



From: David Morley
E: David.morley@sandbankscg.com

To: Clare McCarthy
Senior Planning Officer
BCP Development Management

By email: clare.mccarthy@bcpcouncil.gov.uk

03 December 2020

Dear Clare

Haven Hotel APP/17/00379/P

Thank you for your email of 17 November inviting our additional comments on this application.

I write on behalf of the Sandbanks Community Group (SCG) and our c.500 members and the 3000+ people who have registered formal objections to this application. Our objections - and the vast majority of other objections registered - relate almost entirely to the Haven Hotel elements of the application.

Introduction

1. It has been over 3 ½ years since this application was first filed. Since then, a significant number of changes have been made to the plans and specifications.

2. There are now over 4100 documents consisting of thousands of pages on the planning portal with variation heaped upon variation. Many of the documents are very dated.
3. It is difficult, if not impossible, for the public to make sense or have a clear understanding of precisely what is now proposed or even which documents now constitute the application. Many people believe this is a deliberate tactic by the applicants - to confuse the public and obscure the true nature of their plans.
4. We do not believe the planning committee can make a proper decision until the applicants file one consolidated set of plans and documents and allow the public to view it in understandable terms.
5. From what we have been able to discern, we acknowledge that some of the changes have improved the application compared to the original application. Those changes include:
 - a. Reduction of the height from 20 storeys pre-app to six storeys
 - b. Exclusion of 159 Banks Road from the plans
 - c. Improved footpath along the seafront including disabled access
 - d. More open space
 - e. Reduced impact on trees
6. However, we continue to maintain strong objections to the plans insofar as they affect the Haven site, as explained below.
7. If despite our objections and those of many local people, the Planning Committee decides to approve the application - which we would not support - then any approval must lock in the benefits promised by the application and not just the burdens, as also explained below in Objections 14 & 15.

Objections to the current proposals

We have 15 main objections as outlined below and explained in more detail in the Appendix to this letter:

- Objection No 1 - **Loss of Haven Hotel and local amenity**
- Objection No 2 - **Opportunity Missed**
- Objection No 3 - **Massing, Height & Dominance**
- Objection No 4 - **Overdevelopment and intensification**
- Objection No 5 - **Traffic & congestion**
- Objection No 6 - **Flood Risk**
- Objection No 7 - **Sewage & Foul Water Discharge**
- Objection No 8 - **Inconsistent with Poole Local Plan, NPPF framework & policy**
- Objection No 9 - **Visual Impact & Landscape character**
- Objection No 10 - **Not an “Enabling” application**
- Objection No 11 - **Viability**

Objection No 12 - **Inadequate and inaccurate application information**

Objection No 13 - **159 Banks Road**

Objection No 14 - **Conditionality**

Objection No 15 - **Public access**

I look forward to receiving your comments on our objections.

As outlined in my letter to Nick Perrins dated 27 October, we would also welcome the opportunity to present our objections to the Planning Committee, both ahead of the Planning Committee meeting to determine the application and at that meeting.

Please place this letter on the public planning portal as soon as possible.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'D H Morley', with a horizontal line underneath.

