The above application has come before the Committee before determination by the District Council due to an amendment to reduce the number of dwellings to 9 from 12.

This application is for an ‘affordable exception site’. An exception site is used to provide affordable housing on a site which would not normally be considered for housing, e.g., in this case the site lies in the green belt.

The Parish Council commented on the application when it first came to the Planning Committee as follows:

The Core Strategy has provision for new housing in Corfe Mullen which includes affordable housing and there is no reason to believe that this will not come forward. There is therefore no need to consider an affordable exception site at this stage. Should this be necessary in the future, all landowners would be invited to put forward land which would then both be assessed for suitability and put to the whole community for consideration so that residents can decide which area of the village’s green belt is the least worst option to lose to provide an affordable housing exception site.

The reference in the above comment regarding assessment of several sites in the parish should an exception site be thought necessary relates to Para 5.5 of East Dorset District Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance on exception sites (attached as Appendix 1). This sets out the process for selecting the preferred site for an exception site.

Previous application

A previous application (3/16/0614/OUT) was refused and dismissed on appeal. This was also for 12 dwellings. The Decision Notice, Appeal Decision, and comments on this application from East Dorset District Council’s Policy Planning Team are attached as Appendices 2,3 & 4 respectively for information.

Regarding the reasons for refusal, there were four:

1. Contrary to Policy LN4: There was no justification at that time for an exception site as East Dorset District Council had demonstrated a five-year housing land supply, the proposal at over 10 dwellings was not small scale, and there was no legal mechanism for ensuring that the housing would be affordable in perpetuity.

   Interestingly, this reason did not specifically refer to the lack of process required in para 5.5 of LN4, but as the reason cites a lack of justification in principle for an exception site, the lack of proper process may have been thought to be irrelevant.

2. Because the proposal did not accord with Policy LN4, it therefore also failed to comply with Core Strategy KS3 and NPPF Para 89 which deal with exceptional circumstances for development in the green belt.
3. The proposal failed to demonstrate that flood risk would not increase with the additional surface water.

4. The proposal did not satisfactorily demonstrate that the development would not harm trees, visual amenity and tranquillity so was contrary to Core Strategy Policy HE2.

Turning to the appeal decision, the reasons for dismissal were threefold:

1. No legal agreement to ensure the dwellings would remain affordable in perpetuity
2. Because of the above, the proposal would therefore be inappropriate development in the Green Belt
3. Lack of demonstration that it would be possible to satisfactorily manage surface water flows to avoid flooding.

Crucially however, the Inspector did find that the proposal would fulfil a local housing need and felt that the housing research report published by the Parish Council in 2015 based on a survey undertaken in 2014 could be used as evidence despite the low response rate and he also cited that the majority of those that responded did come out in favour of the general Pardys Hill location as a suitable site for an exception site (48 respondents mentioned Pardyshill, 6 mentioned Haywards Lane and 3 cited Broadmoor Road/Sleight Lane). He therefore felt that the proposal did comply with para 5.8 of Policy LN4 (he did not refer to para 5.5).

He also did not concur that the 4th reason for refusal outweighed the pressing need for affordable housing. In addition he concluded that although 12 dwellings were higher than the normal definition of small-scale (10) this is only marginal and did not therefore warrant dismissing the appeal on that alone.

The report on the Parish Council’s Housings Needs Survey is attached as Appendix 5. One recommendation was that the Parish Council undertakes further scoping work to identify potential locations for an exception site and assess these in planning terms and ask the local community which it prefers. To date this has not been progressed, so the survey remains the most current evidence.

The Parish Council is aware of other sites where the landowners may be willing to be considered for an exception site, however no proposals have been submitted formally.

The justification for an exception site appears to have increased since the apparent stalling of the relocation of Lockyers School which is thought now not to happen in the short to medium term at least. This, and the reduced % of affordable housing finally negotiated in the remaining Core Strategy sites (the allotments and two adjacent fields) mean that the original provision of 75 affordable homes is only likely to be a maximum of 28. The Housing Needs Survey indicated that 46 affordable homes were required in the period 2015-2020.

Although this Core Strategy housing is now progressing (confirmation received today) this leaves a shortfall in affordable housing in Corfe Mullen. Possible additional green belt sites are to be looked at in the Local Plan Review, but that process has been delayed until Autumn 2019.
The current application

This was originally submitted for 12 dwellings and has been amended to 9 dwellings. This now means that it is not classed as a major development so the DCC Flood Risk Management Team no longer has a statutory role as consultee, however due to its previous objections it has submitted an advisory response which is attached as Appendix 6.

The reduction in dwellings will also enable the detailed plans (should outline planning be granted) to address more easily the arboriculture officer’s concerns about tree protection.

Some of the dwellings will be for rent at 60% of market rent, and the remainder will be for sale at 75% of market value and it is understood that details of a satisfactory legal agreement have been submitted to the District Council to ensure the dwellings will be kept as affordable housing in perpetuity, although there is no confirmation of this on the documentation available on the dorsetforyou website, so this is subject to confirmation.

There were 116 objections to the application, with objections just starting to be lodged for the amended application (16 so far).

The Parish Council Planning Committee will need to consider fully all the above factors when reaching a decision on how to respond.

K Blee
Parish Clerk
22.11.18
5 Policy LN4 Affordable housing exception sites

Introduction

5.1 Affordable Housing Exception Sites are permitted in locations that would otherwise be unacceptable for market housing - permission is only granted because the development will specifically enable the meeting of locally identified housing need in perpetuity.

5.2 Robust long-term arrangements are required to manage and control exception sites through a S106 agreement between the Council and an appropriate "Approved Provider", usually a Registered Provider or a formally constituted Community Land Trust.

"Exceptionally land adjoining or very close to the defined rural and urban settlements which would otherwise be considered inappropriate for development may be developed to facilitate affordable housing..."

5.3 This policy sets out the principles and mechanisms for establishing the exceptional circumstances that allow for the provision of small sites for affordable housing in perpetuity in rural areas where development would otherwise be contrary to policy.

5.4 In accordance with the NPPF definition, such sites should only be permissible where resultant development enables local community housing needs to be met for households who are either current residents or have an existing family or employment connection. Appropriate measures will be included within a S106 Agreement to restrict the occupation of affordable housing on exception sites.

5.5 Exception site proposals will only be supported where they are adjoining or very close to the listed settlements. Sites must be appropriate and selected as the preferred and deliverable option following an evidenced scoping exercise and sequential test of potential sites capable of meeting the locally identified need. Evidence of site investigations will form an expected part of the Planning justification process, usually carried out in partnership with parish councils, community bodies and local landowners.

5.6 A central enabling feature for exception-site development is the constrained land value that results from affordable housing usage, when open market land values would render subsidised housing undeliverable and financially unviable. Given the increasing difficulty in securing public subsidy for such schemes, the successful delivery of affordable housing is likely to depend upon very low land values - as close as possible to agricultural values.

"...in perpetuity, provided that secure arrangements are included to ensure that its benefits will be enjoyed by successive as well as initial occupiers"

5.7 Types and models of affordable housing will only be accepted in accordance with the Council's Affordable Housing definitions or, exceptionally, if approved by the Council as part of the planning process. The details of tenure and operating mechanisms will need to be defined within the legal planning agreement. The affordable housing provision and occupation conditions will be required in perpetuity, benefiting the first and all subsequent occupiers, save only for any primary legislative rights or where Mortgagor in Possession risks have been mitigated either by the Homes and Communities Agency or through special arrangements with the Councils.
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Policy LN2 Affordable housing exception sites

“The proposed development would provide a mix of housing and type which meets demonstrated local housing needs.”

5.8 The type and tenure of affordable housing to be provided on exception sites must address demonstrated local community housing need identified through up to date parish need surveys or research using methodologies supported by the Local Planning Authority. Such research should normally be undertaken in partnership with the local community and the appropriate Parish Council or Parish Group.

5.9 In the context of exception site policy, “local” refers to those households with a local connection to the parish or community, as defined by the Council and including:-

- Being permanently resident therein for at least four years immediately prior to such occupation
- Having currently resident close relatives (i.e. parents, children, brother or sister) who have lived therein for at least four years
- Having permanent employment and having been employed therein for at least 12 months prior to such occupation
- Other special circumstances which create a link to the given parish (not including resident in a hospital, armed forces accommodation, holiday let, or prison) such special circumstances having first been verified and approved by the Borough/District Council

5.10 However if there are no local households in housing need and with a local connection to the parish or community when an exceptions dwelling becomes available, a S106 cascade approach will be permitted, meaning that the geographical area of the search can be gradually widened over time to prevent prolonged voids, when proactive marketing activity has been demonstrated.

“The development is small scale and reflects the setting, form and character of the settlement and the surrounding landscape.”

5.11 For the purposes of this policy ‘small scale’ usually means a scheme of no more than 10 dwellings. Exception site proposals must relate to the local needs of the settlement and its hinterland. Where proposed sites form part of a parish group, housing need arising within all parishes within the group may be included and if a settlement bridges more than one parish, both may be included as part of the justification.

