

Question 24b. Are there any suitable alternative approaches to provide the infrastructure needed for the current and future needs of the Winchester District?

Customer Reference	Name	Comment Reference	Agent
00007	Cheriton Parish Council	00007/00001/055	
It is central government who is forcing increased burden on this area, their assistance should be available for important infrastructure items.			
00013	Denmead Parish Council	00013/00001/054	
Allow the ability of parish/town councils to build funds for a major project. Allow for developers to pay for a nominated stretch of an open space to build up a 'holding'			
00016	Hambledon Parish Council	00016/00001/066	
Infrastructure costs must be paid by developers and it must be genuinely sufficient for requirements.			
00025	New Alresford Town Council	00025/00001/059	
The tariff system should be separate from open spaces money and recreational provision. Exclude making good nearby roads from site traffic.			
00084	South East England Regional Assembly	00084/00001/010	
Welcome references to SE Plan Implementation Plan. Core Strategy must set out significant infrastructure required, when required and how it will be delivered. Support of Option 3, subject to any tariff contributing to the delivery of regional and sub-regional infrastructure, to be highlighted in the Core Strategy.			
00085	Highways Agency	00085/00001/008	
The proposed policies on infrastructure and implementation are not clear or concise. The strategy should work from the principle of reduce, manage and invest as set out in the Hampshire Local Transport Plan. Mitigate development impact on the SRN by managing down demand for private car trips and encouraging public transport usage. The provision of new infrastructure should only be considered as a last resort.			

Question 24b. Are there any suitable alternative approaches to provide the infrastructure needed for the current and future needs of the Winchester District?

Customer Reference	Name	Comment Reference	Agent
00089	Hampshire County Council	00089/00001/046	
<p>Seek clarification as to the range of benefits likely to come forward through a tariff approach- need to ensure developments remain viable. HCC welcome a mechanism to collect contributions towards provision of public services but a tariff may result in provision of services after completion of the development. This section needs to include a Core Public Service Policy to acknowledge the plans and programmes implemented by service providers such as the County Council.</p>			
00096	Southern Water	00096/00001/004	
<p>Contributions should be sought, when up- sizing of local networks is required to meet demands arising from growth.</p>			
00103	Network Rail	00103/00001/002	
<p>Network Rail should be exempt from normal developer contributions on their projects as any profits from the schemes are reinvested in the railway. Contributions should be sought from developers for station/rail improvements where appropriate. Transport Assessments should be scrutinised for impact on station capacity.</p>			
00134	Mr Peter Franckeiss	00134/00001/054	
<p>Solar panels on all new buildings, Rain capture tanks, Wind turbines.</p>			
00289	Ms K Hill	00289/00002/021	
<p>Provision of infrastructure can be used for bargaining/bribe</p>			
00320	Ms R Wetherill	00320/00002/063	
<p>Isn't this a matter again for central government.</p>			
00381	Mr Paul Byers	00381/00001/046	
<p>Local council to decide - but if the developer provides the facility the council should hold a significant and controlling bond to make sure the developer completes it to acceptable standards - perhaps even doing the facility before it is allowed to build.</p>			
00556	Mr A Gossling	00556/00002/057	
<p>Revise planning permission unless development provide infrastructure needed in full make them pay not local communtiy</p>			

Summaries of responses to Core Strategy Issues and Options (October 2008)

Question 24b. Are there any suitable alternative approaches to provide the infrastructure needed for the current and future needs of the Winchester District?

Customer Reference	Name	Comment Reference	Agent
00840	Mr Paul Reeves	00840/00002/054	
All infrastructure provided in lieu should be guaranteed to agreed standards and contractually binding.			
01008	Mr And Mrs Anthony And Helen Drury	01008/00003/039	
The reality is that the developer does not pay for the infrastructure; the costs are passed on to house buyers with the higher proportion to the normal houses (as opposed to social housing). the perception is that this is merely a way for the council to avoid their responsibility. The unfair burden being passed to those buying affordable houses.			
01151	Mr C H Dore	01151/00002/049	
Perhaps there could be a lottery style approach to encouraging/limiting local developments/improvements such that if local community funds a percentage of the cost of a new scheme/restricting an unpopular scheme, the council funds the balance. Bull Lane Waltham Chase apparently has an issue with drainage which will be exacerbated by development on some gardens but seems not to be a reason for restricting development. Is this not a case where the developers should fund the necessary improvements.			
01243	Ms Serita Campbell	01243/00002/033	
No development needed in small villages, only small towns and cities.			
01501	Revd David Simpson	01501/00005/051	
The situation at Knowle where we have an 'independent' water and sewage plant is unacceptable. It allows developers to exploit residents for maintenance fees. The provision of water by, in our case, Portsmouth Water should be sine qua non.			
01923	Captain John Ellis	01923/00001/063	
Provision of housing within all economic development project.			
01931	Mr Micheal Cunliffe	01931/00002/058	
Developer contributions must be ring-fenced and used for the purposes they were provided.			
01939	Mrs Jean Buckle	01939/00001/055	
Demand promised/agreed infrastructure be in situ before housing.			

