource for planning and designing healthier places'

63. https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/729727/spatial_planning_for_health.pdf

Principle of development and provision of affordable housing

64. The importance of living in good quality and affordable housing is associated with numerous positive health outcomes. PHD support the principle of providing high quality affordable homes, including homes suited to the needs of older people.

65. We assume that, in accordance with Policy LN3 (Provision of affordable housing) of the Christchurch and East Dorset Local Plan Core Strategy the, the affordable housing provided on site will be secured for people in housing need in perpetuity, and will be made available to those with a local connection to Christchurch to ensure that it contributes to meeting both the current and future housing needs of the local community.

66. The applicant notes in the Design & Access Statement that Policy LN1 is a relevant planning policy consideration. We assume that the proposals will comply with the requirements of Policy LN1 (The size and type of new dwellings) of the Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy which stipulates that all new housing will be built to meet minimum living space standards. Ensuring new housing provides adequate internal living space is an important component of housing quality which in itself is an important determinant of health.

Access to greenspace/public open space

67. Access to, and engagement with, the natural environment (including urban greenspace), is associated with numerous positive health outcomes. There is consistent evidence that having access to parks and playgrounds is associated with increased physical activity and reduced risk of obesity. With this in mind we support the proposed provision of an enhanced, 'light controlled' pedestrian crossing to enable occupants of the proposed development to access areas of greenspace to the south of the A35.

68. The proposed 1 bedroom flats in Block A do not appear to benefit from any shared outdoor space and the proposed development does not provide shared space for allotments/food growing. Across the proposed development overall there appears to be limited provision of green/public open space, barring a central area which appears to be accessible only from a central car parking area. Given the numerous benefits to physical and mental health associated with adequate access to publicly accessible greenspace (of a variety of types and scales) we would support measures to incorporate these features into the proposed development. Providing infrastructure (e.g. outdoor seating areas, shared growing space, play equipment) has been shown to facilitate engagement with outdoor spaces and we would encourage incorporation of these features into the proposed landscape plan, along with provision of shared outdoor space to serve the proposed flats in Block A.

Provision for walking and cycling

69. There is a wealth of evidence to show that investing in infrastructure to support walking and cycling can increase physical activity across all age groups. Prioritising active travel can deliver co-benefits for health and well-being by avoiding air pollution associated with motorised vehicles and encouraging social interaction. Paragraph 110 a) of the NPPF states that new development should give priority first to pedestrian and cycle movements, both within the scheme and with neighbouring areas.

70. With this in mind we would encourage the inclusion of the pedestrian link (omitted after pre-application consultation) from the proposed development site to Twynham Avenue (which appears to benefit from existing parking restrictions to mitigate the risk of vehicle overcrowding). This would allow occupants of the proposed development to access a shorter walking route to Christchurch Station as well as providing a more direct route for pedestrians from the High Street to

reach the same location via the development site. We would encourage the installation of appropriate signage and lighting to encourage pedestrian movement through the proposed development.

71. To ensure that the proposed development prioritises pedestrian movements within the site (as a means of enabling physical activity and securing the health and wellbeing benefits associated with it) we would encourage the inclusion of appropriate traffic calming and lighting measures to reduce vehicle speeds within the site and encourage walking/cycling. This seems particularly relevant for the road that will connect the A35 and B3073 on either side of the site where excess vehicle movements could impact on the health and wellbeing of residents through noise, air pollution and discouragement of pedestrian use.
72. We welcome the measures proposed in the submitted Travel Plan to encourage sustainable travel choices. We suggest that this also makes reference to encouraging car club use which could further encourage sustainable travel choices by occupants of the proposed development.

Climate change

73. The impact of climate change poses risks for public health and we would encourage the inclusion of measures to both mitigate and adapt to those impacts. The proposed development offers opportunities to do so through generation of renewable energy, rainwater harvesting and maximising provision of green infrastructure.

Social value

74. We recognise the opportunity that development of the site could offer to support the local economy and providing local employment opportunities. If the proposal is approved we would encourage consideration of providing employment for local people during construction and/or apprenticeships or other routes to accessing employment. Employment is recognised as an important determinant of health and the development could provide an opportunity to influence this and/or support the local supply chain.

Further comments NHS Dorset (DCCG)

75. Stour Surgery does not have capacity to register these patients in our current building. Is there funding to help us enlarge the surgery? If not what is the plan to accommodate these patients with a local GP?

Natural Environment Team (Dorset Councils) 18/12/2018

76. I note that an Ecological Assessment and Biodiversity Mitigation Plan have been produced however, it would appear that these have not yet been submitted to the NET for review and approval under the Dorset Biodiversity Appraisal Protocol. If the applicant submits the documents along with the appropriate fee we would of course be happy to process the submission and review any proposed mitigation, compensation and enhancement required for protected species and notable habitats.

Revised comments 05/02/2020

77. The revised plan for the ecological corridor is an improvement on the original proposal and the increased length and width of such is welcome. However, concern remains where the width of the corridor is reduced to 3m due to the lack of certainty of successful mitigation both to compensate for the loss of existing on-site habitat and its long-term ecological function. Smaller width areas are likely to be difficult to maintain and manage appropriately for wildlife. I note the comments by the ecological consultant highlighted by the agent, and whilst we appreciate that there are no existing direct links to adjacent green infrastructure or natural habitats, the area does provide an island /stepping stone in the urban landscape and as such is an important ecological feature. The green corridor is the only means, given the quantum of development, by which the loss of the existing habitat can be mitigated, which we are not entirely confident of and which means that the development will also fall short of realising a net gain for biodiversity. This may therefore, call into question full compliance with the mitigation hierarchy set out in the NPPF.
78. If however, the authority are minded to grant permission based upon the current proposals, the BMEP should be amended to show the improved corridor provision and should include an additional commitment to produce a detailed design and management regime of the corridor to be submitted to the authority for approval. The certified BMEP should then be made a condition of the permission.

Christchurch Town Council 18/11/2019

79. Raise OBJECTION for the following reasons:

- a) The proposed development results in a loss of public car parking capacity serving the town centre with no provision for replacement parking either on the proposed site location or within the vicinity and does not provide for any commuted infrastructure contributions in lieu of on or off-site provision contrary to saved Policy P5 of the Christchurch Borough Council Local Plan 2001;
- b) The proposed development creates an unsympathetic relationship along the western boundary with Twynham Avenue residents. The proposed green strip along this boundary has been significantly reduced and given the proposed development along this boundary it shall result in an adverse relationship with the existing occupiers of Twynham Avenue contrary to saved policy H12 of the Christchurch Local Plan 2001 and HE2 of the Christchurch and East Dorset Local Plan -Part 1 Core Strategy.

DC Lead Flood Authority - Revised comments received 7 February 2020

80. Following our earlier Holding Objection, and in addition to any previous submissions, we note that the applicant has provided documents which provide

detail regarding drainage from the applicant's site. As a result, we can acknowledge the following:

81. In the absence of information about Ground Water (GW) levels, the applicant has presented a backup strategy in the form of an attenuated discharge to Wessex Water (WW) SW Sewers. We understand that GW monitoring is being commissioned for the site, if they are found to be favourable then infiltration at the site could proceed and detailed designs produced at Discharge of Conditions (DoC) / detailed design stage accordingly. However, in the event that GW levels are too high, a proposed attenuation system has been demonstrated as feasible.
82. In support of the revised, provisional drainage design the applicant has submitted a breakdown of impermeable areas post development and calculated brownfield discharge rates in a way that accords with the CIRIA SuDS manual.
83. Attenuation volumes and indicative layouts have been provided to facilitate acceptable discharge rates that broadly accord with expected rates from the site and may offer some betterment beyond the current baseline scenario.
84. The applicant has demonstrated a viable drainage strategy and provided the necessary detail to substantiate this. We therefore have no objection to the application subject to the conditions and informatives at the end of this letter being included on any permission granted.
85. Whilst we are willing to recommend conditions at this time, we would draw your attention to the following:
 86. The applicant has still not presented a drainage system which offers any multifunctional benefit. The drainage systems proposed offers no amenity, no ecological and no water quality benefit. This does not accord with paragraph 165 of the National Planning Policy Framework and is particularly disappointing given the loss of some green areas within this site and the close proximity to Christchurch harbour, however, in respect of ecological harm or water quality issues you would need to consult Dorset Council's Natural Environment Team and Natural England respectively.
 87. In your email to us dated 16/01/2020, however, you advised that the weight likely to be accorded to this policy would be low due to lack of housing supply within Christchurch. Clearly, allocation of weight to policy is a planning matter; we are content that the drainage system proposed will work, but do not consider that it accords with best practice or policy regarding SW management. This point, in our view, should be highlighted to the planning committee.
 88. We note that future maintenance and ownership of the proposed infrastructure has not been addressed but are content for this to be dealt with by way of the condition(s) below. To ensure that the above elements are properly considered, and a detailed design provided, we recommend the following conditions be attached to any permission granted.