5.12 For all exception sites, construction, materials, and external finishes should be sympathetic to those in use locally. ‘Off the peg’ standard house types will not be acceptable, instead requiring design elements that reflect the sites unique context.
Town and Country Planning Act 1990

Intelligent Land
The Studio
Ferndown Forest Golf Club
Forest Links Road
Ferndown
BH22 9PH

Refusal of Outline Planning Permission

Application reference no: 3/16/0614/OUT

East Dorset District Council in pursuance of powers under the above-mentioned Act hereby REFUSE to permit:

The Development of 12 Affordable Dwellings and Associated Access (All Matters Reserved)

at Land at Pardys Hill Corfe Mullen BH21 3HW

in accordance with the refused plans, for the following reasons:

1. The Council has a five year land supply and a sound strategy for the provision of affordable housing. There is insufficient justification for an affordable housing exception site in this location at this time, the proposal is not small scale and there is no mechanism to secure its future use as affordable housing in perpetuity so the proposal conflicts with Policy LN4 of the Christchurch and East Dorset Local Plan: Part 1- Core Strategy (2014), the Christchurch and East Dorset Housing and Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document April 2014.

2. The site lies within the South East Dorset Green Belt, the purposes of which are set out in Section 9 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and Local Plan policy KS3 ‘Green Belt’, and where the construction of new buildings is to be regarded as inappropriate unless it accords with those exceptions set out in paragraph 89 of the NPPF. The proposed development fails to accord with Local Plan Policy LN4 so it cannot benefit from the ‘limited affordable housing for local community needs’ exemption (NPPF para 89) and it therefore represents inappropriate development within the Green Belt. No very special circumstances have been demonstrated which
would outweigh the harm to the Green Belt caused by inappropriateness and harm to openness. The proposal is contrary to Policy KS3 of the Christchurch and East Dorset Local Plan: Part 1-Core Strategy and Section 9 of the NPPF.

3. The proposal is contrary to Policy ME6 'Flood Management, Mitigation and Defence' of the Christchurch and East Dorset Local Plan: Part 1- Core Strategy (2014), NPPF paragraph 103 and National Planning Practice Guidance, as it fails to demonstrate that flood risk would not increase as a result of the development proposed, or that post-development surface water runoff would not exceed pre-development levels.

4. The supporting documentation fails to demonstrate that the proposed quantum of development can be achieved on the site without harm to the landscape character by reason of its likely impact on protected trees, visual amenity and tranquillity contrary to policies HE2 'Design of New Development' and HE3 'Landscape Quality' of the Christchurch and East Dorset Local Plan: Part 1- Core Strategy (2014).

The following Informative Notes are drawn to the Applicant’s attention:
The Planning Inspectorate
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The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Hearing Held on 12 October 2017
Site visit made on 12 October 2017

by J Wilde C Eng MICE

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 18th October 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/U1240/W/17/3176819
Land at Pardy’s Hill, Corfe Mullen, Dorset BH21 3HW

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant outline planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Mr Kevin Hodder (East Borough Housing Trust) against the decision of East Dorset District Council.
- The application Ref 3/16/0614/OUT, dated 27 April 2016, was refused by notice dated 14 February 2017.
- The development proposed is twelve affordable dwellings and associated access.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural matter

2. The application was made in outline with all matters other than access reserved for later determination.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are whether or not:-
   a) The proposed development could be defined as an affordable housing exception site.
   b) The proposed development would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt, and the effect of the proposed development on the openness of the Green belt,
   c) The effect of the proposed development on flooding in the area, and on
   d) The character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site forms part of a field located adjacent to the settlement boundary of Corfe Mullen and within the South East Dorset Green Belt (GB). There are houses on the opposite side of Pardy’s Hill and the land to the west of the site is designated as an Area of Great Landscape Value (AGLV).
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Whether or not the proposed development could be defined as an affordable housing exception site.

5. Policy LN4 of the Christchurch and East Dorset Local Plan Part 1 – Core Strategy (CS) deals with affordable housing exception sites, and makes clear that it applies to the settlement of Corfe Mullen. At the Hearing it was agreed by the main parties that the crux of the matter between them relates to the second bullet point of the policy which requires that any development proposed under the policy must meet demonstrated local housing needs.

6. I will deal firstly however with the likely supply of affordable homes in Corfe Mullen. The CS is dated April 2014 and extends to 2028. It is therefore only three and a half years into a fourteen year plan period and the Council can demonstrate a five year supply of housing land. Section 9 of the CS deals specifically with housing in Corfe Mullen, culminating in policy CM1. This identifies two sites, based around Lockyer’s school, that are intended to provide a total of 250 new homes, one of 150 and one of 100. The CS indicates that green field sites, which would include the larger of the two sites mentioned above, should provide up to 50% affordable homes, whilst previously developed sites such as the smaller of the two, should provide 40% affordable housing. It was originally intended that the larger of the two sites would be completed by April 2018.

7. During the Hearing it was confirmed that the larger site now has outline planning permission for 112 dwellings of which 25% would be affordable, equating to 28 affordable dwellings. At the time of the Hearing the Council indicated that the legal agreement relating to the site was about to be signed. However, reserved matters and pre-commencement conditions still have to be agreed. It seems highly unlikely therefore, on the balance of probability, that any work will commence on site until 2018 at the earliest, the year when it was originally intended that it should be completed. Furthermore, the site will contain 38 less dwellings than originally intended with the ratio of affordable dwellings at half originally intended.

8. The smaller of the two sites referred to in policy CM1 contains a school that was intended to be replaced by a new school on a new site. However, this school is now an Academy and therefore not under the direct control of the Education Authority. It has also had funding spent on it to improve it and consequently it seems very unlikely that the second site will come forward at all. In summary therefore it is likely that only about 28 affordable homes will be developed in Corfe Mullen under policy CM1 by about 2020 at the earliest.

9. I note that affordable housing could also come forward through policy LN3. However, the Written Ministerial Statement of 1 December 2014 limited the provision of affordable housing to sites over ten units, and I have been supplied with no compelling evidence to show that a significant number of affordable dwellings could be generated via policy LN3.

10. In terms of local affordable housing need a Housing Research Report (HRR) relating to Corfe Mullen was published in March 2015. This was a joint initiative between Corfe Mullen Parish Council and East Dorset District Council. The report concluded that there was a need for about 35 affordable homes in Corfe Mullen in the period 2015-2018 and about 46 between 2015-2020. Whilst these figures are not absolute, they are of a scale that was accepted by
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both main parties at the Hearing, and I consider them to be the best available
evidence relating to local need.

11. The HRR also concluded, in the fifth bullet point of its findings and
recommendations, that based on currently available information, this need
could be met from the first phases of the development resulting from policy
CM1 which should provide up to 75 affordable dwellings in the short to medium
term, should they come forward as anticipated. The sixth bullet point states
that that notwithstanding the above recommendation, it would be potentially
useful for the Parish Council to undertake further work on a shortlist of
potential sites for a small scale affordable housing scheme, **should the new
neighbourhood not come forward in the timescales currently envisaged** (my
highlighting).

12. I have found that the new neighbourhood is not coming forward in the
timescale envisaged at the time of conception. Furthermore, fewer dwellings
are being provided on the larger site than anticipated, with a lower percentage
of affordable houses, and the smaller of the two sites may well not come to
fruition at all.

13. I also note that the letter dated July 2014 that accompanied the housing
survey forms that resulted in the HRR starts off by stating that the Parish
Council is aware that the lack of affordable housing is a major issue and that no
affordable housing has been built in the village for many years. Furthermore,
the 2012 Strategic Market Housing Assessment identified a need for affordable
housing in the parish of 44 units per year and 426 units per year across East
Dorset as a whole. However, this figure was not taken forward in the CS due
to its potential impact on the overall housing market. The SHMA actually
concluded that the need for Corfe Mullen was 21 dwellings per year of which
40% should be affordable. This would equate to about 9 affordable dwellings
per year, and since adoption of the CS none have been provided.

14. It seems to me therefore that it has been shown that the proposed
development would meet demonstrated local affordable housing need and in
this respect would be in compliance with policy LN4.

15. In arriving at this conclusion I note that the Council’s Supplementary Planning
Document entitled **Housing and Affordable Housing** makes clear in paragraph
5.8 that the type and tenure of affordable housing to be provided on exception
sites must be address demonstrated local community housing need identified
through up to date parish needs surveys or research using methodologies
supported by the Local Planning Authority. Such research should normally be
undertaken in partnership with the local community and appropriate Parish
Council. I acknowledge that HRR is now two years old and that the appellant
has had no hand in its formulation. Nonetheless the Parish Council was
involved in the formulation of the HRR and whilst it may be two years old, I
cannot see that the affordable housing situation has improved in that time.