Summaries of responses to Core Strategy Issues and Options (October 2008)

Question 24b. Are there any suitable alternative approaches to provide the infrastructure needed for the current and future needs of the Winchester District?

Customer Reference	Name	Comment Reference	Agent
01956	Mrs Barbara Holyome	01956/00002/061	
Provided that the infrastructure linked to existing, as in the case of transport provision.			
01960	Mr Ian Merritt	01960/00001/061	
Large scale housing should be supported by improved infrastructures funded from a government development fund.			
01962	Mr John Harrison	01962/00001/049	
Any development will put a strain on availability of essential utilities such as water availability no matter how big a tariff or other contributions may be negotiated.			
01964	Mr John Beveridge	01964/00001/061	
The assumption would be that a tariff system will apply for developments up to a certain size and then above that, developers could or should provide infrastructure themselves. NB Transport does need specific consideration for the larger developments- E.g. requiring excellent levels of bus services.			
01965	Mrs Joyce Simmons	01965/00001/049	
At current we have a very high level of taxation in this country, local and otherwise, Taxes should be able to contribute to infrastructure funding. Where on earth is it all going			
01973	Mr Ewan Simmonds	01973/00001/067	
I do not know or have an opinion on this matter.			
01989	Dr Keith Paskins	01989/00001/060	
In addition to developer contributions, central government should back up its imposed development targets by providing funding for national solutions to water supply, flood control etc.			
01994	Miss J Nicholson	01994/00001/063	
A grant paid for from National taxation. Immigration is swelling numbers. The EU should help pay the bill.			

Question 24b. Are there any suitable alternative approaches to provide the infrastructure needed for the current and future needs of the Winchester District?

Customer Reference	Name	Comment Reference	Agent
01995	Mrs Diana Paskins	01995/00001/058	
Central government must back up its imposed development targets by providing enough funding for national solutions to water supply, flood control etc. The dictates of central government lack research. One knee jerk action follows another and so to disaster.			
02003	Mr Ptol Slattery	02003/00001/070	
Refuse planning permission until development meets infrastructure needs in full. Evaluate facilities provided to ensure commitments are met. Refuse future planning if obligations not met.			
02006	Mr Raymond Marsh	02006/00001/052	
An obligatory financial contribution from an industrial development, particularly manufacturing would be a deterrent to employment locally			
02008	Mr Caesar Slattery	02008/00001/070	
Unless development provides the infrastructure required in full, planning permission should be refused. Evaluate facilities provided, and refuse future planning permissions every time until all commitments are met.			
02009	Mr Ian Embrey	02009/00001/032	
Planning permission should be refused unless development provides the Infrastructure required in full.			
02010	Mrs Sylvia Moss	02010/00001/031	
Make certain the infrastructure is in place and refuse permission to build on Greenfield sites.			
02014	Mrs Carole Embrey	02014/00001/025	
Planning permission should be refused unless development provides the infrastructure required in full.			
02022	Mr Michael Carter	02022/00001/053	
A tariff system of this sort is the fairest and the least likely to be circumvented			

Summaries of responses to Core Strategy Issues and Options (October 2008)

Question 24b. Are there any suitable alternative approaches to provide the infrastructure needed for the current and future needs of the Winchester District?