Conservation Officer of former CED Council (15/03/2019)

89. The area of Christchurch known as Bargates has a well-documented history that can be researched in various places that explain the development of a typical Saxon town as is Christchurch. Christchurch has a strong sense of place and this is displayed within the material and textures used in the construction of the vernacular architecture.
90. With the obvious exceptions such as the Priory, The Castle and the remains of the Constables House, high quality brickwork has been the precedence. It is unusual to encounter such an avoidance of freestone architectural detailing in a town that is within reach of limestone, sandstone and green sand building material options,
91. Classical architecture styles and themes that have carried across the Georgian period into the Victorian era and into the recent 20th century have maintained a continuity of local brickwork style in texture and bond.
92. Typically, buildings display a Flemish bond with burnt headers or decorated headers to present the de rigueur checkerboard brick pattern. This is highlighted when this theme is not followed or adhered to and material options are not controlled, as in the modern handling of the Hospital buildings on the northern approach to the town centre. A well-constructed and designed building being let down in the brick choice and bond. A modern terracotta brick fired at high temperature has been used on this building, with a cementitious mortar...out of character and somewhat alien to the character of Christchurch.
93. Christchurch brickwork is a significant driver that should be at the forefront of any major development and the choices are vast. The dimensions, clay choice and firing temperature of the brick material are where control should be a focus.
94. Mortar joints and bedding mortar to be compatible with the low fired, soft clay bricks. The standard approach being to insist upon a lime based mortar. This detail also requires a specialist focus to ensure that the mortar is not uniform throughout and is chosen or selected to compliment the various brick colour and textures that the palette will comprise of. The usual housebuilder approach is to use a mass produced hydraulic lime mortar that can be mixed to order from a huge silo. This approach does not lend itself to the expectation or demands of the locale vernacular style, being a display of varying shades and textures of materials used in the equally varying pointing styles.
95. If the design of the dwelling asks for stone sills or lintels, then these should be stone and not composite elements. The ranges of cast cement based reconstituted stone products do not age well and will not oxidise or collect patina that compliments the brickwork.
96. Genuine or authentic compound brick arches or lintels to be insisted upon as a specification condition. The use of creasing tiles or plain tiles to add string

courses or platt bands is suitable and calls for expertise within the craft of the bricklayer or mason.

97. Rusticated or ashlar facing is not a usual handling of the façade of Christchurch. This is usually displayed in a better grade of brick and with detailing to the quoins. Either being proud of the façade or by being a slightly different shade of brick.
98. The recent trend to paint brickwork within Christchurch should be avoided at all cost and the brickwork, if beautiful should remain and any further painting of nearby extant dwellings to be carefully controlled. Once painted, the character has diminished significantly.
99. There are a few properties within the existing building stock of Christchurch that are rendered. These are rendered over the brick and do have a gentle ashlar incised texture. This trend appears to come about after the introduction of an early cement product. It is most likely a Vicat product and was in general use from around 1860-1920. Not really cementitious but magnesium based, hydraulic lime. Very fast setting and pre dated the British "Roman cement" from the Victorian era.
100. If a rendered façade assists with the theme of ongoing development of the new estate, the render material and skill that is required to produce an indented ashlar is to be conditioned or controlled by sample panels prior to application. This can look awful and inappropriate if not managed.
101. Roof cover can be natural slate/Plain clay tiles or pan tiles. The selection and options are vast. Recently Spanish slates have proven themselves to be acceptable but great care to be taken in the selection to ensure minimum iron content and that they are true riven slates rather than sawn.
102. Obviously avoid fake chimneys, grp chimneys are an insult to any house and town planners need to steer designers away from these as an option. They do not age comparably with the genuine materials that they hope to emulate.
103. Cast iron rainwater goods, black-gunmetal. No plastic. External joinery including doors and windows-Good quality sustainable sources such as joinery grade Douglas fir. Painted. This to follow through on soffits, barge boards and timber fascia.
104. There are some very well made metal framed door and window options such as the new crittal or bronze casement company. These would add a variation if required especially on the dwellings that have an ancillary style or being of the converted stable theme. Small panes with genuine glazing bars.

105. The concept buildings as proposed are well proportioned and offer a variety of styles and sizes that complement the historic development of Christchurch. A varied and interesting roof scape will positively enhance this area of the town.
106. In order to deliver this estate, sacrifices will be required. One being the older public house called the Goose and Timber. A commercial building that seems to have lost the sense of place that other buildings within the town have managed to retain. They have also maintained or retained their community which is not the case here.
107. A prime regeneration project with nearby amenity and with a mixed commercial/residential use. Within the adjacent conservation area stands a listed building. The clock chain factory. This building should be used as design lead to offer solutions to the symmetry issues that do occur within some of the concept designs.
108. If the proportions suggest a second or a third garage door would add balance or interest, these should be added or defined as being present at a point in time. The use of conservation roof lights to be encouraged and to ensure basic symmetry is delivered when positions of dormers, windows or doorways are considered.
109. The tall buildings and the narrow elements of the town houses are exquisite and bring so much character to this redundant part of Christchurch.

Summary

110. Bricks to be taken from a palette of reds through to buff. Including snapped or burnt headers. To be low fired soft clay. Mortar to be taken from a palette of colour and texture that compliments the soft clay bricks. To be a true lime mortar comprising of sharp sand/stone dusts and either hydraulic lime or putty lime. Sharp sand/stone dust 2.5 :1 part hydraulic lime, No cement or additives. Sharp sand/stone dust 3: 1part putty lime.
111. The above are industry standard mortar proportions and should not be ignored. The use of pigments within any mortar has a very short life as the pigment being water soluble will leave the set mortar and bring about a colour change that will be incompatible with the building elements.
112. An exemplar panel of the built brickwork to be installed prior to specifications being set is a usual way of controlling the quality. This set of dwarf walls to be on site and maintained throughout the build phase and only removed once all brickwork is signed off. This helps broadcast the intention and the focus of the council to ensure that this is a quality regeneration project within the heart of Christchurch.
113. The above costs no less than the other way. The other way being driven by modern housebuilder practices to save money or to use low skilled labour. This is

not a project that should be scrimped on with materials or craftsmanship. There may well be a bursary or grant available from one of the heritage craft skills bodies to assist with the project.

114. It may also warrant sponsorship from one of the heritage brick industries to advertise and educate the importance of using appropriate material.

115. Supportive of the scheme.

Tree Officer of former CED Council

116. The significance of the tree cover on the site has not been set out, except where, with notable exceptions (G41, G42, T8), trees have been identified for felling. The assessment is incomplete.

117. Most of the trees that are to be retained will have development surrounding them. Once again the root protection areas (RPA) of existing trees have been plotted as circles, using the minimum root protection area as set out in BS5837:2012. No attempt has been made to identify the actual RPAs of the trees, given the current use of the site. This approach puts the layout designer at a disadvantage when the local authority raises legitimate arboricultural concerns about the scheme.

118. All the significant trees that are shown for retention have some form of development within the minimum radial RPA as shown. While this is not unusual in urban developments, it does require detailed on-site assessment and interpretation of the collected data. It also requires site specific solutions to the issues raised by the arboriculturist, for an engineer to resolve. Using generic guidance, especially with the limitations as set out on the front cover of each site guidance note does not provide the certainty of outcome that the Council requires against the background of its duty under the 1990 T CPA, and in order to support an application with planning conditions in accordance with paragraph 54 of the NPPF.

119. As a result of all this the proposals are currently unacceptable because they will lead to the loss of and damage to trees contrary to Policy HE2 and HE3 of the local plan. I can offer a reason for refusal if required.

Additional BCP Tree and Landscape Officer comments received 15/01/2020

120. The tree concerns raised by the previous Tree and Landscape officer in their comments dated 10/12/18 and during the meeting held in March 2019 appear to remain. The placing of dwellings and/or parking just outside the root protection areas of the retained TPO trees on site appears unchanged in the updated arboricultural assessment and method statement, ref: 17301-AA6-PB, dated 15/11/19. Therefore, harmonious relationships will not be created with the following trees, Norway (T11), Cherry (T50), Sycamore (T51), Sycamore (T21) and Yew (T25). The tree numbering is per the tree report. To date the Council has received no evidence as to why the protected Norway Maple (T10) needed to

be removed. While the proposed planting of a new tree is welcomed, appropriate tree species suitable for the site are still to be confirmed, again as discussed in the March meeting.

BCP Environmental Health (14/01/19)

Contaminated Land

121. There is believed to be some former historic contaminative uses on site, but the site is not classed as contaminated. However our standard contaminated land condition should be applied.