16. I also acknowledge that the HRR was based on a low response rate.
Nonetheless it is the best evidence currently available and it is very possible
that a larger response could have in turn demonstrated a larger affordable
housing need. The Council have questioned the site selection process and also
pointed out that the SPG defines small scale as usually no more than 10
dwellings. However, the HRR looked at a large number of sites and the
majority of respondents cited Pardy’s Hill as suitable. Furthermore, given the
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identified need, the quantum of twelve dwellings is not so far removed from ten as to mean that the appeal should be dismissed on that basis.

17. However, notwithstanding my above findings, whilst the application was for 12 affordable dwellings I have nothing before me in the form of a legal agreement that would ensure that any dwellings built would actually be affordable, or indeed affordable in perpetuity, as required by the SPG and by policy LN4. Therefore whilst the intention of the proposed development would comply with policy LN4, the actuality of it is that I have no option but to dismiss the appeal as not complying with that policy.

Green belt

18. Paragraph 89 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) indicates that the construction of new buildings in the Green Belt is inappropriate unless one of six exceptions is met. The fifth of these exceptions is limited infilling in villages, and limited affordable housing for local community needs under policies set out in the local plan (my highlighting). As I have found that due to the lack of a legal agreement the proposed development would conflict with policy LN4 of the CS, it follows that the proposed development has to be considered inappropriate development.

19. Paragraph 87 of the Framework indicates that inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt, and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. Paragraph 88 of the framework makes clear that substantial weight should be given to any harm to the Green Belt. In this case therefore, as the proposed development would not come under one of the exceptions given in paragraph 89 of the Framework, very special circumstances have to be demonstrated for it to be allowable in respect of Green Belt policy.

Openness

20. Openness in Green Belt terms can be considered to be a lack of built form. The proposed development would result in additional built form and would therefore have a harmful effect on the openness of the Green Belt.

Flooding

21. Due to a combination of topography and localised water courses the appeal site suffers from flooding problems, particularly to the south of the site. The appellant has provided a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) compiled by Mr Frank Tyhurst. This document is somewhat brief but points out that the application is in outline and that there appears to be no flood risk reason why this development should not proceed as proposed. The FRA also makes clear that the developer intends to employ a specialist consultant to compile a comprehensive surface water drainage strategy, which will be centred on the design of a Sustainable Urban Drainage Scheme. The aim of the strategy will be to demonstrate that surface water drainage can be accommodated entirely on the site, probably by soakaways served by attenuation tanks.

22. However, the Council’s specialist consultee on this matter, Dorset County Council, point to the existence of a watercourse not specifically referenced in the FRA and to the fact that no evidence has been provided to show that soakaways would work in this particular area. They also indicate that theoretical mapping suggests a significant risk to units 1-4 as shown on the indicative site plan.
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23. Whilst in general I would accept that a condition could be imposed at outline stage to require further details of drainage, in this particular case, given the brevity of the FRA and the particular site circumstances, I concur with the Council that further information should be provided to demonstrate that it would be possible to satisfactorily manage the likely received and newly produced surface water flows.

24. In arriving at this conclusion I note that the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG)\(^1\) indicates that a FRA should demonstrate to the decision maker how flood risk will be managed now and over the development’s lifetime. The submitted FRA fails to do this. I also note that paragraph 103 of the Framework makes clear that when determining planning applications, local planning authorities should ensure that flood risk is not increased elsewhere. It seems to me that the Council were not able to comply with this requirement given the paucity of information that they received.

25. Given my findings above the proposed development would conflict with policy ME6 of the CS. This requires, amongst other things, that developments will be required to demonstrate that flood risk does not increase as a result of the development proposed.

Character and appearance

26. The trees to the road side of the appeal site along Sleight Lane and the upper north section of Pardy’s Hill are protected by tree preservation orders\(^2\) and the Council have concerns that these could be adversely affected by the proposed development, which in turn would impact upon the character and appearance of the area. In particular my attention has been drawn to the fact that units 8-12 appear too close to the canopy of the trees, that the footpath access from Sleight Lane could potentially interfere with the adjacent trees and that the crown spread of tree T8 is closer to 10m over the site than the 6m shown.

27. I am mindful however that the scheme has been submitted in outline, with layout as a reserved matter. I have been given no significant evidence to show that it would be unlikely that a scheme could be submitted that demonstrated that no harm would be occasioned to the trees, either directly or through future amenity pressure from residents. Given that conclusion it follows that no harm would be occasioned to the character or appearance of the area by virtue of disturbance or harm to the protected trees.

28. In terms of a more general impact on character and appearance, the proposed development would replace a green field with built development. Whilst this would be relatively well shielded by the surrounding vegetation, particularly in autumn and winter, there would nonetheless be some views of the proposed development available, particularly from the B3074, from where the development would be seen as an intrusion into the green valley. However, I do not consider that any harm generated by the proposal would be at such a level to merit dismissing the appeal on this ground, when balanced against the pressing need for affordable housing.

---

\(^1\) Paragraph 7-03D-20140306
\(^2\) The East Dorset District (Sleight Lane No.5 Corfe Mullen) Tree Preservation Order 2006
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29. In their reason for refusal the Council also mention an impact on tranquillity. However, there are already houses on the opposite side of the road to the appeal site, and I do not consider that the area is so tranquil at present such that the proposed development would significantly compromise this tranquillity.

30. In light of this I find that there would be no conflict with policies HE2 and HE3 of the CS. The former of these requires, amongst other things, that development is compatible with its surroundings in terms of visual pact and its relationship to mature trees. The latter requires, amongst other things, that development demonstrates that tranquillity and visual amenity have been taken into account.

**Conclusion**

31. I have found that the proposed development would fulfil a housing need such that in that respect it would comply with policy LN4 of the CS. However, the failure to provide a legal agreement to ensure that the dwellings would be affordable negates that compliance and therefore conflict with policy LN4 exists. Due to that conflict the proposed development would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt. The proposal would also harm the openness of the Green Belt and I have also found conflict with policy ME6 in respect of flooding.

32. There are no other considerations that outweigh the identified harm. Consequently very special circumstances, necessary to allow the appeal, do not exist. Having taken all other matters into careful consideration, including the issues raised by interested persons at both the application and appeal stages, I therefore dismiss the appeal.

*John Wilde*

INSPECTOR

---
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APPLICATION REF: 3/16/0614

ADDRESS: Land at Pardy's Hill, Corfe Mullen

PLANNING POLICY COMMENTS

1 GENERAL

1.1 The above application is for the construction of 12 affordable homes to be considered as an "exception" site on land at Pardy's Hill, Corfe Mullen.

1.2 The proposal is for a mix of social rented homes and low cost homes for sale. Further information from the applicants has revealed that 6 of the homes will be for rent and 6 for sale. The mix of units will be:

- 2-bed: 3 dwellings (25%)
- 3-bed: 8 dwellings (67%)
- 4-bed: 1 dwelling (8%)

1.3 The site is approximately 1 hectare, and is located within the Green Belt to the north west of Corfe Mullen.

2 POLICY ISSUES TO BE CONSIDERED

2.1 These policy comments relate to specific policy issues only, and do not deal with other planning merits of the scheme, such as layout and design of units, impact on landscape or the openness of the Green Belt, or matters such as access.

2.2 Instead, these comments address the following:

- The need for affordable housing in Corfe Mullen
- The current strategy for addressing that need, as set out in the Local Plan (Core Strategy)
- The policy requirements for consideration of exception sites
- The extent to which this application should or should not be supported in the light of the matters above.

Need for affordable housing in Corfe Mullen

2.3 Corfe Mullen is defined as one of the main settlements in the Local Plan (Policy KS2), where development will be focussed.

2.4 There are two main sources of information regarding need for affordable housing in Corfe Mullen. The Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2012 provides the evidence base for the Core Strategy housing requirement. The Core Strategy provides for a total housing requirement of 8,490 dwellings across Christchurch and East Dorset, of which overall 35% of these (2,972) should be affordable dwellings.
The SHMA 2012 does refer to absolute need for affordable housing of 426 units per annum across East Dorset, and 44 units per annum across Corfe Mullen. However the SHMA also concludes that it would not be realistic or sensible to plan to meet this absolute housing need due to potential impact on the housing market. The SHMA therefore concludes an overall housing need figure of 336 dwellings per annum in East Dorset, and 21 dwellings per annum in Corfe Mullen, of which 40% should be affordable dwellings.

In the case of Corfe Mullen, this would represent a total housing need figure of 315 dwellings over the plan period, of which 126 should be affordable.

It must always be remembered that SHMA figures are a technical assessment of need, and are “policy off” in that they do not take account of any constraints which might limit ability to meet that need.