Customer Reference	Name	Comment Reference	Agent
02049	Mrs Wendy Thorpe	02049/00001/052	
<p>If builders have to bear the costs of infrastructure, it makes houses very expensive. Why not separate the cost of housing from the cost of infrastructure and make the government pay the latter. This will ensure there is only development where absolutely necessary.</p>			
02070	Mr And Mrs Roger Hockin	02070/00001/058	
<p>Option 1 ensures the odd pavement etc. is provided but central government still has to provide money for hospitals, schools, prisons etc. And they DO NOT (e.g. Whiteley).</p>			
02092	Mr Fergus Christie	02092/00001/061	
<p>Infrastructure provided before development is permitted.</p>			
02115	Mapledean Developments Ltd	02115/00002/018	Southern Plannin
<p>It is anticipated that the government will introduce legislation before the Plan is progressed through to adoption which will dictate the manner in which developer contributions are secured, and the opportunity for local variation. Further consideration should be given once these plans are clearer.</p>			
02117	Persimmon Homes	02117/00001/026	Southern Plannin
<p>It is anticipated that the government will introduce legislation before the plan is progressed through the adoption which will dictate the manner in which developer contributions are secured, and the opportunity for local variation. Further consideration should be given once these plans are clearer.</p>			
02118	Highbridge Properties	02118/00001/014	Southern Plannin
<p>It is anticipated that the government will introduce legislation before the Plan is progressed through to adoption which will dictate the manner in which developer contributions are secured, and the opportunity for local variation. Further consideration should be given once these plans are clearer.</p>			
02121	Bovis Homes	02121/00001/015	Adams Hendry
<p>The City Council will need to ensure that its proposed approach is consistent with government policy. The options outlined above may be overtaken by the proposed implementation of the Community Infrastructure Levy.</p>			

Summaries of responses to Core Strategy Issues and Options (October 2008)

Question 24b. Are there any suitable alternative approaches to provide the infrastructure needed for the current and future needs of the Winchester District?

Customer Reference	Name	Comment Reference	Agent
02122	Heron Land Developments	02122/00001/015	Adams Hendry
<p>The City Council will need to ensure that its proposed approach is consistent with government policy. The options outlined above may be overtaken by the proposed implementation of the Community Infrastructure Levy.</p>			
02126	Taylor Wimpey	02126/00001/029	Boyer Planning
<p>In relation to providing a mechanism for collecting developer contributions, we would support Option 1, which would be to continue to negotiate contributions on a site by site basis, as required under the Local Plan, until such time as further guidance is provided by Government. We recognise that a new tariff system is being considered, but until such time as Government stipulates that contributions should be calculated in this way, we would recommend that the existing system is retained. Of course any contributions sought should be in accordance with the five tests identified in circular 5/05, which states that contributions required should be: - Relevant to planning; - Necessary to make the proposed development acceptable in planning terms; - Directly related to the proposed development; - Fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind; and - Reasonable in all other aspects.</p>			
02169	Mr Brian Jezeph	02169/00001/044	
<p>Flexible approach on site by site basis.</p>			
02170	Mrs Caroline Jezeph	02170/00001/054	
<p>Flexible approach on site by site basis</p>			
02171	Miss Charlotte O'Neill	02171/00001/057	
<p>Flexible approach on site by site basis.</p>			
02174	Tichbourne Estate	02174/00001/044	Dreweatt Neate
<p>To be considered in conjunction with the community infrastructure charge.</p>			
02193	Mrs Dagmar Slater	02193/00001/071	
<p>Developers should be required to provide not only the infrastructure necessary for the development they are engaged in but also improve and/or replace anything they find that is inadequate with more modern and appropriate materials. A part of any profit made on a development should be put back into the community. Inspection should be independent as should the valuation of any contributor to be made after properties have been sold.</p>			

Summaries of responses to Core Strategy Issues and Options (October 2008)

Question 24b. Are there any suitable alternative approaches to provide the infrastructure needed for the current and future needs of the Winchester District?