Noise

122. The development should be conditioned in line with the noise report. The development must be built to the specifications set out in the Noise Impact assessment - Technical Report: R7574-1 Rev 0. This report demonstrates that with some mitigation, including acoustically rated glazing and ventilation, in the habitable rooms of the residential dwellings (as shown in Glazing Zones Plan), would comply with maximum internal levels of 35 dB LAeq during the daytime, 30 dB LAeq at night, and 45 dB LAmax,f at night for regular events.
123. The plans show some commercial units and flats that might have external plant associated with it. The noise from any plant in the development must be controlled to 5 dBA below the typical background level when measured at the façade of any noise sensitive property.
124. The proposed retail units have residential above them. Therefore deliveries and waste collection from the retail units should be limited by condition so that they do not occur between 19:00h and 07:00h

Construction

125. A construction method statement needs to be submitted and agreed by the LPA before construction commences. It needs to detail how nuisances (noise, odour, dust, smoke) will be avoided.

Demolition

126. A demolition method statement needs to be submitted and agreed by the LPA before demolition commences.

CCTV

127. Currently we have a camera sited in Pitside Car Park. It is an important camera for us providing unique coverage of specific locations that are relevant to our aims and objectives and its loss will adversely affect our operations. Due to the height of the development the field of view of this camera will be obscured. To replace these lost views the existing camera will need to be relocated, and two additional cameras will need to be installed. The Environmental Health Department, who manage the Council's CCTV, require a one-off contribution towards the cost of relocation of the camera and additional installation of 2 additional cameras. This has been estimated at £25,000. If agreed this will need to be added to a section 106 agreement.

BCP Planning Policy

128. My comments on this application are in accordance with the NPPF, the adopted Core Strategy (2014) and the Magistrates Court Site Development Brief (SPG, 2003). However, it is important to note that while still extant, the Magistrates Court Brief is out of date. As such, my comments mainly relate to the NPPF, adopted Core Strategy and associated evidence base.

Housing Provision:

129. The proposed development includes 131 residential dwellings and 39 units of age restricted sheltered accommodation. A total of 170 dwellings are appropriate in this town centre location which will make an important contribution towards the Core Strategy housing requirement set out in Policy KS4. This is also consistent with Policy CH1 of the adopted Core Strategy which seeks to accommodate high density residential development alongside the projected requirement for retail floorspace.

SHMA Mix:

130. In measuring the mix for open market housing against the 2015 SHMA there is an over provision of 1 bed properties and an under provision of 3 bed properties. However, in this town centre location, where higher density development is appropriate, a higher number of 2- and 1-bed properties may be appropriate. The same imbalance exists with an over provision of 1 bed affordable properties and under provision of affordable 3 beds. Is there any potential for this mix to be revisited to establish a better balance of housing provision?

131. Policy LN3 of the adopted Core Strategy requires that brownfield sites should deliver up to 40% affordable housing at a tenure mix of 70% social rented / affordable rent and 30% intermediate housing. The definition of affordable housing has been broadened in the NPPF to include Starter Homes and Discount Market Sales. However, the tenure split, whilst including these broader categories will need to be broadly consistent with Policy LN3.

132. The submitted application proposes 31% affordable housing which takes into account the vacant building credit as set out in the NPPF. The NPPF makes provision for a vacant building credit where a vacant building is brought back into any lawful use, or is demolished to be replaced by a new building. In this instance, the developer should be offered a financial credit equivalent to the existing gross floorspace of relevant vacant buildings when the local planning authority calculates any affordable housing contribution which will be sought. Affordable housing contributions may be required for any increase in floorspace.

133. In this instance it has been agreed that a vacant building credit applies and a calculation has been submitted as part of the application. I trust that the case office has assessed the VBC and agreed with the calculation submitted.

Design and impact on the Conservation area:

134. The Magistrates Court Site is located adjacent to the Christchurch Central Conservation Area. A Heritage Assessment has been undertaken by Elain Milton Heritage Planning assessing the impact of the proposal on the conservation area and listed buildings. I trust that the Conservation Officer will provide detailed advice in terms of relationship and impact on the conservation area.

Transport and Access and Parking:

135. A Transport Assessment has been prepared by Odyssey on behalf of Aster Homes. This assessment concludes that no significant offsite improvements are required in order to mitigate the transport impact of the development. The main proposed measures include the site access road from Barrack Road to Bargates. I understand that parking provision will be in accordance with the Dorset Parking Standards which is consistent with the policy approach in the Core Strategy.
136. I note that off the existing pay and display parking spaces currently located on the site, 15 will be retained. I trust that this is consistent with the council's current car parking strategy and provision for the town centre.
137. BCP transport planning has provided comments regarding site access and in relation to the through road link from Barrack Road to Bargates. Issues have been raised that this route through the site could be used as a general through route / short cut by vehicular traffic which could have implications for increased turning movements and congestion at the main site junctions. The scheme has been amended so that the through link from Barrack Road to Bargates will be pedestrian and cycle only. I trust that BCP Highways will comment further on these revised proposals.
138. The pedestrian crossings on Barrack Road and Bargates are now proposed as Toucan crossings which appear to be more appropriate for pedestrian safety.

Flood risk:

139. Following my comments made in December 2018 the FRA has been updated in May 2019 and the flood risk consultants have applied the published SFRA Level 2 (2009) flood risk data which is welcomed. The FRA now identifies that the south east corner of the site is located within Flood zone 3 and flood zone 2 when climate change is taken into account to 2126. Development located within this part of the site includes residential and commercial so the 2126 scenario should be applied.
140. The Magistrates Court Site is identified as a strategic site in Policy CH1 of the adopted Core Strategy (2014) and as pivotal in delivery of the town centre vision. On this basis it is not necessary to undertake a sequential approach to consider alternative sites. However, there is not a detailed allocation in the adopted Core Strategy and the BCP Local Plan is at an early stage of preparation. Therefore, it is necessary to undertake a sequential approach within the site to locate development outside flood risk affected areas in accordance with the NPPF.

141. The 2019 Christchurch SFRA Level 2 is now available and the data can be provided to the flood risk consultants. The 2019 SFRA identifies the south east corner of the site including the Pit Site car park within flood zone 3a (2133). Additionally, the edge of the Police Station site adjacent to Barrack Road is affected by flood zone 3.

Heathland Mitigation:

142. The adopted Core Strategy (2014) Policy ME2 requires that development between 400m and 5km provide mitigation to avoid adverse impacts on the heathland. For residential development of 40 or over the Core Strategy sets out a requirement to provide Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space. However, through the adopted Heathlands SPD there is flexibility on town centre sites to deliver an appropriate package of heathland infrastructure projects subject to agreement with the council and in consultation with Natural England.

143. The Adopted Heathland SPD sets out in paragraph 5.5 that, '*within the built up area brownfield sites are unlikely to be able to accommodate the scale of space required for a SANG and would therefore make a contribution through either S106 or CIL towards HIPs provision. It is expected that HIP provision should be delivered in advance of occupation of dwellings, as is reasonably possible, to ensure that there is no likely adverse effect on the Dorset Heaths*'.

144. It is therefore a requirement that the scheme identifies either suitable SANG provision or a package of Heathland Infrastructure Projects (HIPs) to be agreed with the Council. The responsibility is with the applicant to devise and implement an appropriate package of mitigation. It is necessary for heathland mitigation to be secured in perpetuity to mitigate the impact of the development. As established through the pre – application process mitigation provision should be secured through S106.

145. Eco Support Ltd has prepared a heathland mitigation strategy and management plan document on behalf of Aster Homes dated July 2019. A detailed heathland mitigation strategy and management plan has been prepared with the involvement of the applicant, BCP Council and Natural England. The following HIPs projects are proposed:

1) **Millhams Common** (3.5ha) (located 300m from the development site)

146. Phased delivery with 169th dwelling

147. 2) **Bernards Mead** (6.52ha) (located 1.4km from the development site)

148. Phased delivery prior to first occupation.

149. 3) **Land off the Merdians** (3ha) (located 670m from the development site)

150. Phased delivery with 85th dwelling.

151. The management plan sets out a programme for the management and maintenance of these HIPs projects in perpetuity. The costs for the delivery and management and maintenance of the HIPs schemes are the responsibility of the developer and will be secured through legal agreement. BCP will maintain land ownership of the HIPs and undertake management and maintenance. This package of HIPs projects has been developed with the applicant, BCP and Natural England and subject to Natural England's final confirmation I consider it to be an appropriate package of mitigation for this scheme.

Open Space Provision:

152. In addition to requirements for heathland mitigation, Policy HE4 of the adopted Core Strategy sets out requirements for on-site open space. As part of the submitted scheme there is no identifiable open space to address Local Plan requirements. If the approach is to utilise or enhance off site provision in this town centre location then this needs to be made clear.