In 2014, Corfe Mullen Parish Council commissioned and undertook its own Parish Housing Needs survey to establish a more specific picture of need for affordable dwellings across the Parish. This survey did not produce a very good response rate, but, following analysis revealed a need of 46 households in housing need over the next 5 years. This was broken down into the following needs:

- In need in the next year: 14 households
- In need in the next 1-3 years: 21 households
- In need in the next 3-5 years: 11 households

Whilst these figures must always be treated with some caution, and indeed, not all of those responding actually wished to be considered for affordable housing, the level of need identified in the Parish Housing Needs Survey over the next 5 years (approximately 9 dwellings per annum), is very similar to the need identified in the SHMA (approximately 8 dwellings per annum).

Strategy for meeting housing need in Corfe Mullen

The Local Plan (Core Strategy) does not identify specific housing requirements for individual areas of the District or Borough. However it has attempted to ensure that there will be a supply of new housing across the plan area in approximate proportion to the settlement hierarchy established in Policy KS2.

This strategy includes identification of possible capacity for urban housing sites through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA), and allocation of new greenfield sites to deliver sustainable extensions to existing settlements. In Corfe Mullen, one such allocation is identified by Policy CM1 for land at Lockyer’s School and north of Corfe Mullen, for approximately 250 new homes, with a policy objective to achieve up to 50% of these dwellings as affordable.

This allocation could therefore deliver a very significant proportion of the identified housing need for Corfe Mullen as established in the 2012 SHMA. Further smaller housing sites are likely to come forward within the built up area of the village.
2.13 Currently, the first phase of the allocated site has been submitted for outline planning consent, to deliver 112 new dwellings. Discussions are ongoing on the level of affordable housing to be delivered, although it is unlikely that the policy objectives will be met on this phase. Nonetheless, it is still anticipated that this phase of the allocation could deliver approximately 25-30 units of affordable housing, which, together with identified potential re-lets of existing affordable housing stock (9 per annum), would be sufficient to meet need identified for at least the next 5 years in the Parish needs survey.

Policy for Exception sites.

2.14 Policy LN4 of the Local Plan Core Strategy allows exceptionally for the development of affordable housing on land adjoining or very close to defined rural and urban settlements, subject to certain criteria. Corfe Mullen is one of the defined settlements.

2.15 Further guidance on the operation of this policy is set out in the Housing and Affordable Housing SPD, adopted in April 2014. This requires that the type and tenure of affordable housing to be provided on such sites must address need identified through an up to date parish needs survey.

2.16 In addition, the SPD states that exception site proposals will only be supported where they are adjoin or very close to the defined settlements, and that sites must be selected following an evidenced scoping exercise and sequential test of potential sites capable of meeting the locally identified need. This process should be in partnership with parish councils and the local community.

The extent to which this application should be supported in the light of policy and need.

2.17 It is clear from the evidence summarised above that there is a need for affordable housing in Corfe Mullen. It is always difficult to quantify such need at any point in time, but it would appear from the evidence that a need of approximately 8-9 dwellings per annum would be a reasonable assumption, based on the various sources of evidence.

2.18 The planning strategy for Corfe Mullen, as set out in the Local Plan, is to meet housing need within the existing built up area, and on the allocated new neighbourhood to the north of the village (policy CM1).

2.19 As set out above, this, together with smaller urban sites and re-lets, appears adequate to meet affordable housing need identified in the Parish Needs Survey over the next 5 years. The first phase of the new neighbourhood is already the subject of an outline planning application for 112 dwellings (with potentially 25-30 affordable units), and a second phase of the new neighbourhood remains to be come forward.

2.20 In principle therefore, the “exceptional” need for a site outside the built up area of the village to meet affordable housing need appears questionable.

2.21 It is clear however that the application does offer a package of affordable housing which could, setting wider policy aside, deliver affordable housing to meet local need. In this respect, the application can meet this element of the policy requirements.
APPENDIX 4 cont’d

2.22 However, the site has not come forward as part of a community led sequential site assessment. Instead it has come forward as an independent planning application, albeit supported by some community consultation by the developer. It is noteworthy that the 2014 Parish Needs Survey sought suggestions of possible sites for affordable housing in the village, and received over 50 suggested locations. Whilst many of these may not be suitable, nonetheless there is clear justification for further assessment and community consultation to be undertaken prior to any selection of a potential affordable housing exception site in the village, even if a clear need was established.

3 CONCLUSIONS

3.1 It is acknowledged that this application has come forward as a genuine attempt to address need for affordable housing in Corfe Mullen. It is also acknowledged that the nature of the affordable dwellings proposed, for sale and for rent, would be suitable to address housing need in the village.

3.2 The Local Plan has however, set out a clear and sound planning strategy for meeting housing and affordable housing need in Corfe Mullen, through urban sites and a new neighbourhood allocation. Part of this allocation is already in the planning process. It would appear that this planning strategy can already deliver housing to meet affordable housing need identified over the next 5 years, with a further phase of the new neighbourhood yet to come forward which will be capable of meeting need beyond 5 years.

3.3 Accordingly, there does not appear to be sufficient justification in this case to recommend support for an affordable housing exception site in this location at this time.
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Summary

In July 2014 housing research was carried out across the Parish of Corfe Mullen, to establish the level of community support that exists for an affordable housing scheme and to identify households in housing need.

A total of 653 residents survey forms were returned in response to a household questionnaire (see Appendix 2). This represents approximately 16% of households in the Parish. A total of 72 individual Housing Need Survey responses were also received.

Supporting information submitted by residents confirmed that 187 family members from 112 households had already left the community due to the cost of housing and the lack of affordable housing.

Over 72% of respondents confirmed that subject to proven need and finding an appropriate site, they would support a small-scale affordable housing development for local people.

Many residents also responded positively by helping to identifying potential sites (see Appendix 1).

Housing Need

Having excluded households not reasonably deemed to be in housing need, and those expressing a preference for housing outside the Parish, a total of 46 households were considered to be in housing need.

Analysed by four life-stage cohorts, survey results indicated 14 households in current need, 21 households that would fall into need within 1 to 3 years, and 11 households within 3 to 5 years. A number of these households expressed interest in affordable homes ownership (with incomes that could make the tenure a possibility). However the financial means of many households confirmed a material ongoing need for forms of affordable rented housing.

Based on currently available information, this need can reasonably be assumed to be met from the first phases of development of the Corfe Mullen new neighbourhood, allocated in the Core Strategy (the three fields north of Wimborne Road). This is likely to provide up to 75 affordable dwellings in the short to medium term, and potentially up to a further 50 affordable dwellings in future phases by the end of the plan period in 2028.

Due to the age and ensuing vulnerability of many households, careful consideration should be given to the most suitable types of housing to build, and to ensure that new provision compliments and optimises the existing social stock. It will therefore be necessary to work closely with registered providers and East Dorset District Council to achieve the optimal alignment of local stock and local allocations policies.
APPENDIX 5 cont’d

Section 1: Introduction

Commissioning the research

As part of a joint initiative between Corfe Mullen Parish Council and East Dorset District Council, a housing research project was carried out across Corfe Mullen during July and August 2014.

Led by the Parish Council and implemented by the District Council, the research was commissioned as the first step in a process that could lead to the identification and advancement of a small affordable housing scheme for people with a local connection to the immediate community.

The household survey was designed to address two primary objectives:

- To establish the level of support from local residents towards the provision of a small affordable housing scheme for the benefit of households with local connections to Corfe Mullen
- To identify the existing level of housing need within the community, and the level of housing need that is likely to arise over the next five years

Coupled with supporting information provided by residents and those in housing need, the survey would enable the Parish Council to move to the next stage, if appropriate; doing so with a mandate from the local community and with robust evidence of the type and tenure of homes that are required to satisfy any planning requirements.

Housing and demographic background information

Before considering the findings of the survey, it is valuable to review existing sources of secondary data, and what these say about the demography of the community and the state of the local housing market.

At the time of the last census, the Parish of Corfe Mullen included 4,078 households residing in 4,150 dwellings. Of the occupied households, the vast majority (84.2%) were owner occupiers; 8.4% of households were renting privately whilst 6.4% (260 households) were social housing tenants. Only 7 households lived in shared-ownership housing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Owner (with mortgage)</th>
<th>Owner (no mortgage)</th>
<th>Privately rented</th>
<th>Social rented</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corfe Mullen</td>
<td>40.5%</td>
<td>43.7%</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Dorset</td>
<td>32.8%</td>
<td>47.9%</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>32.7%</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Households by tenure (Census 2011)

It can be seen from the table that the Parish falls closely in line with the District of East Dorset in that it has a significantly higher level of owner occupation without a mortgage and significantly lower levels of both social rented and affordable rented tenures
In terms of the typology of housing both Council Tax records and the census housing stock profile confirm that Corfe Mullen has a very limited element of lower value and entry level housing stock relative to the rest of Southwest England:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Council Tax Band</th>
<th>Corfe Mullen</th>
<th>East Dorset</th>
<th>Southwest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Council Tax A</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Tax B</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Tax C</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Households by Council Tax Band (Census 2011)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Council Tax Band</th>
<th>Corfe Mullen</th>
<th>East Dorset</th>
<th>Southwest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Detached</td>
<td>58.9%</td>
<td>60.5%</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi Detached</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrace</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flats</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caravans</td>
<td>0.7% (30)</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Dwellings by type (Census 2011)

Age related census data from 2011 provides the proportion of households across four ‘life stage’ groupings. The information highlights the low number of younger households and the high number of older households that already exist not only in Corfe Mullen but also in East Dorset as a whole.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lifestage</th>
<th>Corfe Mullen</th>
<th>East Dorset</th>
<th>England</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Households with HRP* below 35</td>
<td>8.3% (338)</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households with HRP* between 35 &amp; 54</td>
<td>38.8% (1584)</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
<td>39.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households with HRP* between 55 and 64</td>
<td>21.8% (890)</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households with HRP* over 65</td>
<td>31% (1266)</td>
<td>40.7%</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Household Reference Person

Table 4: Households by Life-stage (Census 2011)

The cost of open market housing

Insights into the local housing market are now possible as a result of access to Land Registry data and also property websites, such as Right Move.