Customer Reference	Name	Comment Reference	Agent
02194	W H Morrison Supermarkets PLC	02194/00001/005	Peacock And Smi
Support a flexible approach to planning obligations which allows an assessment of contributions on a case by case basis rather than a standard formula.			
02229	Gleeson Homes	02229/00001/065	Turley Associates
A robust tariff based system based on a thorough assessment of existing infrastructure capacity constraints, will provide greater certainty for all those involved in the acquisition and assessment of land use and development. However, this should remain the starting point and negotiations should continue to be on a site by site basis. Up-to -date assessments of infrastructure capacity should also continue to form part of such negotiations. This will ensure that the planning obligations sought are reasonable and necessary to address the impacts created by a development.			
02230	Knightspur Properties Ltd	02230/00001/017	Turley Associates
This would allow greater flexibility and would enable issues to be addressed in a site specific way. This approach is more likely to ensure compliance with planning gain guidance in terms of reasonably relating to the development.			
02237	Martineau Trustees	02237/00001/041	Dreweatt Neate
To be considered in conjunction with community structure charge			
02238	Holmes And Sons	02238/00001/046	Dreweatt Neate
To be considered in conjunction with the community structure charge.			
02239	Trustees Of E M Toogood Settlement	02239/00001/046	Dreweatt Neate
To be considered in conjunction with the community structure charge.			
02274	Mr Peter McManus	02274/00001/060	
Unless development provides the Infrastructure required IN FULL, Planning Permission should be refused. Evaluate facilities provided, and refuse future planning permissions every time UNTIL ALL commitments ARE met.			

Question 24b. Are there any suitable alternative approaches to provide the infrastructure needed for the current and future needs of the Winchester District?

Customer Reference	Name	Comment Reference	Agent
02365	Mr Ralph Pointer	02365/00001/050	
<p>In addition to ensuring that site infrastructure is included in any development plan, contributions should be provided by the developer toward general infrastructure improvements within the larger community effected by the development.</p>			
02373	Miss Emma Barnett	02373/00001/015	
<p>The City Council will need to ensure that its proposed approach is consistent with government policy. The options outlined above may be overtaken by the proposed implementation of the community infrastructure levy.</p>			
02376	Ms Janet Mckenzie	02376/00001/034	
<p>Developers are not to be rushed.</p>			
02385	Mrs Elisabeth Hopson	02385/00001/063	
<p>Funding from Government and from the EU.</p>			
02403	Mrs Pat Mann	02403/00001/056	
<p>What is the definition of new development Will it apply to the rebuilding of church halls for example.</p>			
02414	Mr David Simmons	02414/00001/062	
<p>It is a matter of constant amazement that the high level of central and local taxation we pay cannot provide large measures of "infrastructure". It increases faster than many people's income. It is peppered throughout with pointless bureaucracy and lack of common sense decisions that mean many simple queries take several iterations to resolve. Savings by having a more streamlined administration with more effective and interlinked IT should generate the funding for much of the infrastructure we need.</p>			
02415	Ms Kelsie Learney	02415/00001/048	
<p>All provision should be based on local and district plans with developer provided infrastructure only allowed where it fits in with those plans.</p>			
02421	Ms Catherine Macintosh	02421/00001/032	
<p>Every encouragement should be offered to developers to take initiatives to conserve resources.</p>			

Summaries of responses to Core Strategy Issues and Options (October 2008)

Question 24b. Are there any suitable alternative approaches to provide the infrastructure needed for the current and future needs of the Winchester District?

Customer Reference	Name	Comment Reference	Agent
02424	Mr Thomas Dey	02424/00001/051	
<p>In our experience developers do not complete their contribution to infrastructure. A tariff paid before development starts would be better than the existing system.</p>			
02427	Mr Michael Emmet	02427/00001/032	
<p>The issue of developer contributions needs to be considered in the context of emerging policy guidance from Central government. CALA favours a uniform transparent approach that generates fair and reasonable contributions which are used to deliver local infrastructure in a timely manner. Option 2 probably best achieves this but we will make more detailed representations in due course.</p>			
02432	Mr Charles Nicholas Perry	02432/00001/030	
<p>Depending on geography there has to be legally enforced interchange between "adajacent districts" irrespective of administrative/ political boundaries to ensure any development doesn't affest another; eg. boreholes, waste as just two aspects.</p>			
02435	Mr William Stroud	02435/00001/047	
<p>Let local communities vote to raise extra taxes for specific projects. For example, my sister, who lives in Elmshurst, outside Chicago, was recently given the opportunity to vote for a new public library. The same could be done for new school buildings, doctors surgeries etc. However, improvements in works such as roads and sewage should be wholly funded by the developer. Local people should be allowed to be consulted and vote on all significant local developments.</p>			
02437	Mr Geoffrey Stephens	02437/00001/048	
<p>More central funding.</p>			
02457	Mr I K G Arnold	02457/00001/053	
<p>Much more money needs to be spent on infrastructure. This needs to come from central Government - see what France has achieved</p>			

Summaries of responses to Core Strategy Issues and Options (October 2008)

Question 24b. Are there any suitable alternative approaches to provide the infrastructure needed for the current and future needs of the Winchester District?