D H Morley
Chairman Sandbanks Community Group

Cc Nick Perrins

By email: nick.perrins@bcpcouncil.gov.uk

APPENDIX - DETAILS OF OBJECTIONS

Objection No 1

Loss of hotel & local amenity

1. This site has had a hotel and a wide range of hotel amenities on it for over 160 years. It is one of the few hotels in the UK that sits on a Blue Flag beach.
2. For all those years the hotel has provided free public access overlooking the spectacular entrance to Poole Harbour, with a panorama from the Needles to Old Harry Rocks, sunrise to sunset views, boat traffic and the wildlife of Studland.
3. This application will result in total loss of that hotel and its amenities, including loss of the restaurant, bar, gym, tennis courts, indoor/outdoor swimming pool, meeting space and broad access to the site for visitors.
4. A restaurant and some permissive access (on terms that remain unclear) to what will primarily be an exclusive residential site is no substitute for the loss of all those amenities. Not just for local people but also the public - residents, tourists, ramblers, dog walkers and other visitors both from the local area and all around the world.
5. The proposed restaurant- no doubt up-market and exclusive - is not an appropriate substitute for the facilities currently available for the public for regular, everyday use. We have not seen any evidence that a restaurant of the size & type proposed will be viable. It will be less accessible to passing trade and more exclusive than the current facilities.
6. All this represents a significant loss of attraction and interest that diminishes and reduces the quality of the public realm and visitor choice for the entire Bournemouth and Poole area.
7. This will also represent a significant loss of amenity for the local community. They would lose access to the swimming pools, the public facilities of the hotel and an important meeting place for local people.
8. Although the application, when combined with the applications for the Sandbanks Hotel and Harbour Heights Hotel, shows only a small net loss of hotel rooms for the area, this fails to consider the loss of a variety of accommodation represented by the loss of the Haven Hotel with its unique views.
9. It also represents a sad lack of ambition for the area. This area needs *more* hotel accommodation with greater variety to fulfil its potential and generate local economic growth, not *less*.

10. The applicants may argue that the area does not support three hotels within such a short distance of one another. They may put forward the weak trading results of the three hotels over the past few years to support that argument.
11. But the low trading figures are **not** the result of lack of demand. They result from a lack of investment over the decades by the owners of the past 40 years. That lack of investment has left the hotels in a sorry state.
12. The Planning Committee is being presented with a false dilemma by the applicants. Sacrifice the Haven to enable two new hotels or let the existing hotels further decay and rot.
13. Those are **not** the only choices. There are others, for example:
 - a. **Choice 1:** Somebody could build and finance three hotels - the report we filed from BNP Paribas shows that is financially possible, or
 - b. **Choice 2:** Somebody could develop one or more of the three sites as mixed-use developments with hotels a mix of hotels and residential accommodation, or
 - c. **Choice 3:** Somebody could develop The Harbour Heights Hotel as apartments rather than the Haven Hotel; it is a more appropriate location for residential development.

Objection No 2

Opportunity missed

1. This application is a once in a lifetime opportunity to enhance this excellent site with a great building local people can be proud of.
2. This site deserves an exemplary piece of architecture benefiting its prominent location at the entrance to Poole Harbour. The proposed blocks of flats are anything but ideal. They are characterless, unimaginative, monolithic and out of scale. They do not fit the character of the area.
3. This landmark building, framed by tall trees, sits at the gateway to Poole Harbour, creating a strong first impression for visitors and investors from around the world. Compare what is proposed here – for the second largest natural harbour in the world – with the splendour and majesty of the Sydney Opera House that awaits visitors to the world’s largest natural harbour.
4. Whatever is done with this site will define the area for generations to come. To introduce a monolithic architecture that lacks any imagination, interest or aesthetic

appeal from any perspective or viewpoint - and reduces public amenity - will weaken the appeal of the entire Bournemouth & Poole area.

5. The current proposals represent a missed opportunity for Poole to secure the Haven site as a vibrant destination for current and future generations.
6. The proposed development has no defining placemaking characteristics to excite and inspire as a local landmark. Redevelopment on the Haven Hotel site is a once-in-a-generation opportunity for the planning system local to Poole to demonstrate that it is intent on demanding standards of excellence for its most visually prominent and sensitive areas. Yet the application at best can be described as offering standard or average private residential-led development.
7. Poole deserves much better, for the next hundred years, on the Haven Hotel site.