Retail Provision:

153. The Magistrates Courts Site is located within the Christchurch Town Centre Primary Shopping Area. As such the site is located, 'in centre' for retail purposes and is highly appropriate to accommodate new retail development. In order to deliver the Christchurch Town Centre Vision in the region of 7,500 sqm of comparison and 2,300sqm of convenience floorspace is required in the town centre by 2028. The town centre has limited opportunities to accommodate this floorspace and the Magistrates Court Site is a key site to deliver a significant part of this requirement as part of a mixed use scheme. The 'Magistrates Court Site' is identified as a 'Strategic site' in Policy CN1 'Christchurch Town Centre Vision' and is to perform a key role in delivering retail requirements for the town centre. The Council is also now progressing a Local Plan Review and undertook Issues and Options consultation in the summer of 2018. As part of a mixed used scheme with residential, it is currently proposed that the Magistrates Court Site is allocated for 1,250sqm of A1-A5 floorspace. The emerging BCP Local Plan now superseded the Christchurch Local Plan Review and this site will be considered further through the BCP Local Plan process.

154. The submitted application proposes only 612sqm of 'commercial floorspace for flexible commercial/community space (A1, A2, A3, A4, B1, D1 (Museum only) use classes). In accordance with the Core Strategy and emerging Local Plan evidence base the A1 – A3 uses are welcomed as they will deliver additional retail floorspace. It is also acknowledged that the B1 and D1 uses will also enhance the town centre as a whole. . It is also acknowledged that recent changes in retailing have led to some uncertainty over the future direction of growth in the high street. Nonetheless, the level of provision is significantly below the 1,250 sqm of A1 – A5 which was agreed previously. The result of this low level provision will mean that it will be more difficult to find opportunities in the

Town Centre to deliver retail / food and beverage floorspace requirements for the town centre as identified in Policy CN1 and KS8 of the Core Strategy.

155. In this regard Paragraph 85 of the NPPF sets out a requirement to,

156. *'Allocate a range of suitable sites in town centres to meet the scale and type of development likely to be needed, looking at least 10 years ahead. Meeting anticipated needs for retail, leisure, office and other main town centre uses over this period should not be compromised by limited site availability.....'*

157. It is disappointing that the application includes no retail assessment or in-depth assessment of the likely occupiers that could be attracted to the site and town centre. Therefore, there is no robust justification for the level of retail provision currently being proposed. Comments about retail provision are extremely light and refer to a concern of Bargates businesses that there may be an adverse risk of trade draw from existing businesses. Additional retail development in this location presents an opportunity to create better pedestrian linkages between the High Street and Bargates and improved footfall which I would anticipate having a positive impact on existing retailers in the town.

CIL / S106 use / vacant building credit:

158. In accordance with the adopted CIL Charging Schedule infrastructure and 123 list requirements should be through S106 and the development should be zero rated for CIL.

Affordable Housing / Vacant Building Credit:

159. Comments regarding affordable housing are as set out above.

Education:

160. The proposed development will be required to make a contribution towards local education provision in accordance with DCC's standard methodology. I would have anticipated the level of contribution to have been agreed with the submission of the application so this matter needs to be resolved.

Heathlands:

161. As set out above the heathland mitigation strategy and HIPs projects need to be formally agreed by the Council and Natural England and secured in perpetuity by way of S106.

Highways Works:

162. Highways improvements to be delivered are mainly on site in addition to the provision of road crossings. These works will need to be agreed with DCC and secured through the legal agreement.

Conclusions:

163. This proposal for the Magistrates Court site presents the opportunity to deliver a positive mixed use scheme appropriate to its town centre location within the Primary Shopping Area. The delivery of 170 residential units will make a

significant contribution towards the housing requirement set out in Policy KS4 of the Core Strategy.

164. A heathland mitigation strategy and management plan has now been prepared which once agreed will provide a robust framework for the delivery of a suitable mitigation package in perpetuity.
165. Site access and highways matters raised by BCP transport planning have been addressed by the applicant in recent scheme amendments.
166. This site is identified as a strategic site in Policy CH1 of the Core Strategy which identifies the importance of the Magistrates Court Site delivering a significant level of retail development to contribute effectively to the Town Centre Vision and retail requirements. The level of provision proposed is currently 612 sqm which is below the 1250sqm previously discussed and consulted on as part of the Christchurch Local Plan Review. If the site comes forward with this level of provision it will be more difficult to deliver the current retail requirements in the Core Strategy and emerging Local Plan, even allowing for the current uncertainties in the retail sector nationally. This is not consistent with the NPPF, the Core Strategy (Policy CH1) and emerging Local Plan. No retail assessment has been submitted with the application to justify the approach adopted.
167. In terms of constraints, the site is affected by flood risk (Zone 3a and Zone 2) on the Pit Site carpark which has not been picked up in the FRA, and this needs to be addressed.
168. I have not commented in detail here about transport matters and design / impact on the conservation area. I trust these matters will be appropriately examined by DCC Highways and the council's conservation officer.

BCP Education Team

169. BCP Council has a statutory duty to secure sufficient and suitable school places for Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole resident children of statutory school age. One of the most important but also challenging roles for BCP Council is to ensure that there are enough school places in the correct area for parents to access them.
170. Accurate forecasting of the numbers of children requiring school places in the local authority area is key to the school place planning process. BCP school pupil forecasts are updated on an annual basis.
171. There are five key factors that determine how many children there will be and the number that will require school places in the local authority area:
1. Number of births
 2. Levels of migration
 3. Levels of new housing development
 4. Cross border flows of pupils, within Dorset and Hampshire in particular
 5. Parental expressions of preference in applications

172. Estimates of the number of children arising from new housing developments are not included within annually updated pupil forecasts because the precise impact cannot be known until planning permission has been granted and the developments have been built out and become occupied.
173. To enable the Council to consider and plan for the impact of new housing development, a modelling tool is used by BCP Council to forecast the number of children that are likely to be generated from housing developments across the conurbation.
174. Number of additional places that would result from the proposed development and its phasing
175. The model has been applied to the submitted scheme. The proposal is for the demolition of the Police Station and Magistrates' Court and other buildings, and erection of 131 residential dwellings, 39 units of age-restricted sheltered accommodation (which are not factored into the modelling) and flexible commercial / community space.
176. The development is comprised of market homes, social / affordable / intermediate rented homes and affordable ownership homes. For modelling purposes these have simply been categorised as market homes and affordable homes, as the following table shows. Taking into account the phasing of the site all homes are considered as being delivered for the start of the 2022/23 academic year (September 2022).

Dwelling Type	Market Homes	Affordable Homes
1 Bed Flat	23	31
2 Bed Flat	24	10
3 Bed Flat	0	0
4 Bed Flat	0	0
1 Bed House	0	0
2 Bed House	7	6
3 Bed House	19	6
4 Bed House	5	0

177. The following figures are used to calculate the anticipated number of children to be generated from each housing type. These figures are the averages taken from the two most recent new build surveys conducted in Poole. No such surveys have been conducted in Christchurch and Bournemouth so the Poole surveys are used as an indicator to be applied across the BCP area. The surveys were completed by occupants of new homes built between 01/04/04 and 31/03/07 (findings published 2007), and 01/04/13 and 31/03/16 (findings published 2016). The outcomes of the two surveys were combined and then averaged out in order to provide a larger sample size.

Type of Home	Children per Market Home	Children per Affordable Home
1 Bed Flat	0.00	0.00
2 Bed Flat	0.12	0.70
3 Bed Flat	0.12	2.33
4 Bed Flat	0.12	2.33
1 Bed House	0.00	0.00
2 Bed House	0.10	0.75
3 Bed House	0.50	1.93
4 Bed House	0.50	2.40

178. Modelling anticipates that **39 children** will be generated by the proposed 131 new homes

Phasing of development

179. The 39 children anticipated to be generated from the development, when apportioned accordingly across the age spectrum using the latest mid-year population estimates as published by government, equates to 2 children per year of age (with a further year having 3 children). This single year with one additional child distorts the projections somewhat so it is reasonable to assume that the development will generate 2 children per year of age across the full 0 – 18 age spectrum.

180. The total numbers of places anticipated to be generated from the proposed development of 131 new homes are as follows:

- 10 x Early Years places
- 14 x Primary places
- 10 x Secondary places
- 4 x Post-16 places

181. The pupil place planning function must also plan for pupils who have Special Educational Needs or Disabilities (SEND). Using the January 2019 BCP School Census as a basis, 15% of children in BCP have SEND. Of this 15%, 9.4% attend specialist schools. When applying these percentages to the number of primary and secondary school children generated by the proposed development, no specialist places are anticipated to be required. Specialist Education places are all-through places (i.e. one place covers primary and secondary).

182. The analysis above is based on the proposed scheme and assumptions regarding housing type and tenure including the proposed percentages of affordable housing, and the delivery rate and phasing of the proposed development. Any changes or further information regarding these will need to be reassessed and these results could change significantly.