Customer Reference	Name	Comment Reference	Agent
02478	Mrs Sue Digby	02478/00001/060	
<p>Plan a new town with the infrastructure required not just for today but for 50 years time so that expansion is not an issue don't build on flood plains which will need to expand for future rises in water levels. Stop pouring concrete over huge areas so that rain water has somewhere to go (into the ground).</p>			
02480	Mr Michael Westwell	02480/00001/058	
<p>Central government needs to be aware that Winchester District is affected by developments outside WCC area of responsibility and needs to develop a coherent area strategy for roads, drainage, health and water supplies.</p>			
02494	Mrs Katie Dutson	02494/00001/049	
<p>Developers shouldn't have to contribute when the present council is unable to maintain the present road system. Winchester Road in Bishops Waltham is in a mess and utility companies are NOT replacing like with like post utility work. This is the main road in and out of town. And would not be able to support a bus lane, cycle lane or any other 'green' transport option.</p>			
02497	Mr Ian Parsons	02497/00001/055	
<p>You need to police the quality of the specific infrastructure as I have seen many where work is low quality and need repair work later or the infrastructure only benefits the new development (i.e traffic lights on main roads only to service a new side development).</p>			
02499	Miss Elizabeth Thorn	02499/00001/052	
<p>Individuals developing small plots should not be subject to tariffs to provide infrastructure - the 'open space policy' currently in favour should be scrapped where individuals are concerned.</p>			
02500	Mrs Heather Smith	02500/00001/052	
<p>Don't increase the pressures on infrastructure by building more houses.</p>			
02502	Mr Geoffrey Johnson	02502/00001/043	
<p>All costs should be met by the developer for specific infrastructure as part of the development, as well as capping selling prices.</p>			
02538	Mr Joshua Layish	02538/00001/054	
<p>Allow the development of a new town in Micheldever in return for the developer funding public transport and other community infrastructure.</p>			

Summaries of responses to Core Strategy Issues and Options (October 2008)

Question 24b. Are there any suitable alternative approaches to provide the infrastructure needed for the current and future needs of the Winchester District?

Customer Reference	Name	Comment Reference	Agent
02546	Mr Loren Butt	02546/00001/041	
The council should identify the needs and then require developers to fund them.			
02550	Mrs Alison Matthews	02550/00001/054	
Planning officers should discuss the suitability of proposed infrastructure with Parish Councils before agreeing it with a developer. This is especially important where there are no main drains.			
02558	Mr Kevin Andreoli	02558/00001/043	
1. Allow accumulation of S106 funds over several years in order to fund larger projects. 2. Allow nomination of specific areas of land to build open space. Each developer buying a portion.			
02565	Mr Alfred Witham	02565/00001/052	
Although Option 3 seems to offer the greatest flexibility it may risk under-funding large infrastructure projects that are not solely associated with the development under consideration. Perhaps some minimum proportion of the tariff may need to be identified for assisting with the financing of such projects.			
02576	Mr Anthony Thorpe	02576/00001/053	
Developers should pay for ALL infrastructure requirements in the sites/areas they are developing. This should have become a national policy long, long, long ago.			
02584	Mr Paul Howden	02584/00001/051	
This aspect needs tying up better than currently, with timely contributions to infrastructure ideally BEFORE large developments are completed.			
02622	Mr Raymond Crump	02622/00001/035	
If Central Government demands such a high level of development it should provide the financial resources to provide the necessary infrastructure.			

Summaries of responses to Core Strategy Issues and Options (October 2008)

Question 24b. Are there any suitable alternative approaches to provide the infrastructure needed for the current and future needs of the Winchester District?