Land Registry data (via the Right Move website – 18th February 2015) confirmed that between May and October 2014, 365 sales transactions had been recorded in Corfe Mullen Parish at an average value of £340,278.
The most recent monthly data (October 2014), shows the following average house prices in the Parish:

Detached: £429,885  
Semi-Detached: £272,593  
Terraced: £282,513  
Flat: £185,125  
All Housing: £359,264

Property searches on the same date confirmed the following lowest-cost properties for sale:-

- No 1-bedroom properties were for sale
- 4 x park homes were for sale ranging from £149,950 to £230,000
- 2 apartments were for sale ranging from £154,950 to £175,000
- The lowest cost 2 bedroom house was £199,950
- The lowest cost 3 bedroom house was £230,000
- The lowest cost 4 bedroom house was £349,950

There were just 11 available rental properties:-

- A 1 bed flat at £700 pcm
- A 2 bed flat at £885 pcm
- The lowest priced 3 bed house at £875 pcm
- The lowest priced 4 bed house at £1,295 pcm

Lower quartile market rents, as defined by the Valuation Office for Housing Benefit purposes are as follows (based upon Local Housing Allowance rates for Bournemouth):-

- 1 bedroom - £530 PCM (£122.36 per week)
- 2 bedroom - £656 PCM (£151.50 per week)
- 3 bedroom - £809 PCM (£186.92 per week)
- 4 bedroom - £1094 PCM (£252.69 per week)
Section 2: Survey methodology and response rate

Following consultation, the form and content of the housing questionnaire and the Chairman’s introductory letter was agreed with Corfe Mullen Parish Council (see Appendix 2). To maximise responses, online survey access was set up via the “dorsetforyou” website or through telephone contact with East Dorset District Council. The Parish Council also promoted the survey through a front page article in the Parish Newsletter, which was delivered at the same time as the survey forms.

To gather information and opinion from both residents and those in housing need, the questionnaire incorporated two separate parts - Part 1: The Residents Survey and Part 2: The Housing Need Survey.

The survey deadline was 22nd August 2014.

Overall Response Rate

A total of 653 residents survey responses were received including 37 online and 616 postal submissions. 72 Housing Need Survey responses were submitted.

Defining affordability

There are two main measures of affordability: mortgage and rental. Mortgage affordability assesses whether households would be eligible for a mortgage; rental affordability measures whether a household can afford private rent. Mortgage affordability is based upon conditions imposed by mortgage lenders using standard lending multipliers (3.5 x household income) together with a minimum deposit (typically 10%). Rental affordability is defined as the rent being less than a given proportion of household income, typically assessed at between 25% and 35% of net income (Shelter).

Therefore to be able to afford to purchase an open market property valued at £200,000, a household would typically need a 10% deposit (£20,000) and a household income of £51,428.

To be able to reasonably afford a privately rented home at £750 PCM, a gross household income of £35,000 would be required.

Statistical validity

Unlike larger scale research based upon a representative sample, every household within the Parish was given a survey questionnaire and invited to respond, enabling them to give their opinion on the need for housing as a resident household, or for members to express housing need.

A total of 653 resident’s survey response forms were returned. If these are taken to be from different households, this represents approximately 16% of households participating in the residents’ survey. This was a relatively low response rate although not atypical for surveys of the general population in an area. However given the rate of response, the results should be treated with some caution.
Section 3: Residents Survey Findings

Household analysis

A total of 653 households responded to the resident’s survey, comprising a total of 1035 persons. The households contained the following age groups:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 15</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-29</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-44</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-59</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-74</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 and over</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

93.1% of respondents were owner-occupiers. A further 2.1% were renting from a housing association whilst 3.8% lived in privately rented accommodation.

Over 77% (77.3%) of residents confirmed they had lived in the Parish for more than 10 years, with 10.1% being resident for between 6 and 10 years. Less than 10% (9.5%) of residents had lived in Corfe Mullen for between 1 and 5 years, and only 3.2% for less than a year.

Analysis of opinions

Using a multiple choice, multiple answer question respondents were asked what types of additional housing they felt were needed within the local community:

![Bar Chart](chart.png)

Table 5: Types of additions housing needed (Resident Survey 2014)
Residents were also given the opportunity to provide further observations on this question. Comments included:

*Infrastructure cannot cope with more homes.*

*Corfe Mullen has been massively overdeveloped in the past forty years, and local roads cannot cope.*

*Corfe Mullen is already one of the more affordable places in the area.*

*We should free up large properties by incentivising single occupiers to downsize.*

*Affordable housing is needed for all groups in our community.*

*If Corfe Mullen grows too much it will lose its village feel.*

*We need to define what is meant by “small scale” affordable housing development.*

*Smaller units for the elderly will allow large family homes to be freed up.*

*I object to building on Green Belt land.*

*I would like to see more housing for young people just starting out, but we do not have the amenities to cope with more people.*

*I would support a new site but am not confident that present resident’s needs would be taken into account. The site should not be close to existing homes.*

>No further development is needed over and above that already planned.*

*Too many families with children are forced to live in flats with no garden, we must have some family homes with gardens.*

*Low cost housing should not mean houses that are too small.*

*New homes should be infill plots as they become available rather than a large development.*

*Also a need for supported accommodation.*

*Unless you have housing at £150,000 or less Corfe Mullen is not affordable for first time buyers.*

*Corfe Mullen is a village, not a town.*

*Development should be small scale and within existing boundaries not using Green Belt.*
112 households reported that a total of 187 former members had left the community and not returned due to the cost of local housing and the lack of affordable housing. It should be noted that 1 household said that 12 members of their family had left the village.

From a total of 636 respondents to this question, 472 (74.2%) said that subject to proven need and finding an appropriate site, they would support a small-scale affordable housing development in the community for local people.

In the final Residents’ question, households were invited to suggest and identify potential sites within the local area that might be suitable to develop a small affordable housing scheme to meet local needs. The extensive list of sites can be found at Appendix 1.
Section 4: Housing Need Survey Findings

Defining cohorts

Whilst it may be of some interest to understand and analyse the aggregate number of households who submitted Housing Need responses, meaningful analysis and future planning requires a more detailed study of typology, and the individual cohorts within the overall group.

It is also important to recognise that survey responses are based upon self-certification and individual testing is necessary to determine if households can reasonably be deemed to be in housing need and whether they could and should be expected to address their own housing requirements. And of course, any primary conclusions must be based upon respondents who have expressed a first preference for their housing needs to be met within the Parish.

In total 72 Housing Need Survey responses were received made up from five primary cohorts:-

- Single persons.
- Couples
- Families with young children (under 18)
- Families with adult children (over 18)
- Other

On further analysis, the 5 responses which stated “other” could be reclassified as falling within one of the other categories, which means the analysis in this report deals with the first 4 categories.

Single people.

The group comprised 15 households, the majority being younger people, in the following age categories:

15-29 – 5
30-44 – 4
45-59 – 1
60-74 – 2
75+ - 3

One household confirmed being in housing need now, 9 expected to be in housing need in 1 to 3 years, and 3 would fall into housing need in 3 to 5 years. Two households did not indicate any timescale.

Eight respondents confirmed living as part of larger households whilst 3 respondents currently live in rented accommodation. Of the 5 older respondents, 4 owned their property, 3 having no mortgage. In terms of why they are in need, the responses were split between younger households wishing simply to set up home for the first time alone or as part of a couple, and older households seeking
smaller, or disabled/elderly friendly accommodation to meet their needs. 1 respondent wished to move from private rented accommodation, and 1 was in tied accommodation.

The majority of respondents reported strong local connections to the Parish. Nine had been born there or have close family living in the community. None however wished to return to the community having moved away. Respondents mentioned 5 locations where they would like to find accommodation, Corfe Mullen being by far the most popular (13), followed by Wimborne (4), Broadstone (3), Creekmoor (2) and Poole (2). Only 1 respondent did not put Corfe Mullen as their first preference.