183. View of BCP Council Pupil Place Planning function on the impact of a development of 131 new homes on school place planning

184. It is the view of the Pupil Place Planning function at BCP Council that there would be the following impacts on school place planning in relation to the proposed 131 new homes.

185. Compulsory school age year groups – the current context

186. The closest BCP Primary phase schools to the site (measured by safe walking route) are Christchurch Infant School, Christchurch Junior School and Twynham Primary School. All three schools are generally popular and oversubscribed.

187. Nationally, demand for Secondary places is increasing. Across BCP Council as a whole, additional Secondary places are forecast to be needed for 2022/23 and 2023/24; there are also shortfalls in some BCP School Place Planning Areas in 2021/22 and 2024/25. The Christchurch Planning Area is forecast to have a shortfall in Secondary places over a five year period from 2020/21 to 2024/25. The closest Secondary school to the site (measured by safe walking route) is Twynham School; this school is popular and oversubscribed. Housing development during the phase indicated for the proposed development will mean that further new Secondary phase school places would be needed in addition to the extra capacity needed to meet increased demand from the current population. Mitigation will be required for the places needed as a result of the proposed development.

Early years provision – the current context

188. Prior to the formation of BCP Council in April 2019, Dorset County Council (DCC) provided the pupil place planning responses in relation to major developments in Christchurch. The original pupil place planning assessment carried out by DCC sought education contributions for the primary, secondary and post-16 phases. No early years funding was sought. In order to ensure some continuity from the original pupil place planning assessment carried out by DCC, early years funding shall not be sought through a S.106 agreement in relation to this proposed development.

Other Planned Developments

189. Other development is planned in the vicinity of the site. Pupil place planning must take account of the cumulative impact of all planned or likely developments. Therefore, this response applies to the proposed development in all its current stated details. If the proposal details vary, including number of units, housing mix, phasing and rate of delivery, the impact on school places will need to be re-determined.

190. Mitigation

191. School places are categorised as site-specific infrastructure to be funded through S.106 Obligations. Therefore, BCP Council will expect the developer to mitigate the full costs of all additional pupil places required as a result of the proposed development, or by any variation to it, through S.106. Again in order to maintain some continuity from the original assessment made by DCC, the costings used by DCC have been applied to the contribution calculations. The required contribution breakdown is highlighted below:

Phase	Number of Places	Cost per Place	Total Cost
Primary	14	£9,937.50	£139,125.00
Secondary	10	£22,525.00	£225,250.00
Post-16	4	£22,427.00	£89,708.00
Total		£454,083.00	

192. Any changes or further information regarding the housing mix of the proposed development will need to be reassessed and these results could change significantly.

BCP Highways

193. The majority of the site is being redeveloped for residential units with access roads predominantly serving residential units. Residential street design documents Manual for Streets 1 and 2 place pedestrian, cyclist and sustainable travel modes as a higher priority, above car use, in residential street design. This promotion of the ease of movement for pedestrians and sustainable travel modes is supported in local policies. Local Policy KS1 refers to development providing new or improving public transport, cycle and walking routes and also refers to permeable layouts which are direct and attractive for walking, cycling and public transport. At present the current layout of the site is very car dominant in design and more needs to be done to promote walking, cycling and bus travel and to create a less car dominant, slower speed environment. Promotion of sustainable modes of travel will reduce car use amongst residents and reduce trips on the adjacent highway network. The proposal also needs to amend the proposed vehicle accesses to reduce the impact vehicle turning movements and address servicing issues to adjacent commercial premises on Bargates. In addition to legal agreements and planning conditions for highway elements of the proposal specific amendments are required to the proposed layout/submitted plans.

194. The proposal indicates a vehicle route running through the site linking Bargates with Barrack Road. This route is not supported as it could lead to more vehicles travelling through the site and residential area, the route could be used as a vehicle short cut from Bargates to Barrack Road and visa-versa increasing turning movements at the main road junctions. This route should be blocked for vehicles, but be retained as a pedestrian and cycle route providing a good sustainable link through the site. I suggest the route is blocked outside units 41-

42 with perhaps the provision of a hard paved raised landscaped area (benches/raised planters/cycle stands.). This area should still be given over as highway to the Council to ensure control over this through route is retained by the highway authority. Blocking the vehicle route outside units 41-42 would allow larger vehicles to turn should they enter off the Barrack Road or Bargates access by mistake and need to turn to leave the site. Amendments to remove the vehicle through route are required.

195. The main route and internal roads throughout the site should take the form of a less car dominant environment with the use of raised tables, non-defined pedestrian routes, changes in surface materials. Some shared space is shown within the proposal but this could be extended to include the central road, especially without it being blocked for through vehicles e.g. Footways could enter into the site but then terminate at raised table features and pedestrians could then utilise a shared carriageway. Roads within the site should have pinch points in areas, perhaps with raised planters, cycle stands, benches located on road build outs. With such features, road speeds within the residential environment are likely to be less than 20mph which should be the aim for residential streets. Amendments in the highway layout & materials are required to create a more pedestrian friendly/ less car dominant environment.

196. Where there are road junctions the footway/cycleway should continue across the junction taking the form of raised continuous footways/cycleway/shared spaces. This includes across the Bargates junction and Barrack Road junctions. With appropriate surfacing and road markings this will emphasise pedestrian and cycle priority across these junctions and internally within the site. The plans currently show over-engineered kerbed radii junctions at most junctions.

Barrack Road - Retirement Flats car park access:

197. I consider that the retirement flats access represents an unnecessary vehicle access when vehicle access for this element of the proposal could be taken from the lower category internal access road to the rear of this retirement unit (building alterations would be required) . This would reduce vehicle turning movements and potential vehicle conflicts on Barrack Road. It would also reduce vehicle movements across the footway/cycleway and also free up an area fronting Barrack Road for the provision of a new bus stop. It is noted that within the applicants' submitted documents an earlier scheme was designed to have the retirement flats accessed off the internal road. The retirements flats' vehicle access needs to be relocated.

Barrack Road – residential access:

198. This access should take the form of a raised continuous footway/cycleway access running across the junction and not kerbed radius access as is shown. With appropriate continuous footway/cycleway materials across the raised junction and vehicle give-way markings set back this will place priority on those sustainable modes of transport rather than vehicles. The raised tables would slow

vehicles as they enter the site. There is no need to have a tapered access for left turning vehicles (as is shown on the plans) off the main road as the taper would increase crossing distance for pedestrians/cyclists over the junction. Amendments to the road junctions construction/layout are required.

199. The proposed Barrack Road right turn lane is considered acceptable as this will reduce the likelihood of rear vehicle shunts for those vehicles passing the site from the east which have just left the Fountain Roundabout. The 3m wide main road lanes are considered acceptable. This width has also been deemed acceptable for cyclists on the main road in discussions with Council's Cycling and Walking officer.

Barrack Road – commercial car park access:

200. Again this access should take the form of a raised continuous footway/cycleway across the junction with vehicle give-way markings set back as referred to above. There is no need for tactile paving with the raised continuous footway/cycleway as pedestrians & cyclists will have priority. Amendments to the road junctions construction/layout are required.
201. The principal concern with this junction is the potential daily vehicle flows turning into and out of the junction particularly if a convenience store type retail use was to occupy one of the commercial units. Although restricted at present to left turn exit only by road signage there is potential for drivers to breach this restriction for convenience increasing safety dangers at this access. There is also significant potential for drivers to wait in the main road to turn right into the site which would increase safety dangers close to the roundabout exit and proposed signalised pedestrian crossing. A solution to these issues is to have a main road central kerb physical feature and signage to physically prevent right turn entry and right turn exit out of this access. I'd suggest this is a narrow feature on the nearside of the central ghost lane markings as this would then allow westbound buses to easily manoeuvre around any bus waiting at the bus stop located opposite this access point. There is also a pedestrian route through this commercial car park area and marking out of this route/emphasising pedestrian movement with appropriate materials, surface markings and signage will be important. The landscape plans show "cobblestones" on the pedestrian route which would be an uneven surface for some pedestrian users and therefore alternative materials should be used. Central main road physical barrier is required to prevent right turns. Alternative pedestrian route materials required.

