

Upmeads 28 Glenmoor Road West Parley Ferndown Dorset BH22 8QF

23<sup>rd</sup> February 2018

Dear Mr Thain

Planning Application: 3/17/3609/OUT

**Location:** Lands East of New Road West Parley

**Proposal:** Outline application (All matters reserved except for access and associated link road); with up to 386 dwellings (Class C3); upto 1000sqm of retail units (Classes A1-A5); upto 900sqm of offices (Class B1) and upto 2200sqm of foodstore (Class A1); together with accesses, a link road and associated highway works, public open space, allotments, landscaping and associated works

For the reasons detailed in the enclosed response, the Parish Council wish to Strongly object to the application as drafted. On Tuesday 20th February an open meeting was held to which parishioners were invited - in excess of 200. The Hall was packed to capacity and we have been asked to request that when the District Council consider the applications, a suitable large venue is held as a considerable number of Parishioners wish to attend and obviously, a few speak in accordance with Council procedure.

We could not find sufficient detail within the supporting enclosures to be satisfied Policy ME3 which sets out the expectation that new homes will meet sustainable development standards for New Development NOR that sufficient cognisance had been taken of the extent to which the acknowledged flood plain (page 105 point 10.5) for the River Stour at West Parley extends, will be affected by the size of the new development -Policy ME6 refers. We would wish to be satisfied that the sequential and exception tests set out in the National Planning Policy Framework has been followed and particularly but not exclusively for SUDS" (sustainable drainage systems)

There was a suggestion that a public appeal be opened to fund the retention of a Planning Consultant and employ specialist Consultants as there are concerns about the accuracy of the information on which specialist recommendations are based e.g flooding, retail etc. The potential for a Judicial Review was also spoken about. Could you give us a detailed timescale to which the Planning Department will be working?

# **ROADS - Object**

**Access** - the information is inadequate and not satisfactory to make informed decisions on the final outcome of the full application for the Access Roads. The additional vehicles eg 800 cars from the development, are likely to nullify any benefit sought from the 'link road', not to mention the further increase in vehicle movements caused by the supermarket, offices, retail, 50k jobs at the airport and passenger increases to 3m at the airport!!

- absence of detail on Parley Close entry/exit
- absence of detail regarding junctions controls (traffic lights?)
- lorry access to supermarket / retail / offices from Christchurch Road to where in the development? How do they reach the store to undertake deliveries as it appears it is going through residential roads?
- given the restrictions and diversions under the new road layout, have the emergency services been consulted as these longer proposed routes would have an impact on their response times?
- horse safe surfacing should be used in this semi rural village Highways are using Stone Mastic Asphalt (SMA) which is not good for horses. It should have either quartzite or calcined bauxite added to give the horse purchase.

### Link Road

- Generally too narrow –as there will be many heavy vehicles, so the road should be the same as New Road /
  Christchurch Road as large vehicles will be using it and vehicles will need to pass parked vehicles without
  interrupting the traffic flow.
- absence of cycle ways to link to those in place on New Road and Christchurch Road.
- 7 junctions off main link road into the development will hinder speed of traffic flow
- This is not providing the relief road as expected within the core strategy it is merely a road through a housing estate!

# External to the development proposed in FWP6

Whilst this is a reserved matter to be determined by Dorset County Council, the WPPC wish to have noted, its concerns at this stage. It is hoped these may be ameliorated by the opportunity to discuss matters with the Highways Authority and by seeking clarification of details/timescales/future plans with Dorset County Council; Bournemouth Borough Council (and their successor bodies) as well as Dorset Enterprise Partnership.

We feel that the Parley Crossroads Approach Flows survey, within the developers Transport Assessment (pg 14), is an inadequate sample as the traffic was merely surveyed for 1 hour in the morning and evening on 16<sup>th</sup> June 2017. A better representation would require multiple days of sampling spread throughout the calendar year. It fails to reflect the projected growth in airport traffic P71 of Core Strategy Document, Policy BA2 where 3m passengers a Year is anticipated by 2030 refers.

It is to be hoped in the spirit of the Localism Act 2011, that the neighbouring Parish of Hurn and Ferndown Town Council would be invited to participate/comment on future proposals since the current congestion and tentative plans to lessen the dire state of journey times, impacts significantly on them as well.

It is acknowledged by Highways that Parley Cross is one of the most congested traffic junctions in Dorset. It is intimated by Dorset County Council that they have secured funding to construct a relief road starting just south of 88 New Road to go westwards behind Ridgeway (Policy FWP7) and linking up at some point on Christchurch Road between Parley Cross and before Dudsbury Country Club. Presumably, a junction off will serve the Cala Homes development of 160 houses. Again the precise detail needs to be shown so the overall impact can be gauged.