The following table summarises the income, savings and tenure aspirations of the group (2 non responses):-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income</th>
<th>Savings</th>
<th>Tenure sought*</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Design*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£8,000 to £14,999</td>
<td>7 x less than £1,000</td>
<td>7 x Rented</td>
<td>8 x 1 bedroom</td>
<td>12 x flats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£15,000 to £19,999</td>
<td>2 x £5,000 to £10,000</td>
<td>4 x affordable home ownership</td>
<td>5 x 2 bedroom</td>
<td>5 x bungalows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£20,000 to £24,999</td>
<td>1 x £10,000 to £15,000</td>
<td>3 x sheltered</td>
<td>1 x 3 bedroom</td>
<td>4 x houses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£30,000 to £34,999</td>
<td>1 x more than £25,000</td>
<td>3 x lower value market housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£35,000 or more</td>
<td>1 x £3,000 to £5,000</td>
<td>1 x residential care</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Multiple choice, multiple answer questions

Table 6: Single people (Housing Need Survey 2014)

Results from the single person group indicate a total potential need from 15 households. However, the following respondents fall into very low categories of need and should be reasonably discounted from further analysis of Parish housing needs:

- 4 respondents already own their own property, 3 without a mortgage, and 1 with substantial equity remaining after the mortgage has been paid. It can therefore reasonably be assumed that these respondents can provide for their future needs without access to forms of affordable housing.
- 1 respondent who has expressed a first preference for a home in Wimborne and not Corfe Mullen.
- 1 respondent who indicated an income of £60,000 or more, and therefore would have the capacity to purchase a property on the open market, based on a potential reasonable mortgage capacity of £210,000 (assuming a multiple of 3.5 times salary).

This leaves a balance of 9 single households in reasonable housing need which are subject to further analysis in Chapter 5 of this report.

### Couples

This cohort included a total of 20 households which comprised members of the following ages:
Under 15 – 0  
15-29 – 11  
30-44 – 3  
45-59 – 5  
60-74 – 16  
75+ – 5  

One household confirmed being in current housing need with the remainder expecting to fall into housing need within 1 to 3 years (11), or 3-5 years (8).

The vast majority of households in this category either own their home outright (7) or with a mortgage (6). Just 3 households are currently living in privately rented accommodation, and 4 are living with parents.

Reasons for being in housing need indicated were polarised between the younger couples simply wishing to set up home, and older couples whose property is too large or is becoming inaccessible due to stairs or the need for wheelchair adaptation. Interestingly however, 4 couples reported that their need would arise from the form of mortgage borrowing they had taken out in the past – primarily interest only mortgages with no prospect of being able to pay off the capital sum without the sale of their property, and little or no equity to put towards another purchase.

Nine of the 20 respondents in this group had either been born in Corfe Mullen or had family connections to the Parish. One household was not currently resident in Corfe Mullen, the form having been completed by their parents who are. Respondents mentioned some 14 locations where they would like to find accommodation, Corfe Mullen being by far the most popular (20), followed by Wimborne (11), Broadstone (6), and Poole (3). Only 1 respondent did not put Corfe Mullen as their first preference.

The following table summarises the income, savings and tenure aspirations of the group:-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income</th>
<th>Savings</th>
<th>Tenure sought*</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Design*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 x £20,000-£24,999</td>
<td>6 x more than £25,000</td>
<td>8 x lower value home ownership</td>
<td>12 x 2 bedroom</td>
<td>15 x bungalow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 x up to £14,999</td>
<td>6 x less than £1,000</td>
<td>7 x ownership</td>
<td>1 x 2/3 bedroom</td>
<td>3 x house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 x £15,000-£19,999</td>
<td>3 x £1,000-£3,000</td>
<td>5 x rented</td>
<td>4 x 3 bedroom</td>
<td>5 x flat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 x £34,999</td>
<td>3 x £3,000-£5,000</td>
<td>1 x sheltered</td>
<td>3 x 1 bedroom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 x £35,999</td>
<td>1 x £10,000-£15,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 x £29,999</td>
<td>1 x £15,000-£25,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 x £40,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Multiple choice, multiple answer questions

Table 7: Couples (Housing Need Survey 2014)
Results from the couples group indicate a total potential need from 20 households. However, the following respondents fall into very low categories of need and should be reasonably discounted from further analysis of Parish housing needs:

- 7 respondents who owned their home outright and had substantial equity such that they can reasonably meet their housing needs on the open market.
- 2 younger couples with a mortgage and some equity who could reasonably use this plus income to meet their future housing needs.
- 1 respondent who did not select Corfe Mullen as first preference for housing location.

This leaves 10 respondents in the couples category who have reasonable housing need to be analysed further in Chapter 5 of this report.

Families with young children (under 18)

A total of 27 housing need survey submissions were received from households with young children living at home.

The vast majority of these households (25) expressed a first location preference for the Parish, with 1 expressing a preference for Wimborne, and 1 a split first preference for Wimborne and Corfe Mullen. Twenty of the 27 respondents in this group had either been born in Corfe Mullen or had family connections to the Parish. Two household were not currently resident in Corfe Mullen. Respondents mentioned some 11 locations where they would like to find accommodation, Corfe Mullen being by far the most popular (26), followed by Broadstone (18), Wimborne (16), and Poole (2).

In terms of current accommodation, the results for this group need to be treated with caution as some respondents indicated "living with parents" on the basis that they felt the accommodation issue to be as much about future accommodation for their children as for the whole family. It was notable however that a significant proportion of respondents in this group (13) rented privately, with 8 stating "living with parents", and 6 owning their home with a mortgage.

Reasons for housing need were very broad for this group, primarily the existing home being either too small, or too expensive, or lack of security from private tenancies. The group included instances of family break up, as well as a smaller number of those needing disabled accommodation.

Nine households confirmed being in current need whilst 15 expected to fall into housing need within 1 to 3 years, and only 3 forecast need over 3-5 years.

The following table summarises the income, savings and tenure aspirations of the group:
### APPENDIX 5 cont’d

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income</th>
<th>Savings</th>
<th>Tenure sought*</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Design</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£11 x up to £14,999</td>
<td>£11 x less than £1,000</td>
<td>12 x rented</td>
<td>14 x bedroom</td>
<td>26 x house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 x £15,000</td>
<td>3 x £3,000 - £5,000</td>
<td>12 x</td>
<td>11 x bedroom</td>
<td>18 x bungalow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£19,999</td>
<td></td>
<td>shared ownership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 x £35,000</td>
<td>3 x £5,000 - £10,000</td>
<td>4 x lower value/size</td>
<td>4 x 1 bedroom</td>
<td>5 x flat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£39,999</td>
<td></td>
<td>home ownership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 x £20,000</td>
<td>3 x £25,000 or more</td>
<td>1 x sheltered</td>
<td>1 x 4 bedroom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£24,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 x £30,000</td>
<td>1 x £1,000 to £3,000</td>
<td>NB 6 x want to own</td>
<td>1 x 4+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£34,999</td>
<td></td>
<td>their own home.</td>
<td></td>
<td>bed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 x £60,000 or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 x £40,000</td>
<td>1 x £10,000 - £15,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£49,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 x £25,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£28,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Multiple choice, multiple answer questions

**Table 8: Families with young children (under 18) (Housing Need Survey 2014)**

Results from the families with young children group indicate a total potential need from 27 households. However, the following respondents fall into very low categories of need and should be reasonably discounted from further analysis of Parish housing needs:

- 2 respondents who did not express a clear desire for Corfe Mullen as a location for future housing.
- 2 respondents with income of £60,000 or more who could reasonably be expected to have a mortgage capacity to meet their housing needs on the open market.
- 2 respondents with an income and equity which would be very close to the threshold for meeting their housing needs on the open market, 1 of whom also stated that their needs could be met through an extension to their existing home.
- 2 respondents who completed the needs survey forms but stated that they wanted to own their own home outright. It is therefore considered that these respondents do not meet the criteria for those stating housing need.

This leaves a total of 19 respondents within the families with young children category who have reasonable housing need to be analysed further in Chapter 5 of this report.

**Families with older children (over 18)**

This group comprised 10 households.

Three of the 10 households had been born in Corfe Mullen, 1 other having close family connections. One respondent lived outside the Parish. Of the 10 households, 9 respondents expressed a first preference for Corfe Mullen, and 1 expressed no preference. A total of 7 other towns were identified including Wimborne (4) and Creekmoor (2).
In this group the majority of households rent. Five households rent privately, 2 households rent from a housing association whilst the remaining 3 households were owner-occupied with a mortgage.

This group, perhaps unsurprisingly, identified the most pressing need for affordable housing, with 6 households stating their need was immediate, 3 in 1-3 years, and just 1 in the 3-5 year period.

Reasons for housing need predictably included the need to set up on their own (5), and issues with security or condition of privately rented accommodation. However 5 respondents also indicated that their present home was too expensive, perhaps as a result of the need to secure a larger home for resident children.