Objection No 3

Massing, height and dominance

1. This is a significantly out of scale development for such a sensitive and uniquely important site. The scale, bulk and mass of the proposal is inconsistent with the prevailing pattern of development.
2. We have significant concerns with the height and scale of the proposed residential apartment blocks, and the impact they would have on the views and setting of the Dorset AONB and the use of the nearby Dorset Heathlands.
3. There is no building or site on the Sandbanks headland with anything close to the bulk and dominance these proposed apartment blocks would have.
4. Equally, the proposed development will **not** closely match the height of the existing hotel building, as stated in the LVIA. The proposed buildings would have a ridgeline 1.8m above the current hotel's pitched roof ridgeline (roughly half a storey) with a dramatic change of scale of buildings on the site making it visually intrusive on the street scene.
5. Also, the visualisations of the new buildings suggest that, unlike the existing hotel, the proposed blocks B and C would not have a backdrop of trees.
6. As **BCP's own Urban Design** team note in their objections (dated 08.05.2019):

"The scale, bulk and mass of the proposal is overtly dominant and damaging to key characteristics of the Sandbanks area where development is subservient to the landscape setting."

7. No building on the Sandbanks' headland is above five storeys or with this scale or dominance. It sets a dangerous precedent for the future of Sandbanks.

8. As **Dorset AONB** rightly note in their objections (dated 22.03.2019), it is evident that this proposal:

"... significantly increases the apparent height and mass of the development within site. The proposed apartment blocks coalesce and thereby visually appear to fill the development site with structures that are perceived to be taller than an existing hotel with a notably greater overall mass."

"This results in a much more dominant built feature that is not well contained and framed in relation to the tree line."

"The scale and form of the proposed development would be read as a large-scale component of the built environment at Sandbanks and of the development within its immediate context."

"In comparison to the surrounding built environment, it would result in a relatively dominant appearance and would stand apart as a more dominant built feature".

10. We share the view of **Dorset AONB** that the proposed apartment blocks:

"...have a relatively homogenous appearance which appear to accentuate the overall scale and mass of the proposed development."

11. **We note that National Trust, Natural England, Dorset CPRE, Society for Poole and Dorset AONB all maintain objections to the Haven proposals on these and other grounds.**

12. All of these points have been made by numerous bodies many times. The changes the applicants have made in response have mostly been tinkering - making relatively minor modifications. The applicants now say they refuse to make any further modifications, for example, to reduce the buildings to five storeys, not six arguing the other benefits of all three applications outweigh any perceived harm. This is not good enough. The planning committee should refuse the application on these grounds alone to ensure the applicants to moderate their plans.

Objection No. 4

Overdevelopment and intensification

1. The Haven Hotel site is likely not a local planning policy-compliant location for the proposed higher density. The Local Plan (specifically PP2) clearly does not identify the site as appropriately accessible for the application's type of intensive development.

2. The proposal is an inappropriate overdevelopment and would harm the character and safety of the area and its setting.
3. The flats will not ease the local housing shortage, and as proposed (contrary to PP2) would not deliver sustainable development. They will likely be expensive second homes empty for large parts of the year.
4. The proposals risk making Sandbanks an even more exclusive Ghost Town.
5. The proposals will turn what is currently an active and lively site that is part of the public realm into an exclusive, semi-private enclave. It will sterilise this crucial part of Sandbanks to the detriment of the whole of the surrounding area.

Objection no 5

Traffic, parking and congestion

1. The traffic survey was undertaken only in December 2016, a time period near the lowest point in seasonal traffic. Its traffic data is therefore not representative of annual or seasonal traffic, and not a safe basis on which to consider local annual traffic or the proposed development's traffic impacts.
2. The addition of 119 new apartments with 158 car parking spaces will increase the traffic congestion pressure and impact of exhaust fumes on the air quality for residents felt on the peninsula in the summer months. Access for so many cars will put increased pressure on ferry queue management outside the main entrance and flare-ups during summer.
3. That pressure was demonstrated acutely this summer including the declaration of a Major Incident on 25 June 2020 when the whole area was overwhelmed by visitors in their cars.
4. The application clearly shows a shortfall of 18 parking spaces.
5. The application should be refused until a) a proper assessment of the traffic issues, including the impact of the development during peak summer periods, has been carried out and b) proper provision for all the required car parking spaces is made.
6. We note Dorset police commented that:

“The traffic survey work was undertaken in December [2016]. Access to the site during the summer has been quite problematic as a small hotel. There is potential for an exacerbation of the angry exchanges that already take place at this location. It is

unlikely that residents will want to travel by bus or bicycle to the extent that the Transport Assessment suggests”.