Sustainable modes

202. As referred earlier the proposal needs to do more to meet aims of promoting walking and cycle links. The proposal will house elderly residents and families with children and therefore safe attractive routes are important. Good sustainable travel routes also encourage lower car use. Therefore, a shared cycle/footway (ideally 5m width but 4m width would be accepted) needs to be provided across the Barrack Road frontage linking around to the proposed Bargates signalised

crossing point. This Bargates pedestrian crossing should also be changed to be a Toucan crossing. The 4m route should also be provided along the western frontage of the site. This would require widening of the existing footway in most areas. The shared footway/cycleway link will provide a safe pedestrian and cycle link for residents linking through to the town centre and nearest local supermarket. There are cycle parking points on Bargates over the crossing point which could be utilised as a termination point for the cycling route. The route towards the west would link to a new Toucan crossing I am requesting on Barrack Road (see later paragraph) and would also allow for potential future cycle/footway routes coming forward on neighbouring sites or as part of future road schemes. The westerly pedestrian route is also likely to be utilised as a route to the local schools of Christchurch Primary School and Christchurch Junior School and therefore a wider footway enhances this route. A minimum 4m shared cycle/footway should be designed to have 0.5m margin to the road edge, then 3m shared lane, then 0.5m margin to the development frontage (total 4m width).

203. On the south side of Barrack Road to the site is an attractive traffic free cycle path route to Christchurch Town Centre, which avoids the busy Fountain Roundabout junction for cyclists. The path also provides a pedestrian and cycle route to a play park, recreation ground and to Twynham High School, a school which may be utilised by children living within the new residential units. The route through the centre of the site from Bargates to Barrack Road will also provide an enhanced link to this cycle path. The application proposes a new central pedestrian refuge on Barrack Road adjacent to this existing south side cycle path. However, I wish to see this refuge upgraded to be a single phase Toucan crossing to ensure a safe pedestrian and cycle crossing point is provided across the busy main road. This toucan crossing not only provides a safe crossing feature but also has the added benefit of being an additional feature on the main road to slow traffic speeds (I have also requested VAS signs in the paragraph below to reduce the speeds).

204. The applicants speed survey information indicates relatively high vehicle speeds along Barrack Road. Given the increase in pedestrian activity (including children), vehicle turning movements and to create a more pedestrian friendly environment measures need to be put in place to encourage slower speeds on this road. I therefore seek the proposal provides 2 Vehicle Activated Signs (VAS) on Barrack Road on the eastbound and westbound approaches to the site. These can then be used to warn drivers of their speed and would act speed reduction measures, including on the approach to the newly requested Toucan crossing on Barrack Road. These VAS can be secured via legal agreement.

205. The proposed signalised pedestrian crossing to the end of Barrack Road at the Fountain roundabout is welcomed and I am satisfied that this remain as a pedestrian only crossing as there are no cycle links on the south side of Barrack

Road at this point. For both the Bargates and Barrack Road crossing advanced signage for the crossings would be important as they are on the roundabout approach.

206. For all the proposed crossings commuted maintenance sums will be required and these should be secured via legal agreement.

207. The proposal needs to encourage bus travel. Discussions have taken place with the Council's Accessibility team regarding bus provision in the area. There is no eastbound bus stop on Barrack Road to the front of the site. Closest eastbound bus stops are some distance away and involve crossing major road junctions. The future residents on the site, including in particular older residents, would benefit from a bus stop being closer to the site and the link that the bus service provides to areas of Christchurch including a large supermarket. This would encourage convenient public transport use and therefore lower car use, meeting sustainable development aims. Therefore, a new eastbound bus stop with a full width shelter, seating, raised kerbs and RTI should be provided on Barrack Road to the front of the site. The shelter needs to be placed at the back of the footway and current shelters are 4.5m x 1.9m in size. The ideal location for a new bus stop would be in the area currently at the existing access No.41 Stour Road.

Parking:

208. Residential Parking

209. The site is in a very sustainable location which should encourage low car ownership amongst residents. However, casual on-street parking spaces for visitors/home deliveries are very limited within the internal roads due to road widths, road junctions and long lengths of perpendicular driveway parking bays needing access and manoeuvring space. There are long lengths of internal access road where virtually no on-street parking opportunities exist. This lack of casual parking areas will result in cars parking half on/off footways, parking on junctions and inconsiderate parking. These issues are all to the detriment of an attractive safe pedestrian residential road environment. Therefore casual lay-by parking opportunities should be provided on internal access roads. On-street parking within the internal roads will need controlling to ensure long term commuter parking does not occur. Traffic Regulation Orders will therefore be required to allow short term parking only on appropriate areas of the streets, these could be secured via legal agreement.

210. Disabled appropriate parking provision needs to be increased within the residential areas and retirement flats car park area.

211. Commercial parking

212. The level of commercial parking is considered acceptable as there will be linked trips to these units from visitors parking in other town centre car parks. With improved bus, walking and cycle opportunities in the area this will encourage less car trips to the commercial units. However, I'd seek the provision

of a dedicated row of disabled appropriate parking bays to the rear of the commercial units as there are very limited disabled parking opportunities close to these units.

213. A number of public parking spaces are proposed within the area to the rear of the commercial units. I assume the other parking bays will be marked out for specific commercial units. Parking regimes within these parking areas should be such that long term commuter parking is discouraged. I would not wish to see any parking bays allocated for staff parking as staff should be encouraged to use sustainable transport modes in this town centre location.
214. There is an existing electronic car park signage system in place to show availability in the Pit Site car park. Such a system should be retained to reduce the likelihood of vehicle congestion in the new smaller public car park, especially as that car park is less visible to passing motorists seeking parking spaces. The existing signage system for the Bargates Car Park will require removing to avoid driver confusion.
215. Cycle parking should be provided adjacent to the commercial units.
216. Commercial Servicing
217. The applicant has submitted tracking movements of larger vehicles within the site and commercial unit service car park area. The management of this rear commercial parking area will be important to ensure the vehicle manoeuvring areas are kept clear of obstruction, such as outside storage containers, bins etc.
218. Bargates
219. Traffic congestion also occurs on Bargates and it is considered that the provision of rear servicing for Bargates, where possible, will further ease the congestion.
220. T12 is a saved policy and although it refers to extension of the magistrates car park (the Bargates Public Car Park) I believe the issues referred to in the Policy are relevant to this proposal and this proposal can address matters of servicing to the rear of adjacent units on Bargates to ease congestion which would also assist with improving public transport movement along Bargates. There are a number of commercial premises which rely on the main road for servicing. Many of these units have narrow side accesses which are not ideal for larger delivery vehicles or refuse collection resulting in larger vehicles parking on the relatively narrow Bargates, blocking traffic including bus services. Therefore, in line with this saved policy, I'd seek that a rear road be provided along/up to the northern boundary of the site to provide rear servicing opportunities for properties fronting Bargates (Nos 34-58 are now the relevant addresses since the 2001 policy was written). Providing such a road may provide an opportunity for rear parking for a number of houses freeing up frontage road space for casual on-street parking.
221. Loss of public parking

222. The proposal will reduce the level of parking available for the general public with the removal of the existing 2 public car parks. The existing Bargates Car Park (around 90 spaces) currently has relatively low parking demand. The Pit Site car park (around 75 spaces) accessed off Barrack Road, has a higher existing parking demand. Both car parks have parking regimes as long stay car parks but this can have the effect of acting as a commuter car park with more than 4 hours parking being allowed. This does not encourage sustainable modes of transport amongst town centre workers who may find the car parks convenient. Further, the majority of streets within the town centre have on-street parking controls which restrict weekday parking and therefore the loss of these car parks is unlikely to lead safety issues on nearby streets due to displaced long term parking. There are other town centre car parks, closer to the retail centre, available for public use with the parking regime aimed at shopper/town centre visitor parking.

223. Saved Policy P2 from the 2001 Local Plan refers to extending the Bargates Car park to provide an additional 200 spaces but it refers to the intention that those spaces would be "used for long stay parking for employees in the Town Centre". As referred to above providing long term commuter parking within town centres, which have good sustainable transport links, goes against the aims of encouraging workers to use sustainable modes of transport and is contrary to the promotion of sustainable development, which is encouraged in numerous more recently adopted Policies.

224. Saved Policy P5 refers to replacement of public parking spaces. The proposal is providing some replacement public parking, although not at the level of the existing car parks, plus other commercial parking spaces related to the new units. There are public car parks available within the centre of Christchurch. As referred earlier the existing car parks principally provide long term parking options whereas more modern planning policies would seek to discourage long term commuter/workers car parking.

225. Therefore, the highway authority raises no objections to the reduction in long stay car parking as a result of the proposal.

Wider Highway Network impact

226. The above detailed comments address impact on the adjacent highway network in terms of vehicle movement at the site. Improvements to sustainable modes of transport links have also been identified in the above comments and these will encourage lower car trips to and from the site, lessening the traffic flow impact on the highway network. The existing adjacent highway network has relatively high vehicle traffic flows and there are existing uses on the site, including 2 car parks, which will generate some traffic flow. Therefore with improved promotion of sustainable modes of transport in the development layout, improvements to rear servicing on Bargates to assist traffic flow, and with the securing of a Residential Travel Plan the overall increase in traffic flow on the

wider highway network from the proposal would not be considered significant to warrant refusal of the proposal.