The following table summarises the income, savings and tenure aspirations of the group (1 respondent gave no response at all to these questions):-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income</th>
<th>Savings</th>
<th>Tenure sought</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Design</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 x up to £14,999</td>
<td>6 x less than £1,000</td>
<td>7 x rented</td>
<td>5 x 3 bedroom</td>
<td>8 x house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 x £15,000 to £19,999</td>
<td>2 x £3,000 to £5,000</td>
<td>2 x downsize to smaller</td>
<td>5 x 2 bedroom</td>
<td>5 x 1 bedroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 x £40,000 - £49,999</td>
<td>1 x £15,000 to £25,000</td>
<td>2 x affordable home ownership</td>
<td>1 x 1 bedroom</td>
<td>5 x flat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 x £20,000 - £24,999</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 x £25,000 - £29,999</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9: Families with older children (Over 18) (Housing Need Survey 2014)

Results from the families with older children group indicate a total potential need from 10 households. However, the following respondents fall into very low categories of need and should be reasonably discounted from further analysis of Parish housing needs:

- 1 respondent who had sufficient income and equity after mortgage balance to reasonably be able to meet their aspirations to downsize their property needs on the open market.
- 1 respondent who provided very little information on income, aspirations or preferred location to provide a meaningful survey response.

This leaves 8 respondents in the families with older children category who have a reasonable need for housing to be analysed further in Chapter 5 of this report.
Section 5: Conclusion and Recommendations

The Corfe Mullen Housing Needs Survey was designed to address two primary objectives:

- To establish the level of support from local residents towards the provision of a small affordable housing scheme for the benefit of households with local connections to Corfe Mullen
- To identify the existing level of housing need within the community, and the level of housing need that is likely to arise over the next five years.

Resident's Survey

Given the response rate for the resident's survey and the quantitative and qualitative information submitted, the first research objective has successfully been concluded.

Approximately 16% of the households in Corfe Mullen participated in the research. The response rate has been low, and consequently some caution needs to be attached to any conclusions on the level of likely community support for a small affordable housing scheme, especially if Green Belt land was to be involved.

With 72% of respondents expressing their support for a small-scale affordable housing development, subject to a proven need and finding an appropriate site, it is clear that the need for affordable housing is an issue that Corfe Mullen residents identify with. The challenge for the Parish Council and its partners however, is how to engage further with the 84% of households in the Parish who did not respond to the survey at all, and whose opinion on the issue has not yet been established.

The resident's survey identified strong opinions that such a scheme MUST be for the benefit of local people, i.e. those with a local connection to the Parish of Corfe Mullen. The survey also revealed a lot of concern that additional housing, of whatever type and tenure, is having an impact on infrastructure within the village, especially transport infrastructure.

The resident's survey has also provided a valuable insight into the real impact of local housing problems with 112 respondents confirming that 187 family members have left the community in the past due to the cost of market housing and the lack of affordable housing.

Supporting information provided as part of the resident's survey confirmed that the sample can be viewed as a fair socio-economic representation of the community as a whole. The data has also given a useful insight into the demographic make-up of the Parish, and the profiles and trends of its residents.

As can be seen from their views on the types of households requiring additional housing, residents rightly identified a wide range of needs. The community will undoubtedly expect to see plans and proposals that not only take account of younger households, but also the needs of older people and those with limited mobility, as well as those who could release larger affordable homes if they are given options to 'downsize'.
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It has also been very pleasing to see the level of responses from residents willing to suggest potential sites for an affordable housing scheme, (some 52 different locations). Many factors need to be taken into consideration before producing a shortlist and then identifying the most appropriate site; however, the extensive list of resident’s suggestions (see Appendix 1) provides an invaluable starting point for further investigation and appraisals into suitable openings.

**Housing Need Survey**

Turning to the Housing Need Survey, the initial analysis of responses in Chapter 4 showed a total of 72 respondents to the survey, broken down into the following categories:
- Single persons – 15 respondents
- Couples – 20 respondents
- Families with young children – 27 respondents
- Families with older children – 10 respondents

This reveals that 11% of the households completing the resident’s survey, also feel they themselves have some form of housing need (1.8% of total households in Corfe Mullen). Again, this does not represent a significant response rate, but the aim of the housing needs survey is to provide a detailed breakdown of potential housing need in order to inform decisions about whether to undertake community consultation on a potential site, where that site might be, what type of housing is needed, and when it might come forward.

As part of the initial survey analysis in Chapter 4, a sieving exercise was carried out which has removed any respondents who, for various reasons, have indicated they are in housing need, but realistically, are unlikely to meet the criteria needed to satisfy the objectives of the Parish Housing Needs Study.

This sieving has resulted in a total of 46 respondents being considered in this chapter as forming the basis of housing need in Corfe Mullen over the next 5 years. The remaining 26 respondents to the housing needs survey have not been included for the following reasons:
- 11 owned their current property outright with substantial equity allowing them to meet future housing needs on the open market.
- 6 had sufficient income, and/or mortgage capacity and equity to enable them to meet their future housing needs on the open market.
- 4 did not state their first preference location as Corfe Mullen.
- 2 younger households had income/savings potential that was very close to the threshold for entry to the open market that they would be very low priority for housing need.
- 2 simply stated their housing need as being "owning their own home outright"; and were therefore assumed not to actually favour any recognised form of affordable housing.
- 1 did not provide sufficient responses to the survey questions to enable adequate analysis of need or capacity.
The following tables summarise the final list of households who expressed housing need by their respective cohort, excluding those interested in a location outside the Parish and those who could not reasonably be deemed to be in housing need.

**Table 10: Current housing need (HNS 2014)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Tenure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single persons</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 x HBF</td>
<td>1 x 2 bedroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couples</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 x B</td>
<td>1 x 3 bedroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Families with young children</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1 x H</td>
<td>2 x 2 bedroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 x HB</td>
<td>2 x 3 bedroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 x 4 bedroom</td>
<td>2 x AHO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Families with older children</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2 x HB</td>
<td>1 x 1 bedroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 x HF</td>
<td>2 x 2 bedroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 x F</td>
<td>3 x 3 bedroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2 x H</td>
<td>1 x 1 bedroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7 x HB</td>
<td>5 x 2 bedroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 x HBF</td>
<td>6 x 3 bedroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 x HF</td>
<td>1 x 3/4 bedroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 x B</td>
<td>1 x 4 bedroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 x F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 11: Housing need 1 to 3 years (HNS 2014)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Tenure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single persons</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2 x HF</td>
<td>3 x 1 bedroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 x F</td>
<td>1 x 2 bedroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couples</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1 x HB</td>
<td>3 x 1 bedroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 x H</td>
<td>3 x 2 bedroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 x HF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 x HBF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Families with young children</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4 x H</td>
<td>1 x 1/2 bedroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 x HB</td>
<td>3 x 2 bedroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 x HBF</td>
<td>5 x 3 bedroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Families with older children</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 x HBF</td>
<td>1 x 2 bedroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 x 2/3 bedroom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5 x H</td>
<td>6 x 1 bedroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 x HB</td>
<td>1 x 1/2 bedroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 x HF</td>
<td>8 x 2 bedroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 x HBF</td>
<td>1 x 2/3 bedroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 x F</td>
<td>5 x 3 bedroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 x no response</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In summary, the findings of the Housing Need Survey have indicated that 14 households are currently in need; 21 households anticipate being in housing need within 1 to 3 years, and that a further 11 households expect to be in housing need within 3 to 5 years.

However before assessing the implications of this housing need it is necessary to take account of the likely supply of affordable housing through relets or re-sales of the existing housing stock, and through any likely new developments. During the 12 month period to February 2015, East Dorset District Council allocated 18 households to rented housing vacancies in Corfe Mullen (6 sheltered and 12 general needs).

Clearly, the amount of potential re-lets of existing stock will vary year to year, and it would therefore be appropriate to factor in a 50% reduction on this figure as a conservative assumption of future availability. Projected over the next 5 years, this vacancy rate (reduced by 50%) suggests that up to 15 sheltered and 45 general re-let opportunities might arise in the existing housing stock, whilst 46 local households will need accommodation.

In addition to potential re-lets of existing affordable accommodation, the Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy also allocates a new neighbourhood in Corfe Mullen.