Objection No 6

Flood risk

1. Local people remain very concerned about the risk of catastrophic flooding of the peninsula as a result of the Haven development either during construction or afterwards.
2. We note the Environmental Agency still objects to the application on the grounds of inadequate Flood Risk Assessment.
3. Despite the applicants' protestations, a Sequential Test must be applied in a disaggregated manner to identify possible sites for 119 flats elsewhere in the Borough rather than co-located on the Haven site.
4. The flood risk assessments by the applicants have used wave data for the interior of Poole Harbour. In the absence of any specific wave data for outside the harbour we believe serious doubts must exist as to the adequacy of the proposed flood defences.
5. The application should be refused unless the applicants carry out a proper Sequential Test and produce relevant wave data to support their proposals.
6. This apparent disregard for flood risk and the safety of the peninsula is a serious concern for the local community.

Objection No 7

Sewage & foul water discharge

1. There are storm sewage overflows a) 500m off Shore Road Beach and b) into Poole Harbour, just beneath Evening Hill. They are both designated swimming areas (or very close to such sites) and regularly used for water sports of all types.
2. After periods of heavy rainfall, these discharge raw sewage into the sea and the harbour. Last year there were 59 discharges from the Shore Road beach pipe alone. These discharges present a potential public health risk, not to mention the damaging impact on the environment.

3. The problem is that surface water from existing and new developments is not required to be separated from foul water and can be discharged straight into the sewers. After heavy rainfall, the sewage treatment plants cannot cope with the volume and divert excess sewage to discharge pipes.
4. We are concerned that the Haven, Sandbanks and Harbour Heights developments will put more pressure on the sewage system and cause more raw sewage discharges into swimming areas. Even if they don't put more pressure on the existing system, the plans for new development should be an opportunity to ease the stress by making proper provision for ensuring surface water does not flow into the sewage system.
5. We note Wessex Water state in their objections (dated 05.05.2017) that: "*There are inconsistencies between the proposed arrangements being put forward for surface water disposal in the submitted documents. The proposed strategy should be clarified.*"
6. We believe this application should be refused unless satisfactory arrangements are made to ensure surface water from the new buildings is **not** put into the sewage system. This is a one-off opportunity to provide for the problem to be improved, not made worse, by new development.

Objection No 8

Inconsistencies with Poole Local Plan adopted November 2018

1. The application falls to be determined under the Local Plan adopted in 2018, yet it still includes references to or consideration of the previous local plan in relation to which it cannot properly be considered. This alone calls into question whether the application presents its proposals in the proper development plan context.
2. In any case, the application is not policy compliant. Specifically, its proposals are not compliant with Local Plan policies including:
 1. PP2: Amount and broad location of development
 2. PP8: Type and mix of housing
 3. PP11: Affordable Housing
 4. PP23: Tourism and the evening/ night-time economy
 5. PP27: Design
 6. PP29: Tall Buildings
 7. PP30: Heritage assets
 8. PP40: Viability.

Objection No 9

Visual Impact & landscape character; trees

1. The development fails to respect the shoreline character of the area and the broader landscape; the setting and characteristics of the Sandbanks Peninsula including harbour views through building gaps, the mature wooded character and the established beach line.
2. In relation to trees we have a number of objections including but not limited to:
 - a. It is unclear exactly what mature trees will be lost at the Haven site as a result of these plans - it is difficult to follow from the documents exactly what is now proposed.
 - b. We believe at least four trees significant to the street scene (especially T1g), and subject to existing TPOs, will be lost:
 - c. We do not agree with the tree officer that these are 'low quality' trees.
 - d. The proposed mitigation measures are inadequate and do not provide the same amenity for the street scene.
 - e. The growth of proposed new Holm Oak trees will be stunted by their proximity to the development and underground parking.
 - f. The applicant's plans show tree roots protection zones extending under Banks Road in breach of para 4.6.2 & 4.6.3 of BS5837:2012.
 - g. Tree root protection for Tg4 is not shown on the drawings and would restrict building to Block B.
 - h. The canopy of Group T4g at its nearest point is only 1m from the proposed balcony of Block B whereas standards recommend at least 2m – the proposal is incompatible with BS 5.2.3.