BCP Highways revised comments 20 December 2019

227. Comments on revised plans and transport Technical Note submission. The revised plans deal with some of the issues raised in previous highway authority comments.
228. The applicant's transport Technical Note comments that they are not extending the extra width shared cycle/lane across the whole site frontage to Barrack Road. The Technical note drawing ref: 15-167/022 Rev C Highway Improvements shows this extra width of shared cycle/footway stopping at the car park access to the retirement unit car park. This extra width is required to extend across the whole frontage. This is particularly important to give pedestrian space around the proposed new bus shelter location which at present would have a small amount of circulation space around the bus shelter for pedestrians/cyclist.
229. Providing the extra width along this length may impact on the landscape frontage and parking bays 149,153,156 & 159. Given the highly sustainable location of the site loss of some parking would be accepted as the wider footway/cycleway is of greater benefit. Extending the extra width also provides for better cyclist/pedestrian movements heading west towards the Stour Road/Barrack Road signals.
230. The bus shelter will need to be of Superstop standard including Real Time Information, circulation space around it, raised kerbs etc. Full details of the bus stop will need to be further agreed as a part of planning conditions/S016/S278 works.
231. The vehicle access onto Barrack Road from the retirement flats car park has been retained on the revised plans. Vehicles exiting the access and wishing to turn right would have to cross 4 lanes of traffic and a right turn lane. In order to avoid these manoeuvres which have significant highway safety risk, this access should be left turn only and should therefore have signs, road markings (to Traffic Signs Manual standard) and a Traffic Regulation Order to indicate this.
232. Vehicles exiting the central street access onto Barrack Road and wishing to turn right would have to cross 4 lanes of traffic and a right turn lane. Having given this further consideration in order to avoid this manoeuvre which has a significant highway safety risk, this access should be left turn only and should therefore have signs, road markings (to Traffic Signs Manual standard) and a Traffic Regulation Order to indicate this.
233. The "Boundary and Hard Landscaping Plan" ref ASP.16.014.002.5 Rev A prepared by Aspire Architects shows the central street area to be "Permeable Black Tarmac". The pedestrian environment should be priority in the layout of residential highway layouts. This material will create car dominated street environment as it will look like a standard street surface material. This central

street material should be changed to have a different material than Barrack Road or Bargates then drivers will be aware they are entering a different residential street environment than the surrounding main roads. This whole tarmac area should be changed or at least a significant length as you enter off Bargates or Barrack Road. I had also previously suggested that footways could be removed from within the proposal to create a more shared space, pedestrian friendly, less car dominant environment.

234. For the general site plans none of the proposed highway works or bus stop improvements are shown. These works are significant safety gain in the proposal and for the avoidance of doubt and to make it clear to the public/Members what improvements are being proposed, I'd suggest that these highway improvement details are transferred onto the general site layout plan.

235. In order to promote sustainable modes of transport amongst future residents a Residential Travel Plan (TP) should be submitted for agreement. That TP should include a minimum of a 3 month bus or rail travel voucher per household and incentives for cycle purchase/use.

236. There are some on-street areas within the street layout where on-street bays could be marked out as part of the parking regime to provide casual on-street parking bays. Such parking bays are important for home deliveries, visitor parking etc. These will require TRO's to time limit the parking otherwise town centre commuter parking may occur. A full review of the on-street parking locations could take place as part of the S38/S278 works and I'd seek a specific contribution of £10,000 to cover the TRO works including for the legal orders, signs and lines required.

237. 3 parking spaces are shown for the retail units. The parking area to the rear of these units is now indicated as predominantly private residential parking. There is a risk that if any of the units are of a use that has a high turnover of parking, such as a small convenience food store, then drivers may choose to enter this parking area seeking parking spaces for convenience leading to congestion in this area. Therefore in order to avoid this I'd seek that the proposed commercial units are prevented from being food retail uses by planning condition. Planning Condition required to prevent use or change of use to A1 Food Retail Use

238. With the above amendments, the Highway Authority could offer support to the proposal.

BCP Highway revised comments 22/10/2020

239. In traffic and highway layout terms the resubmission is similar to the previous submission and therefore the Highway Authority's previous comments still stand but they've been further summarised below, with some alterations/additions. The scheme amendments have no significant highways impact to those considered as part of the previous submission. It is assumed that the applicant's previous

submitted Transport Assessment and highways technical notes are to be considered as relevant to this new submission.

240. The summary below contains details of proposed conditions and S106 clauses . The proposed conditions have been reworded from our previous comments to taken account that the development may come forward in differing phases. It is therefore important to ensure that conditions reflect potential phased piecemeal development and that they secure delivery of appropriate highway details , highway infrastructure, parking and delivery of roads/footways to serve the development if it possibly progresses in phases. This phasing was not reflected in the Highway Authority's previously suggested conditions.

Highway Mitigation measures

241. If the same package of highway improvements and mitigation measures , both to encourage sustainable modes of transport and for highway safety reasons is now proposed then the Highway Authority can offer support to the proposal. The physical measures are shown on the drawing *Proposed Off Site Highway Improvements Drawing No. 15-167/012 Revision E dated June 18* produced by Odyssey and contained within the *Odyssey Technical Note – Response to BCP Highways* dated September 2019. The measures include:

- New Toucan crossing across Barrack Road adjacent to the main residential road vehicle access. This crossing will provide a link with the existing recreation ground cycle/footway path opposite the site.
- New double Pedestrian crossing across Barrack Road adjacent to the Fountain Roundabout
- New Toucan crossing across Bargates adjacent to the Fountain Roundabout
- New Bus stop and shelter, with Real Time Information, on Barrack Road
- Widened footway to provide a shared cycle/footway along the Barrack Road/Fountain Roundabout frontage of the site.
- 2 x Vehicle Activated Signs to be located on Barrack Road to encourage reduced vehicle speeds.
- A vehicle proof barrier/feature in the centre of Barrack Road to prevent right turn into the rear car park area of the retail units car parks.
- A Residential Travel Plan containing measures to encourage sustainable transport including a 3 month free bus or rail voucher per household.

242. The existing buildings and car parks on the site may generate some pedestrian movement but the proposal is likely to generate significantly more movements, including from unaccompanied children and older members of the community which places a further emphasise on the requirement for the above highway safety measures.

243. The physical highway works will need to be subject to a S278 agreement which should be referred to within a S106 agreement.
244. Grampian conditions should also be imposed which can also refer to phasing of the mitigation measures in accordance with the demands placed by various parts of the development as they are occupied.
245. For the Vehicle Activated Signs (VAS) we propose that a sum of £15,000 is secured through the S106 for the provision of these signs by the Council with appropriate clauses linking the VAS signs to be used on roads within this development location.
246. Any vehicle exiting the developments various accesses onto Barrack Road and wishing to turn right would have to cross 4 lanes of traffic which could cause safety issues. Therefore all vehicles exiting onto Barrack Road should turn left only. Appropriate Traffic Regulation Orders, signage and road markings will be required to ensure that drivers turn left on exiting.
247. In addition to the above "No Right" turn works there are various others Traffic Regulation Orders (TRO's) with legal fees, signage and road markings required as part of the proposal including TRO's on all the roads within the site to cover no parking and the provision of a limited amount of on-street parking bays with time limited parking (to prevent commuter parking) and Beryl bike hire scheme bays . A contribution of £10,000 should be secured through a S106 for these TRO requirements.

Layout

248. Roads within the site have been designed to encourage slow speeds. The Aspire Architects plan *Proposed Site Plan Boundary and Hard Landscaping Drawing No. ASP.16..014.002.5 Revision Dated 25/7/18* indicates a variety of materials to be used for the internal road surfacing and these will encourage slow speeds and make drivers aware of the change in road environment to one of residential with pedestrian priority. The final road surfacing construction will be agreed as part of the S38 road adoption process but the materials should follow a variety of materials as indicated on the aforementioned drawing.
249. The vehicle accesses off Barrack Road and Bargates should all take the form of continuous footway/cycleway across these accesses. At these accesses the development access carriageway should be at the same level and of the same material as the footway/cycleway which crosses it. This places an emphasis that pedestrians and cyclists have priority and would also slow vehicles, in addition to giving an indication to drivers that they are entering a residential and lower road category area than the main road. **The site plan does not indicate such access construction for the accesses and for the avoidance of doubt this plan should be amended to show the continuous footway/cycleway.** If revised plans are not forthcoming then a condition could be imposed ie *Not*

withstanding the approved plans of the construction and layout details of the first 6m of each vehicle access into the site shall be submitted and agreed . This would also cover the area into the vehicle access to the commercial unit rear parking which would not be fully covered by road adoption construction approval.