Customer Reference	Name	Comment Reference	Agent
02635	Mr Chris Benham	02635/00001/020	
<p>The IOCS sets out 3 options for the mechanism for developers to contribute to infrastructure provision: Option 1 - negotiate contributions on a site-by-site basis Option 2 - a tariff system based on floor area or site size, etc Option 3 - a combination of a tariff system but allowing developers to offset this by providing specific infrastructure instead of financial contribution. Central Government has investigated a number of mechanisms to secure financial contributions towards infrastructure in conjunction with delivering new development. A national taxation system (Planning Gain Supplement) was initially proposed but has been recently abandoned in favour of a tariff-based approach. However, no firm details of this are yet available and the current process of site-by-site negotiation remains in force. The disadvantage of this approach is that many small scale developments provide little or no contributions towards infrastructure and services, thereby increasing pressure on the facilities. A continuation of the existing system is therefore unlikely to facilitate adequate contributions from small scale developments. An inflexible tariff-based system for all developments is unlikely to encourage developments to make direct provision for infrastructure on-site, such as open space; given that schemes would be required to make standard payments irrespective of the delivery of on-site facilities. On this basis, the Core Strategy should conclude that the most appropriate option for securing development contributions is a hybrid system, where tariffs exist, but there can be offset by on-site infrastructure, as set out under Option 3. All developments, irrespective of size, should be required to make reasonable contributions to infrastructure, in accordance with the needs that arise from the development. Such a tariff based approach might be most suitable for small scale developments where on-site provision is least likely to be possible or appropriate. However, in large scale developments, where schemes can integrate on-site infrastructure, such as open space, etc, it would be appropriate to offset such provision by reducing the level of developer contributions. This flexible approach would ensure large-scale developments are encouraged to provide on-site infrastructure, where appropriate.</p>			
02665	Mr Martin Burton	02665/00001/046	
<p>Developers, and subsequent purchasers of property, should be required to pay the true marginal cost of the development. This will mean that, for example, where roads need widening because of increased traffic the burden falls on those creating the increased need, and will not be dispersed to include the existing users of the (sustainable) resource.</p>			

Summaries of responses to Core Strategy Issues and Options (October 2008)

Question 24b. Are there any suitable alternative approaches to provide the infrastructure needed for the current and future needs of the Winchester District?

Customer Reference	Name	Comment Reference	Agent
02670	Mr Nigel Paterson	02670/00001/056	
enlist more thinking and ideas from local businesses via a Hampshire Chamber: they are the people who most need improved infrastructure.			
02674	Mr Mike Anthony	02674/00001/009	
Stages of infrastructure provided before development. Currently situation is development first and infrastructure upon completion of a certain number of houses. Can't we change			
02698	Mrs Rosemary Stephens	02698/00001/044	
More central funding			
02764	Mr Graham Mulholland	02764/00001/054	
Central Government and Statutory Authority contribution. Continued dependance on Developer contribution cannot help affordable housing (in reality).			
02819	Mr John Fuller	02819/00001/039	
Approval should only be given where it is demonstrated. There is sufficient resources without further harming the environment. No more dried up ponds and rivers because of water extraction, for instance.			
02847	Mr Stuart Lindsay	02847/00001/048	
Should not be allowed to prevent appropriate development coming forward.			
02919	Mrs Catherine Pollitt	02919/00001/043	
If developers want to develop a particular site they should be made to financially or otherwise provide for the infrastructure necessary for that development.			
02922	Mr Ben Welch	02922/00001/025	
The utility providers should absorb these costs, not the developer. The utility companies will make money from the new customers.			
02924	Mrs Helen Field	02924/00001/052	
Don't put up houses unless the area can cope. Get the developers provide open spaces to children to play. Make sure that the existing water/gas pipes etc can cope with extra houses.			

Summaries of responses to Core Strategy Issues and Options (October 2008)

Question 24b. Are there any suitable alternative approaches to provide the infrastructure needed for the current and future needs of the Winchester District?

Customer Reference	Name	Comment Reference	Agent
02930	Mrs Jacey Jackson	02930/00001/038	
<p>A combined approach may be needed depending on the location of the development. Some large scale may need a specific road, rail or sewer improvement, others could be charged an additional general tax towards educational, healthcare or social welfare provision.</p>			
02936	Mr Randolph Mulley	02936/00001/053	
<p>I think a tariff system would reduce the 'wriggle room' of developers in negotiation with local councils, and option 3 would give flexibility in using the financial contributions. Attention would also have to be given to guaranteeing the improvements really do happen locally and the financial contributions are not subsumed into council coffers never to be seen again</p>			
02941	Mr Piers Austin	02941/00001/062	
<p>Whatever you do be very wary of developers. If they default or fail to meet targets, currently there is no recourse. Look at Knowle Village as a classic example/disaster. Their only motives are profit, not sustainability. Infrastructure must be strongly linked to stages of development, vis a vis recreation facilities, Village halls etc. With severe penalties for failure. Always sewage and drainage systems must be built to adoptable standards with an end target of Adoption by the respective water authority. Not to require this is folly. It is quite clear, either the developers, local or central government has to provide infrastructure in proportion to any new developments, looking at the roll-on effect on adjacent highways, roads and motorways and of course schools, doctors, dentists, hospitals etc. In some cases the infrastructure will have to be built in advance of new developments, as common sense will tell you. Not to create problems for ourselves by just building lots of houses to meet targets and we end up living in conditions like a third world country.</p>			
02993	Tesco Stores Limited	02993/00001/011	DPP
<p>We stress that financial contributions or works should only be sought which have a direct connection to development proposals.</p>			
03016	Mrs Danielle F Giles	03016/00001/064	
<p>Government spending</p>			