This proposed road and how it interfaces with New Road south and Christchurch Road, needs to be shown on any Highways Plan, Planning agreed and be built **PRIOR** to the development of the Wyatt Homes Project. The phasing approach within the Core Strategy must be strictly adhered to. What happens if they go into liquidation?

#### What consideration has been given to the highways on a wider scale?

- All schooling and medical provision would require residents to travel through the crossroads to the facilities on Glenmoor Road. The road is already busy at school drop off and pick up, with dangerous parking. The doctors surgery has limited parking available. Any vehicle movement increase will make the situation more dangerous. There was a fatal accident near the Doctors Surgery (with the junction of Ellesfield Drive) in 2011.

The Parish Council applied for yellow lines on the junction 2014 and have only just received initial consultation. Any improvements to road safety need to be undertaken at this planning stage to ensure they are introduced by the time the increase is seen.

- Consulation with Bournemouth Council should be undertaken to review the installation of 3 road islands on New Road (Northbourne of Ensbury Bridge), specifically the junction with Kinson Park Road. Since the installation, the road was narrowed, so any cars turning right, cause massive tailbacks beyond Parley Cross. If this road, and Avebury Avenue, were made No Entry, cars would continue to the roundabout and could return either along New Road and turn left, or along Wimborne Road and turn right, with would help to eliminate queues at Parley Cross.
- Rat runs there are a number of rat runs which have established because of the congestion at Parley Cross. Attention should also be sought to remedy these rat runs as more will be caused due to the restrictions this application proposes on entries and exits from Parley Cross.
- ALL the construction traffic must be parked on site for the entirety of the development to ensure that it does not impact the current flow of traffic or parking the local streets nor the Parish Council car park?
- Longfield Drive end of the Service Road MUST remain a no entry to avoid rat runs along the busy shop fronts to avoid the lack of left turn at Parley Cross from New Road south.
- will there be a pedestrian crossing from the proposed new shops to the old? If so, is this an additional set of traffic lights on New Road south (potentially creating 3 additional sets between Ensbury bridge and Parley Cross)
- Will there be yellow box junctions on all the traffic light junctions to ensure when people jump the colour, that the opposing flow of traffic is not prohibited from progressing (as currently happens at Parley cross)?
- traffic coming from New Road south wishing to go to Longham, which currently does not present much problem with queues in the left feeder lane, will instead be forced through the new link road, encountering 3 sets of traffic lights instead of just one set at Parley Cross itself!

# Internal to the development proposed in FWP6.

Although the location plan is drawn to scale, it is difficult to be certain of the proposed width of this Road. It is more than just a feeder road to the Estate as public transport will apparently turn right from New Road South with other vehicular traffic to go to Hurn and beyond. Along with the traffic wishing to travel Christchurch West, who will no longer be able to turn left at Parley Cross. Given the intensity of the amount of housing and other developments proposed for this site, we quote back to you the comments made in the Core Strategy Document of 2014 in respect of Policy FWP 6 and development generally, that it would be totally undesirable for any verge parking associated with new housing, to have to take place on this traffic route. Ideally double yellow lines and a speed restriction of 20 miles an hour should be agreed for this strategic vehicular route at the outset.

We as a Council also have concerns that an additional exit/egress road is proposed south of the road detailed above. As a cul de sac, this provides no benefit to the highways improvements and traffic alleviation on Parley Cross, but increases house numbers, with associated vehicles which will have a detrimental impact on traffic flow. Again, the lack of detail in the Outline makes detailed comment challenging. Will it be served by traffic lights or will cars 'take their chance' when trying to enter or exit? Traffic speed reduction measures on all of New Road need to be implemented urgently- 30 mph instead of the current 40 mph.

We are presuming that the proposals at Parley Cross junction for traffic movements and detailed in the Core Strategy remain (see 2014 Plan attached to this response) and have incorporated the additional traffic movements from Eco expansion, Berry Hill Sewerage Works, Parkfield School, Mineral extraction site and airport expansion.

It would make sense for another new road to be built from Northbourne roundabout to link with the Chapel Gate Roundabout. Clarification as to whether this is either not considered practical OR an aspiration with a timescale would be helpful.

In conjunction with all this, it is to be hoped that the observations made by both this Council and Christchurch Borough Council, to limit work operations to those currently existing at both the ECO site and Hurn Court Quarry are determined as requested, by the inspector currently considering the County Minerals and Waste Plan.