2. We agree with the views of **Natural England** in their objections (dated 09.04.2019) that:

"...the conclusions reached in the LVIA appear to be inconsistent with the evidence referred to. The increased effects of scale, mass and height of the proposed blocks coalesce to appear as a uniform and predominantly glass-fronted block and often appear as a single unit which is a dominant feature in the landscaping store, therefore, it is difficult to [accept] the LVIA's judgement of moderate but not adverse effects in the operational phase".

3. We share the view of the **National Trust** in its objections (dated 22.05.2017) that:

"...the proposed development would be notably more prominent in many local and long distant views, without a backdrop of trees, and is therefore likely to have an adverse impact on landscape and visual amenities, including the setting of the AONB and Heritage Coast."

4. We also agree with the objections of **Dorset CPRE** in their objections (dated 04.07.2018) that:

“the view from the protected land at Shell Bey would be severely impacted by the proposed re-use of the Haven Hotel site.”

Objection No 10

Not an “Enabling” application

1. We argue that:
 - a. the Council cannot adequately or lawfully consider the proposed development of the Haven site as effectively a single planning application while the application remains a proposal for the combined development of the Haven Hotel, Sandbanks Hotel and Harbour Heights Hotel sites. It should only do so if the proposed Haven Hotel development is the subject of its own separate and standalone new application; and
 - b. it would not be lawful for the Council to grant planning permission for what would otherwise be an unacceptable development at the Haven site, induced by the supposed benefits connected with the Sandbanks Hotel and Harbour Heights Hotel sites which would have no real or direct connection with the proposed development at the Haven site.
2. The whole of this application is founded on the basis that the demolition of the Haven Hotel and its replacement with blocks of apartments is essential to finance the redevelopment of the Sandbanks Hotel and Harbour Heights Hotel as “*enabling development*”.
3. Therefore, the application acknowledges that by itself, it is unacceptable in planning terms so far as it relates to the Haven Hotel.
4. It follows, given the reliance on enabling development, that the Council must first form a view on the Haven Hotel as a stand-alone development. Otherwise, it could not adequately take into account the proposed planning obligation for contributing funds to redevelop the Sandbanks Hotel and Harbour Heights Hotel sites.
5. We filed a legal opinion from Guy Williams of Landmark Chambers dated 18 October 2018 supporting the above position. There has been no response from or comment by the Council about this crucial legal issue since that date.

Objection No 11

Viability

1. This entire application is founded on the basis that it is necessary to demolish the Haven Hotel and replace it with tower blocks of apartments to finance the redevelopment of the Sandbanks and Harbour Heights Hotels.
2. This issue lies at the heart of this application. We believe it lacks credibility for the following reasons:
 - a. The Applicant insisted first in its initial public consultation exercise that a 20-story development was required at the Haven site to finance the redevelopment of the other two areas. Then, in its original application, that ten storeys (195 apartments) would be sufficient and now, in the current application, that six storeys (119 apartments) are enough.
 - b. This inconsistency of approach and argument by the Applicant cast doubt on the credibility of their assertions about financial dependency. It throws into question the central issue about whether and to what extent it is necessary to sacrifice the Haven to an unacceptable development to achieve the claim to the public benefit of the redevelopment of the other two sites paragraph
3. The only real reason for sacrificing the Haven is to reduce the extent of borrowing to finance the redevelopment of the other two sites and/or to generate a higher overall profit for the landowner. The suspicion is heightened by the landowner's intention, revealed in the original application, to sell the Haven site once planning permission is granted, rather than redevelop the site itself.
4. SCG commissioned a report from specialist financial advisors in this field, BNP Paribas Real Estate filed with the Council in December 2018 which concludes:

*"We have concluded that the Sandbanks Hotel and Harbour Heights Hotel do not require additional monies to be provided and are therefore able to undergo a redevelopment without any cross-subsidy from the redevelopment of the Haven Hotel. Therefore, we have concluded that **the viability assessment submitted by the Applicant does not justify the demolition of the Haven Hotel and replacement with a residential scheme** to finance the redevelopment of the remaining two hotels."* [emphasis added]

5. We have seen no response to the BNP Paribas Real Estate report.
6. We also note that the Savills 'Business Viability Report' dated 1 August 2018 on which the applicant relies pre-dates the BNP report and is now well over two years old.
7. We understand the Council has sought an independent opinion from the District Valuer over 18 months ago. Despite repeated requests to the Planning Dept. during

that time the Council has informed us (by letter dated 26 November 2020) that The District Valuer's report has still not been finalised.

8. For that reason, the Council have declined to disclose the contents of the District Valuer's report (or the Council's instructions to the DVS) despite those requests and a formal FOI/EIA request (which remains only partly fulfilled by the Council).
9. It would be unlawful for the Council to determine this application without full public disclosure of the DV's report and the instructions that gave rise to that report and sufficient time for their contents to be considered by objectors.
10. Also, the BNP report shows that if the Applicant wishes to press ahead with the redevelopment of the Haven Hotel site, it will need to be assessed separately from the other two sites. The BNP appraisal shows that the proposed development of the Haven site generates a surplus of £7m against the viability benchmark. The scale of the proposed development at the Haven site could be reduced and used to provide affordable housing on-site or make different section 106 payments.

Objection No 12

Inadequate and inaccurate application information

1. The application's materials across its documents detailing the proposed development are so manifestly inadequate that it would be unlawful for the Council to determine it on their basis.
2. Under Article 7 of The Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 (**the 2015 DMPO**), an application for outline planning permission must be accompanied by "*plans, drawings and information necessary to describe the development which is the subject of the application*"; besides, plans "*must be drawn to an identified scale and, in the case of plans, must show the direction of North*".
3. However, the application's plans viewed as a whole fail to satisfy these requirements under Article 7 of the 2015 DMPO – in both quality and detail they contain very many errors, inaccuracies and misleading elements.
4. It is not the responsibility of an objector to do the Applicant's job for it; therefore, the following list is not a comprehensive list of all of such failures in the application's plan to satisfy Article 7, but we feel it only right to ensure that the Council has its attention drawn to the following points in particular:

1. **labelling errors** – for instance, both the original application plans and the amended application plans mislabel elevations as sections (with what are elevations being mislabelled as “sections AA” and “sections BB”; these “sections” do not intersect the relevant building, and therefore by convention are elevations).
2. **Scaling errors** – scale bars throughout the original application drawings were shown at the wrong scale; scale bars have been obliterated from the amended application. This is well below even standard (let alone best) practice and calls into question the reliability of the information before the Planning Officers. The only scalable contextual information that has been provided appears to be incorrect when compared to an independent survey. The combined effect is to give the neighbouring houses a much greater impression of scale than is accurate, and therefore downplays the bulk of the proposed Block B (in particular), in comparison.
3. **Elevation errors** – comparing the existing elevations supplied with the current application against detailed elevations submitted for previous planning applications on the Haven site, (1991 and 2003), there are discrepancies in the scale of the existing building. Even allowing for the possibility of scanning effects on old drawings, it is apparent that the elevations from the previous applications bear a much closer relationship to each other than to the proposal. This calls into question the accuracy of the survey and the resulting elevations submitted as part of this application. This is a crucial point for reference of a new proposal and for the assessment of daylight and sunlight impacts.
4. **Misleading drawings** – the application’s drawings as a whole are very misleading because they lack any street scene or elevations which combine the massings of all blocks. Without this information it is simply not possible to evaluate the real impact that the proposed development would have on the surrounding area; given the very sensitive context of the Haven Hotel site, this is a fundamental omission. In addition:
 - i. The drawings also show trees as backdrop to the buildings which are proposed to be felled or do not exist.
 - ii. The sections drawing BB incorrectly shows the height of neighbouring buildings as up to 2m higher than they actually are to try to reduce the impact of the massing and scale of the proposals.
5. **False and inaccurate images** – in support of the Application plans, the Applicant has provided false and inaccurate images which misrepresent the Proposed Development shown on the plans. For example:

- i. The Application CGI images contain a false representation of the seawall height on the seafront at the Haven site which is at least 1m higher than shown in the images giving a totally false impression of the look and feel of the development.
- ii. Also, CGI images 2407328 show the site from an aerial view with a materially inaccurate representation of the boundary line with the adjoining property at 159 Banks Road giving a false impression of space and greenery.
- iii. Many of the background trees in those CGI images do not exist nor are they planned.

Objection 13

159 Banks Road

1. 159 Banks Road, immediately adjacent to the Haven Hotel was included in the original application back in April 2017. It is in the same beneficial ownership as the hotel itself.
2. It was subsequently separated from the application. We understand it no longer forms part of the application for determination. However, the drawings and the key seem slightly confused on this point so we would like to see clarification.
3. Many people believe this may be a tactic to enable the applicants to obtain planning permission for the larger hotel site at a later date. No doubt the applicants intend to apply then to enlarge the development site by including 159 Banks Road in a subsequent application to amend the application.
4. If the Council approves the application, it should only do so on condition that any subsequent amendment to or extension of the development cannot include development of all or part of 159 Banks Road.

Objection No 14

Conditionality

1. If the Council decides to approve the application, no such approval would be legally valid unless it includes a robust mechanism to secure that the funds from the residential development of the Haven Hotel site are appropriately applied to the development of the Sandbanks Hotel and Harbour Heights Hotel.

2. We are advised that a series of comprehensive interlocking mechanisms would be required (including Grampian conditions and unequivocal planning obligations), fully consulted on with the public and statutory consultees.

3. We note the comments of the BCP Tourism Liaison officer on 04.02.2020 that:

“The phasing/timing of the development programme should be kept to an absolute minimum and the work at each site should be actioned in the following order. The Sandbanks Hotel needs to be developed, completed and operational before the development of works at the Haven Hotel commencing. This would mean that there is still a large hotel in operation whilst the other is worked upon. If the Haven were to be developed first, then their rooms would be lost closely followed by the Sandbanks Hotel rooms whilst that development took place. The Harbour Heights development should also only commence following the completion and operational opening of the Sandbanks Hotel.”

4. We agree with the principle but would go further and argue the Sandbanks Hotel and Harbour Heights Hotels should be built and operational before first occupation of the Haven in order to ensure the supposed benefits of this proposed scheme do materialise for the local area and visitors to it.

5. The Council cannot validly approve the application without including conditions to guarantee funding and delivery of all the application’s proposed development for the Haven Hotel, Sandbanks Hotel and Harbour Heights Hotel sites.

6. It would be legally unsafe for the Council to determine the application without a full picture of how the proposed development will be delivered as a whole, including a clearly sufficient delivery mechanism.

Objection 15

Public Access

1. Also, we believe that the application, if approved, should be subject to the following requirements, secured by condition and obligation, as appropriate:

a. in perpetuity dedication of all the public realm for unrestricted public access - not a licence capable of revocation or change,

b. An agreed mechanism whereby the airspace above top-of-structure of the Haven blocks is safeguarded for the life of the building by enforceable means at the behest of BCP Council so as to prevent the possibility of any further height being added by way of subsequent applications or planning rights.

- c. Dedication of the public footpath (i) along the seafront at the Haven Hotel and (ii) between Shore Road (at Jazz Cafe) and Banks Road through the Sandbanks Hotel, in both cases as permanent public rights of way. It would not be sufficient to rely on planning condition rights such as those that currently exist in relation to (ii). Those were ignored by the applicants' closure of that footpath from March-November 2020 until planning enforcement officers insisted on re-opening.

END