Summaries of responses to Core Strategy Issues and Options (October 2008)

Question 24b. Are there any suitable alternative approaches to provide the infrastructure needed for the current and future needs of the Winchester District?

Customer Reference	Name	Comment Reference	Agent
03029	Mr Robert Toleman	03029/00001/026	
You obviously have decided that it is the councils intention to destroy what environment of any quality presently exists for the enjoyment of existing residents.			
03042	Mrs Janet Nobes	03042/00001/047	
All infrastructure (roads, schools, health centre, NHS dentist and sports areas) should be built before any new development.			
03071	Mr John Hayter	03071/00001/071	
The contribution should be the maximum that is viable for a scheme and should be spent according to need, which would usually mean most being spent on affordable housing.			
03073	Bewley Homes	03073/00001/025	White Young Gre
Winchester City Council should operate a flexible approach to contributions on a site-by-site basis based on an up to date SPD detailing the methods of calculation, transparent and up to date formulae and tariffs. These should then be adjusted early on in the determination period to reflect the current local situation.			
03080	Winchester Housing Board	03080/00001/020	
Support Option 2, with affordable housing contributing to functional requirements of development, but exempt from more strategic contributions.			
03083	Hampshire Constabulary	03083/00001/002	
Should be developer contributions towards extra cost of police services needed as result of growth.			
03104	The Theatres Trust	03104/00001/006	
Look forward to a broadening of this issue in the form of SPD, to include cultural provisions.			
03105	Save Barton Farm Group	03105/00001/061	
Unless development provides the Infrastructure required in full, Planning Permission should be refused. Evaluate facilities provided, and refuse future planning permissions every time until all commitments are met.			

Summaries of responses to Core Strategy Issues and Options (October 2008)

Question 24b. Are there any suitable alternative approaches to provide the infrastructure needed for the current and future needs of the Winchester District?

Customer Reference	Name	Comment Reference	Agent
03135	Hampshire And Isle Of White Wildlife Trust	03135/00001/023	
<p>Need to consider the approaches being formulated for the regional infrastructure fund and Thames basin heaths. These two funding approaches could be used as models for which to develop the approach that Winchester takes along with any funding strategies being developed as part of the PUSH Green infrastructure fund. Winchester also needs to consider what its role is in securing contributions for the Regional Infrastructure Fund.</p>			
03199	Sport England (South East Region)	03199/00001/012	
<p>Amend open space fund to include a wider range of provision including indoor facilities - a tariff approach linked with the findings of the PPG17 study will provide clarity and consistency for all, the level of flexibility should be dictated by the evidence base. Sport England has carried out work with regard to developer contributions, see Planning Contributions Kitbag.</p>			
03202	Mr M Charrett	03202/00001/037	
<p>It is vital that financial contributions from developers are used to carry out improvements in the vicinity of the development (especially for contributions to highway alterations).</p>			
03223	Mr David Sansom	03223/00001/059	
<p>All infrastructure provided in lieu should be guaranteed to agreed standards and contractually binding.</p>			

Q24b

The following list made this comment:

All infrastructure provided in lieu should be guaranteed to agreed standards and contractually binding.

Each response has been counted as an individual comment.