The cumulative effect of each proposed and existing planning application on the B3073 corridor has to be seriously considered. The recently built and proposed new housing at Coppins and Holmwood Park, the existing planning consents for Hurn Airport Industrial Park (potentially 50,000 additional jobs) and the desire of the new owners of the Airport to increase passenger traffic from the current 600k to 3m yearly, have to be taken seriously. That is without mentioning the newly generated traffic from Parkfield School and the Berry Hill Sewerage Works.

Consideration must also be given to increased traffic as result of the SANG, which is available to all residents, not only for their journey but also parking on the narrow and busy Church Lane, which should be prohibited. It should not be overlooked that an addition Traffic Assessment be undertaken, as suggested by S K Savage – Transport Development Liason manager.

To ensure a flow of pedestrians from the development to both the existing shops and play area, in what form will pedestrian crossings take to cross these exceedingly busy roads?

When looking this applicant, we ask that the basic questions be considered:

- 1. How is the existing and proposed network of roads going to cope with the huge increase in vehicle movements per day as it cannot cope for the majority of the time now?
- 2. how realistic are the figures quoted by the Consultants on the Application. Have they really factored in all the Core data?
- 3. Are they really independently assessed?
- 4. the new roads and proposed increase in the number of traffic signals have to be maintained and factored into the equation.
- 5. before the development is commenced we need a vast improvement in current infrastructure, particularly at Parley Cross.
- 6. due to the current congestion at Parley Cross, 'rat runs' have developed which are of a great concern to locals, particularly Ridgeway / Elm Tree Walk/ Service Road adjacent to New Road and also Chine Walk and Mags Barrow. Are we going to wait for a serious accident to occur on one of these 'diversions' before anything is done to slow the traffic down?

# **HOUSING – Strongly Object**

This Council notes with concern, the application for up to 386 houses and associated matters - some reserved - others not, in this current application.

Prior to the adoption of the Core Strategy in 2014, a Planning Inspector considered the suitability of this site for Housing and a figure of about 320 Homes was recommended, which COULD include a convenience store of about 800-900 sq metres. Policy FWP6 of the Core Strategy included comments on layout and design, phasing, transport and access as well as Green Infrastructure. This Policy and associated relevant extracts from the Core Strategy of 2014 are attached for ease of reference.

Whilst we understand that the Department of Housing; Communities and Local Government have indicated in a White Paper, that where Planning Consent has been given, consideration can be given to an increase in density. **HOWEVER THIS IS NOT MANDATORY!** Each site has to be considered on its merits. It is understood from computations made by NHS Dorset Clinical Commissioning Group that the development as requested would result in approximately a further 930 people needing medical services. This does not factor in the population increase generated by Policy FWP7.

The density is too high for this semi-rural village and should not exceed the 320 in the Core Strategy. We need more information on house numbers / type and layout.

- There are currently 1786 dwellings within West Parley to increase by 386 houses alone is a 22% increase in the WHOLE village. This doesn't include the offices / retail / supermarket! 320 in the core strategy was an increase of 18% which was in itself ridiculous.
- In addition, the Dudsbury Heights proposed development is now likely to be for 200 additional houses, which is a 20% increase to the Core Strategy again. Adding additional pressure to all services.

This Council is mindful of the need for new housing in East Dorset, particularly for affordable housing for younger local people. Policy LN3.

These comments on Housing relate specifically to Policy FWP6, but the implications set out in Policy FWP7 for the Housing behind Ridgeway to the West of New Road, need to be factored in.

The Parish Council is willing to play its part in accepting new development provided:

- that it is complementary to the area. This is an area of low density housing, with a substantial number of bungalows and detached houses on large plots.
- it notes the District Council's target for affordable housing and accepts that West Parley takes its proportionate share, on the basis that the Parish Council wishes to secure a contribution towards community infrastructure. We seek a substantial part of the S106 Agreement Funding re-invested in West Parley Local Services such as sporting facilities, play areas (despite a park close to the crossroads being included within the Core Strategy, no such apparent provision in the current proposals), medical services, education and to support existing community meeting place facilities such as the Sports and Social Club and Memorial Hall which need now substantial endowment to preserve their life span.
- it notes no detail is yet given of the mix of housing, yet it appears some flatted developments are proposed in the draft layout Plan and we will return to this aspect later, on the draft layout plan.
- it has concern that the draft layout plan indicates an apparent paupacity of screening on the edges of the development and would request a detailed landscaping plan be agreed as a condition. This Council feels it important to try and retain the semi-rural 'feel' of this historic Village and that this development compliments the Special Character and Conservation Areas within West Parley.
- in the 2014 Core Strategy, the existing public right of way E56/7 which is part of the historic Stour Valley Right of Way allowed a buffer of green belt to the South. This has been eroded in the current plans. This will spoil the natural enjoyment of this significant Public Right of Way to the south and should be integral to the layout and enhancement of this Housing Scheme.
- the Council consider it incongruous that flats some 3 stories high are apparently proposed for construction along the Estate feeder road and at its entrance to this new Estate opposite New Road. Opposite is a well established bungalow Estate. It would provide no symmetry to the village along New Road south. The look would be oppressive and overbearing.
- whilst the NPPF is indicative of 1 parking space per house, there has to be surely, meaningful provision for additional areas of off-site parking for visitors, and the two car families as well as for visiting tradesmen and cycle storage. Unless suitable provision is made there is every likelihood the proposed Estate through road will attract parking on the verges. The road itself is wide at the start, narrows and then widens again, on the plan attached to the application. The village already experiences parking on the service road for commuting vehicles as well as holidaymakers to avoid the aiport's car parking fees.
- Three properties are proposed for the double plot next to 26 Church Lane. If this were being considered as an application on its own, we would consider this to be overdevelopment of the plot, unneighbourly and overbearing to neighbouring properties because they are too cramped and 'out of keeping' with neighbouring properties in Church Lane. The addition of not only 2 chalet bungalows but also a house is overdevelopment of the plot. We further understand there is a mains sewer running through the plot and diversion of this may have to be considered if development is permitted.

• given the policy emphasis on affordable housing, this in turn means it will attract younger people with young children, We regret the omission of suitable play areas which needs to be located near to houses and was included within the Core Strategy. Smaller developments provide more facilities eg Camellias just over the border in Ferndown provided 2 play areas for the 180 houses! Accessing areas of public open space in the proposed village park, SANG and existing recreation ground does not suffice for practical purposes.

In summary, the Council's considered view is that the figure of about 320 quoted in Policy FWP6, be adhered to along with the other points detailed in this response. Anything higher is too high density housing for a village.

#### **Allotments**

Within FWP6, the plan for the allotments were easily accessible towards the north east boundary of the development, however no provision for parking was illustrated, yet would be required. In the current plan the allotments are tucked away on the south boundary of the development with no provision for vehicular access. They are in close in proxity to the trees and we have concern for the health of the trees if gardeners use weedkillers and chemicals.

# PROPOSED RETAIL, FOODSTORE and OFFICE PROVISION – Strongly Object

On Page 35 reference is made to 'convenience floorspace for West Parley. Earlier there is reference to a total of 4,000 sqm net additional floorspace for the whole of East Dorset to 2031. With respect it appears perverse logic and bad planning for West Parley to have now such a large amount of retail floorspace thrust upon it. It appears a supermarket is proposed, not a convenience store.

In FWP6 the total commercial activity was quoted as 8-900sqm – This proposal the total activity including foodstore, offices and retail has increased this to 4100sqm – which in the Core Strategy was the total to be achieved for the WHOLE of East Dorset. Therefore, it is a totally disproportionate increase of over 4.5 times the commercial activity for the village!

# **<u>Retail Units -</u>** The draft proposal is for retail units up to 1000 sq metres

In West Parley there are currently 2 shops to let and 1 take away shop closed. In Ferndown there are 5 as well as a Fish and Chip Shop and Indian restaurant. In addition two Banks have recently closed premises and Ferndown has 6 charity shops, West Parley 1.In Kinson there are 7 shops to let and in Wimborne 13.

It begs the question, where is the demand to sustain these units?

### **Foodstore**

A new food store is proposed of upto 2200 sq metres. Policy FWP 6 suggests a convenience store of 8-900 sq metres. Not only are we concerned about the size of the proposed store, we are also extremely concerned about the hours of operation, the light pollution, delivery vehicles and noise.

There are 5 established food stores in Ferndown as well as the 2 Tesco in Kinson and the 2 smaller Tesco in West Parley.

Tesco want to downgrade the size of their store in Ferndown as it fails to meet its profit yardstick.

Many of the major players in this sector are now closing stores as profitability has fallen and more people do on line shopping. The Co-Op previously occupied the Tesco shop at Parley Cross but failed to make it pay.

Were the Store to be built, it would occupy a floor space of approximately 3.5 times the size of the Village Memorial Hall and with parking, the total area would be similar in size to the village's Recreation Ground.

It appears perverse to build such a large store needing servicing by large articulated lorries and attracting extra short stay traffic -assuming they can attract the footfall - to such a congested traffic site. A small convenience store as proposed in FWP6 would answer any concerns about 'lack of choice'. In reality, if there were local concern about Tesco's presence, others would have opened up in other existing shops.

### Offices – Object

Proposed up to 900 metres.