Policy CM1 of the Core Strategy allocates land at Lockyer's School and north of the Wimborne Road for a new neighbourhood including 250 homes, local facilities and services and a new Lockyer’s School. This land has been removed from the

---

**Table 12: Housing Need 3 to 5 years (including unspecified) (HNS 2014)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Tenure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single persons</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3 x F</td>
<td>4 x 1 bedroom</td>
<td>2 x Rented, 1 x Rented or AHO, 1 x Sheltered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 x BF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couples</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2 x HB</td>
<td>2 x 2 bedroom</td>
<td>2 x AHO, 1 x rented or lower value market or AHO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 x B</td>
<td>1 x 2/3 bedroom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Families with young children</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2 x HB</td>
<td>1 x 1 bedroom</td>
<td>1 x rented, 1 x rented or AHO, 1 x lower value market, 1 x lower value market or AHO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 x HBF</td>
<td>2 x 2 bedroom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 x HF</td>
<td>1 x 2/3 bedroom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Families with older children</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4 x HB</td>
<td>5 x 1 bedroom</td>
<td>3 x rented, 2 x rented or AHO, 1 x sheltered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 x HBF</td>
<td>4 x 2 bedroom</td>
<td>2 x AHO, 1 x lower value market, 1 x AHO or lower value market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 x HF</td>
<td>2 x 2/3 bedroom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 x BF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 x B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 x F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Green Belt as part of the Core Strategy. It seems likely that a planning application for the northern part of the allocation will be submitted within the next few months. This has potential to deliver up to 75 affordable homes based on current Core Strategy policy requirements. In the longer term, there is potential for the remainder of the site to deliver a further 50 affordable homes.

Map 1 – Corfe Mullen New Neighbourhood (Core Strategy Policy CM1)

This allocation, together with a small potential for re-lets of existing affordable homes, appears to have the capacity to address the need over the next 5 years as established by this survey. There may however be some delay in meeting the needs of those households (14) who have stated their need as immediate. However this group’s needs will be difficult to meet until any site is brought forward.
Findings and Recommendations:-

Based on the outcomes of the Corfe Mullen Housing Needs Survey, the following recommendations are made:

- That there is clearly a need for affordable housing of varying types and tenures in Corfe Mullen over the next 5 years.
- That this need is most acute for families with younger or older children, but in the longer term the needs of couples and single people needs to be addressed.
- That the outcomes of the survey, as refined by analysis, are considered robust, subject to the caveat that the response rate was low.
- That the overall need identified is for approximately 35 households in the 2015-2018 period, or for approximately 46 households in the 2015-2020 period.
- That, based on currently available information, this need can reasonably be assumed to be met from the first phases of development of the Corfe Mullen new neighbourhood, allocated in the Core Strategy. This is likely to provide up to 75 affordable dwellings in the short to medium term, and potentially up to 125 affordable dwellings by the end of the plan period in 2028. This, together with a smaller potential from re-lets of existing stock, appear adequate to address the need identified in this survey over the next 5 years, assuming that the first phase of the new neighbourhood comes forward as anticipated.
- That, notwithstanding the recommendation above, it would still be potentially useful for the Parish Council to undertake some further exploratory work, and perhaps community consultation, on a shortlist of potential sites for a small scale affordable housing scheme, should the new neighbourhood not come forward in the timescales currently envisaged.
Appendix 1: List of suggested potential sites.

The following sites or locations were referred to by respondents to the resident’s survey. The exact locations of certain sites are unclear, and will need further investigations. The number of respondents mentioning each site is shown.

Pardy’s Hill – 46
Former Virgin Active Club site – 33
Waterloo Road – 21
Opposite Lockyer’s School – 15
Site of Beacon Hill Waste Disposal Site – 12
Holm Bush – 12
Springdale Road – 10
Near Corfe Hills School – 8
The Allotments – 7
Land off Hayward’s Lane – 6
North of Lambs Green – 5
Recreation Ground – 5
Naked Cross – 4
Candy’s Lane – 4
Wareham Road opposite the Post Office
Rushall Lane – 3
Methodist Church, East Road – 3
Broadmoor Road/Sleight Lane – 3
Springdale Road, SW of Post Office – 2
Blandford Road, adj Cemetery – 2
North of Recreation Ground – 2
East of Violet Farm Close – 2
The old school site – 2
101 Wareham Road – 2
Pardy’s Lane opposite the Post Office – 2

Land north of Lamb and Flag pub - 1
10 acres at Wimborne Road/Willet Road - 1
Olivia Close - 1
Chapel Lane - 1
Corbin’s Yard - 1
Brownfield Farms - 1
Disused Railway Line - 1
South Roman Heights - 1
Hillside Road – Coventry Close - 1
Knoll Lane North - 1
Lambs Green Lane - 1
Old pub/Tots nursery school - 1
Brog Street - 1
Grants Copse - 1
Near Castle Court School - 1
Lower Wareham Road - 1
Brookside Road - 1
North end of the village near the church - 1
Merley Lane - 1
Rushcombe Bottom smallholding - 1
Broadstone Golf Club - 1
152 Springdale Road - 1
Next to the village hall - 1
Victoria Close Car Park - 1
33 Blandford Road - 1
East end - 1
Brook Lane - 1
Dear Sir / Madam,

Re: DCC/LLFA Reconsultation – Surface Water Management.

Proposal: Development of 12 affordable dwellings and associated access onto Pardsy Hill. Outline application with all matters reserved – Supply of additional information indicating a revised scheme of 9 dwellings, and amended site layout.

Location: Land to the North of Pardsy Hill, West of Sleight Lane, Corfe Mullen, BH21 3HW.

We write in response to your reconsultation request(s) of 06 & 19/09/2018, to Dorset County Council's (DCC) Flood Risk Management (FRM) team, as relevant Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) and statutory planning consultee for surface water management, associated with major development. Given that the revised proposals outline a development of (only) 9 dwellings, rather than 12 units as previously, it does not qualify as major development as defined within the Town & Country Planning, Development Management Procedure, England Order 2015. On this basis we (DCC FRM) do not have a statutory role with regard to the revised and reduced development proposals. However, given our previous involvement at this location and objection to previous submissions it is considered appropriate that we offer discretionary comment with regard to the amended scheme.

By way of context we reiterate that the site falls entirely within Flood Zone 1 (low risk), as indicated by the Environment Agency’s (EA) Indicative modelling of fluvial flood risk, although land located immediately west of the site is seen to fall within Flood Zone 3 (high risk of fluvial flooding). However, much of the lower / southern half of the site is shown by mapping of (theoretical) surface water flooding to be at severe risk during significant rainfall events (1:30/100/100yr), from received flows and runoff derived from elevated land to the north and north-east.

Further to the above, the site is understood to be in proximity to a minor (Ordinary) watercourse, aligned close to the eastern boundary, which may generate a degree of flood risk, pending further investigation. In accordance with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) – Revised July 2018, it is a requirement that all development proposals consider flood risk from all sources, and are supported by an appropriate strategy of surface water management that both protects the site / development, and prevents off-site worsening. Prevailing ground conditions (BGS - clay) and topography, are likely to make the use of infiltration methodologies inappropriate for the management of surface water runoff generated by the proposed development.

The following additional / revised documents have recently been forwarded to DCC FRM for our consideration;
• Flood Risk Assessment – Fourth Revision (FRAv4) as compiled by Frank Tyhurst, dated Sept 2018.

• Proposed Site Plan (showing revised layout & reduced scheme) drawn by Ellis Belk ref: 14121-01 Rev C dated 28/08/2018

On the basis of this additional information and amended scheme that is outlined we would make the following observations and discretionary comments:

• The revised layout demonstrates a sequential approach, with proposed dwellings (9) located beyond the mapped extent of (theoretical) surface water flooding discussed within our previously responses.

• The revised site plan provided does not clarify whether the relevant redline boundary is to be amended. As such we assume that the wider site and application area retains all of the southern area previously identified as being at severe risk of surface water risk. Therefore, we reiterate our earlier referral to the Sequential Test, in accordance with Central Government’s Flood Risk & Coastal Change – Planning Practice Guidance document (ref: para:019 Reference ID: 7-019-20140306, Revision date: 06 03 2014), and as highlighted within the recently revised NPPF (July 2018).

• Whilst the supporting FRA (v4) has been amended to acknowledge the revised scheme and reduction in proposed dwellings, we advise that the supporting Drainage Strategy document (ref: Smith Foster - 31040, dated April 2018) be equally updated, together with other supporting documents and drawings.

• We note that the revised FRA (v4) continues to refer to a 1 in 30 year event, as being a reasonable design criteria. The relevant surface water management scheme should comply with current guidance and adhere to a 1:100 year design criteria, with appropriate allowance for climate change (40%). The in-principle agreement previously offered by WV should not be taken as agreement of the 5i/s discharge rate that has been presented, subject to further substantiation.

• We advise that relevant precommencement conditions are attached to any subsequent permission in respect of the necessary detailed design and future management of the surface water drainage scheme.

• Given the proximity of the site to an Ordinary Watercourse we highlight that any works, whether temporary or permanent, offering an obstruction to flow within this channel i.e. diversion, realignment, culverting or connection, will require prior Land Drainage Consent from DCC’s FRM function, in accordance with s23 of the Land Drainage Act 1991.

Should you require any further clarification of our position, or indeed the discretionary comments made, please do not hesitate to contact me. In-light of the non-major status of the amended proposal we (DCC FRM) do not anticipate that further consultation with ourselves will be necessary.

Yours faithfully

{ SHAPE .V MERGEFORMAT }
Gary Cleaver
Engineer
Flood Risk Management