250. It's important to ensure the highways are constructed to the appropriate standards and also that appropriate highways are delivered for each phase of development should the development come forward in a piecemeal fashion. A condition is proposed to cover these matters.
251. A S106 clause will be needed to give over roads and footways for adoption as part of a S38 process, including the land forming the proposed widening of the footway around the site. We would not propose adoption of the car park and servicing area to the rear of the proposed commercial units but to aid pedestrian and cycle permeability permissive routes through this area should be secured via S016 legal agreement.
252. There is a cycle store proposed along the line of what would be a proposed permissive route link through this rear commercial servicing area to Bargates. This cycle store should be relocated although this could be dealt with by condition if revised plans are not forthcoming. A Parking and Servicing Management Plan condition is detailed below which also seeks details of cycle parking and this could cover this matter.

Parking

253. The site is close to the town centre and the new bus stop/shelter, widened footway/cycle and new formal crossings will aid links to sustainable modes of transport encouraging lower car use and car ownership. The commercial units are likely to attract shoppers/patrons already using existing town centre parks for links trips to other Town Centre commercial units and therefore no specific general parking for these units is required (see Use Class condition comment below), although **some disabled appropriate parking bays should be provided in the rear car park** as the nearest disabled parking opportunities are not close by for patrons/shoppers visiting these units. This could be conditioned if the plans are not amended at this time. These disabled bays should be time limited to prevent all day commuter parking. With the addition of some disabled parking bays to the rear of the commercial units the parking provision for the various uses within the site would be considered acceptable. A condition is proposed below to ensure a Parking and Servicing Management Plan is agreed which will also cover phasing of the parking delivery to ensure each phase of development is provided with the appropriate parking as it comes forward. This agreed management plan can also cover disabled parking provision, cycle parking provision and how the commercial units will be serviced by delivery type vehicles.

254. There is a risk that if an A1 Food Retail (convenience store type use) were to locate within the proposed commercial units then this could generate a specific high vehicle parking demand as a destination and a quick vehicle trip turnover at the Barrack Road vehicle access. With this type of use drivers may choose to enter the rear parking area to seek parking, despite there being no or limited parking for such a use, and then they may take short term parking risks in this rear area parking in unauthorised spaces or vehicle manoeuvring areas. This could cause highway safety and congestion issues. **We therefore seek that a condition is imposed to prevent a Food Retail/Convenience Store type use operating from these commercial units.**

Loss of Public Parking

255. Comments are broadly the same as those initially provided.

256. In anticipation of the loss of public parking when the site was to be brought forward for development the previous Local Highway Authority, Dorset County Council, undertook a review of and made amendments to public parking in Christchurch Town Centre. As a result an **additional 105 public parking spaces** were provided. The existing Council controlled "Pit Site" Public Pay Display car parking bays to be lost as a result of the proposal is circa 69 spaces (some bays are currently fenced off for safety reason).

257. The "Bargates" car park is currently operated as a Public Pay and Display car park under a licence agreement with the owner of that car park. There is no obligation for the owner to continue that agreement and therefore that car park can be closed off to the public by the owner, regardless of whether this planning application receives consent or not. The fact that that car park can be closed to the public by the owner and the parking spaces removed from public use is a material consideration. This Bargates car park removal has not therefore been considered as loss of public parking which can be controlled. Again though, as referred above, 105 additional public parking spaces have been created in anticipation of the development of the whole site.

258. There are existing electronic Parking Signs on roads in the area associated with the Bargates and Pit Site public car parks. These signs will requiring removal/amendment to remove reference to these car parks otherwise drivers may be direct to the development site to seek public parking. Alteration/removal of these signs could be dealt with by planning condition.

Traffic Generation

259. There are 2 car parks on the site and other uses which could be brought back into operation. Vehicle trip generation from the proposal on the highway network would not therefore have a significant impact on the highway network compared with what could be existing and when the above package of mitigation measures to encourage sustainable transport modes and the sites location close to town centre amenities, which encourages fewer car trips/lower car ownership, are is

also considered. There are also significant highway safety benefits to the wider public as a result of the safety mitigation measures being required to mitigate the impact of the proposal.

Summary

260. BCP Highway Authority offers support to the proposal subject to the following conditions and legal agreement requirements:

261. **Conditions** (repeated from the previous submission with some amendments & additions particularly to allow for the development to be brought forward in phases but ensure appropriate parking and highways details are brought forward in association with the appropriate phase).

262. Full details of off site highway improvements works based on drawing *Proposed Off Site Highway Improvements Drawing No. 15-167/012 Revision E dated June 18* (produced by Odyssey) shall be submitted to the LPA for written approval. The approved works shall be delivered in accordance with the following phasing:

- New Toucan crossing across Barrack Road adjacent to the main residential vehicle access – to be delivered prior to occupation of any unit within either phases bounded Green or Blue on the attached plan
- New double Pedestrian crossing across Barrack Road adjacent to the Fountain Roundabout – to be delivered prior to occupation of or bringing into operation any unit within the phase bounded Yellow on the attached plan
- New Toucan crossing across Bargates adjacent to the Fountain Roundabout - to be delivered prior to occupation of any unit within either phases bounded Blue or Yellow on the attached plan
- New Bus stop and shelter, with Real Time Information, on Barrack Road - to be delivered prior to occupation of any unit within either phases bounded Green or Blue on the attached plan
- Widened footway to provide a shared cycle/footway along the Barrack Road/Fountain Roundabout frontage of the site – the total length of widened footway/cycleway bounding each phase shall be delivered prior to occupation of any unit within that phase

263. The following shall be submit to and agreed in writing by the LPA:

- A highway scheme to prevent the right turn of vehicles off Barrack Road into the rear car park area of the proposed commercial. The agreed scheme shall be implemented prior to the approved parking area being brought into use.
- Prior to the commencement of any works to construct roads, footways, parking areas and pedestrian routes, details of a highway phasing plan for the implementation/completion of each section of these works shall be submitted

for written approval. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved highway phasing plan.

- Details and specifications of construction, materials, drainage, street furniture and lighting associated with roads, footways, parking areas, pedestrian routes and the first 6m of any vehicle access shall be submitted for written approval prior to those works commencing on the associated phase of development requiring those works. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
- Details of a highway feature, such as bollards or landscape planter, to prevent through vehicle traffic from Barrack Road to Bargates (or visa versa) . The agreed feature shall be put in place prior to the internal access road being connected to form a possible vehicle through route . The agreed feature shall be retained in place at all times thereafter or until such time as the internal roads and feature become the responsibility of the Local Highway Authority.
- Details of a scheme to amend/remove existing electronic car park signage associated with the existing Bargates and Pit Site Pay & Display Car Parks.
- (In the interests of highway safety and to ensure the provision of appropriate safe access is provided to each phase of development prior to occupation of that phase)
- Prior to any part of the development hereby approved being occupied or commercial uses coming into operation, a Parking and Servicing Management Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Plan shall include details of; phasing of the car parking implementation, provision of disabled parking for the commercial units, servicing of the commercial units by delivery vehicles and details of cycle parking. The parking and servicing shall be managed in accordance with the approved Plan at all times thereafter.
- (In order to minimise long term commuter parking within the development, to ensure parking is delivered in accordance with the associated phases of development being brought into operation, to encourage cycling as a sustainable mode of transport and to ensure efficient and safe servicing of the commercial units.)
- Non of the approved commercial units shall be used as Food Retail use. (To reduce vehicle trip and parking demands to the commercial units in the interests of highway safety)

S106 legal agreement Clauses to cover

264. Clauses for the following highway works to be delivered, linked to a S278 agreement, based on drawing *Proposed Off Site Highway Improvements Drawing No. 15-167/012 Revision E dated June 18* produced by Odyssey :

- New Toucan crossing across Barrack Road adjacent to the vehicle access
- New double Pedestrian crossing across Barrack Road adjacent to the Fountain Roundabout

- New Toucan crossing across Bargates adjacent to the Fountain Roundabout
- New Bus stop and shelter, with Real Time Information, on Barrack Road
- Widened footway to provide a shared cycle/footway along the Barrack Road/Fountain Roundabout frontage of the site.
- A vehicle proof barrier/feature in the centre of Barrack Road to prevent right turn into the rear car park area of the retail units car parks.
- £15000 for the installation of 2 Vehicle Activated Signs on Barrack Road
- £10000 for Traffic Regulation Orders (TRO's) and associated works including; "No right turn" orders for accesses off Barrack Road, parking restrictions and on-street parking bays within the site and Beryl bike scheme parking bays.
- Securing land to be given over for adoption and the adoption of roads and footpaths through the S38 process.
- Securing permissive routes for public use through non adopted areas of the site.
- (For both the S38 adoption areas and permissive routes see the attached sketch plan for an indication of these areas – final details to be agreed as part of the S38 process. This sketch plan is based on the previous submission layout plan, although the areas are extensively the same)
- A Residential Travel Plan containing measures to encourage sustainable transport including a 3 month free bus or rail voucher per residential household.