The greenbelt was rolled back for the provision of essential housing within East Dorset and not the creation of additional offices which are not needed given our subsequent comments.

Again the rationale for these is not understood. There are 2 unlet Office Suites above existing shops.

The argument was used in the granting of planning for the Hurn Airport Industrial Park that office space was needed. There is considerable unlet Office accommodation within the Park. In Ferndown, there are currently 16 sites with a total floor area in excess of 5000 sq metres.

It is rare to see office accommodation in a village environment and if let, will again attract additional traffic to an already congested area.

On commercial grounds alone, the Parish Council question the viability of these proposals, let alone their overwhelming concerns about traffic generation.

#### Infrastructure

Whilst we have established that s106 funding will be given to the West Parley Surgery on Glenmoor Road towards expansion to accommodate the additional population increase, there are no details regarding the wider impact. Have the hospitals been consulted who will be directly impacted by this proposed pollution increase? Do the fire / police services have the resources for increased demand?

We would draw the attention of EDDC to the wording of paragraph 10.31.where it talks about '...providing improved local services and facilities for the local community..".

To give a sense of identity the need for recreational, social and community meeting place facilities is an absolute requirement in the view of this Parish Council. That is why it is vitally important that the existing facilities be improved and enhanced if we are to cater for the increase in housing proposed in both FWP Policies 6 and 7. Giving money to the parish council for repair/replacement of the existing sports and social club is an absolute priority claim.

#### **Environment**

- DERC show records of 30-40 bat roosts in a 2km radius therefore it is highly likely that bats are utilising the site for foraging, and it will be important to ensure that sufficient mitigation and enhancement measures are put in to protect that function if the development goes ahead.
- In all the species survey reports it has been made clear that there will need to be further checks made in the presence of a licenced and qualified ecologist. Evidence is requested.
- We support Dorset Wildlife Trust seeking to ensure that the entire Biodiversity Mitigation Plan is made a condition of any planning permission and introduction of numerous bat boxes.
- Bat friendly low level lighting around the proposed development.
- Hedgerows at the Eastern Boundary with Church Lane properties to be enhanced to screen from noise / light pollution from the new development, as well as ensure hedgerows are reintroduced around the boundary of the whole development to encourage wildlife.

# Flood Plain

The field has a high risk of flooding which extends to the end of Church Lane at the South. Are you aware that there is a river which runs under Church Lane which is within a conservation area?

The flood report deals with strategies for coping with the flooding within the development site, but given the anticipated volume of tarmac and houses, the impact of flooding on the local area beyond the development itself will be greatly exacerbated. Who will accept future liabilities should either the houses on the development or more importantly, those beyond the boundaries of development, especially to the South, experience flooding as a result of this development?

We feel the Planners should challenge PFA regarding the Flood Risk Assessment as the effectiveness of the SUDS is questionable, and there is no Executive Summary and neither is there a Conclusion nor Risk Assessment!

### Sewerage

The sewerage pipes leading along Church Lane are a smaller diameter than standard pipes. Indeed a number of properties at the end of Church Lane are on Septic Tanks. The pumping station at the end of Church Lane has failed on numerous occasions, seeing raw sewerage entering the River Stour. Have appropriate checks been undertaken to ensure that the system is capable of coping with this hugely increased demand from housing and commercial usage? Who will accept future liability should the pumping station fail and residents are affected and the river further polluted?

# **Air Quality / Pollution**

We question whether the monitors in place were adequate and would question whether these pollution levels have been predicted to the future, taking into account the increase in cars from the development, the vehicles visiting the retail / offices at the site, the expansion at the airport to generate an additional 50k jobs, and the plan by the new owners of the aiport to increase passenger numbers at Bournemouth Airport from 600,000 pa to 3 million! This will not only have an inpact on pollution from road vehicles but a huge increase in air pollution from increased air movements, which pass directly over the development.

### **Airport Response**

There are many comments from this response which cause concern. Wyatt Homes representatives informed us that the SUDS would be ponds in winter. This causes not only a hazard for the aircraft by attracting large birds, it is also dangerous for children who could drown in the area, if unattended. Given the absence of any play area, they are likely to see these areas (which were informed at the public exhibition would be for play in summer months) to be recreational.

# **Community Donation**

The village and residents do not want this size of development and it is being imposed upon them. Therefore some recourse is sought for funding towards enhancing the existing community facilities within the village and for the benefit of the village.

Finally, we need to remember we are merely custodians for the environment in which we live. What is built now will probably subsist for another 100 years. It should be something of which we are pleased to be associated with.

Yours sincerely,

Mrs Linda Leeding

Clerk to West Parley Parish Council