Customer Reference	Customer Name	Comment Reference
02296	Mr Cox	02296/00001/059
02297	Ms Gill Strickland	02297/00001/072
02298	Mrs J Block	02298/00001/059
02299	Mr And Mrs R Jones	02299/00001/074
02300	Mr R Yover	02300/00001/059
02301	Ms Gill Sprake	02301/00001/059
02302	Mr Kevin Chevis	02302/00001/059
02303	Mr F Bradley	02303/00001/059
02304	Mr And Mrs B Girling	02304/00001/059
02305	Mr M Clark	02305/00001/059
02306	Dr Milford	02306/00001/059
02307	Mr And Mrs Roger And Linda Wiltshire	02307/00001/059
02308	Mr D R Cox	02308/00001/059
02309	Mr Chris Tickner	02309/00001/059
02310	Mr Henry Vaughn	02310/00001/059
02311	Ms Katy Jones	02311/00001/060
02312	Mr C Deane	02312/00001/059
02313	Mr And Mrs Mills	02313/00001/059
02314	Mr And Mrs P And V Vinnall	02314/00001/059
02315	Mr A Howlett	02315/00001/061
02316	Mr H Gobl	02316/00001/059
02317	Mr I Davidson	02317/00001/059
02318	Mr J Proctor	02318/00001/059
02319	Mr N Marsh	02319/00001/059
02320	Mr K R Williams	02320/00001/059
02321	Mr C M Schofield	02321/00001/058

Summaries of responses to Core Strategy Issues and Options (October 2008)

Customer Reference	Customer Name	Comment Reference
02322	Mr B M Wright	02322/00001/059
02323	Mr K Machan	02323/00001/059
02324	Mr J Tee	02324/00001/059
02325	Mr And Mrs Bailey	02325/00001/059
02326	Mr P Mundy	02326/00001/060
02327	Mr S Eggleton	02327/00001/059
02328	Mr P J Selby	02328/00001/059
02329	Mr T J Madgwick	02329/00001/058
02330	Mr And Mrs Pettit	02330/00001/059
02331	Mr M M Gutter	02331/00001/052
02332	Mr P Hardy	02332/00001/035
02333	Mr J M Lane	02333/00001/060
02334	Ms Lisa Smith	02334/00001/059
02335	Ms Marilyn Farrow	02335/00001/061
02336	Ms Liz Crane	02336/00001/059
02337	Mr Brian Carpenter	02337/00001/061
02338	Mr And Mrs Bicknell	02338/00001/059
02339	Mr And Mrs Sebastian	02339/00001/060
02340	Mr R Sadler	02340/00001/054
02341	Mr E Sykes	02341/00001/059
02342	Mr Martin Smith	02342/00001/070
02343	Ms Michelle Josephs	02343/00001/059
02344	Mr E Pulsford	02344/00001/063
02345	Mr And Mrs Coombs	02345/00001/059
02346	Mr D Studley	02346/00001/059
02347	Ms Mandy Farmer	02347/00001/061
02348	Mr M Megson	02348/00001/059
02349	Mr E Tongs	02349/00001/059
02350	Mr And Mrs Payne	02350/00001/058
02351	Mr S Oliver	02351/00001/059
02352	Mr Danny Marshall	02352/00001/059
02353	Mr D Logan	02353/00001/059

Customer Reference	Customer Name	Comment Reference
02354	Mr C M Buckler	02354/00001/059
02355	Mr And Mrs Madgwick	02355/00001/059
02356	Mr Mary Hampton	02356/00001/059
02357	Mr Dave Arbon	02357/00001/060
02358	Ms Julie Plant	02358/00001/059
02359	Mr M Barrick	02359/00001/059
02360	Mr And Mrs Pardoe	02360/00001/057
02361	Mr S Ralph	02361/00001/059
02363	Mr Graham Hayes	02363/00001/054
02364	Mr And Mrs J Hooper	02364/00001/059
02366	Mr C W Kettell	02366/00001/059
02367	Mr Onslow	02367/00001/059
02368	Mr And Mrs Buckle	02368/00001/059
03106	Mrs D Churcher	03106/00001/059
03107	Mr And Mrs P Gray	03107/00001/059
03109	Miss J Shiels	03109/00001/059
03110	Mrs Anna Lloyd	03110/00001/059
03111	Mr C B Moore	03111/00001/059
03112	Miss L M Higgins	03112/00001/059
03113	Mr And Mrs B Glenister	03113/00001/059
03114	Miss S L Johnson	03114/00001/059
03115	Mrs C M Allibon	03115/00001/059
03116	Mr And Mrs B Cocks	03116/00001/059
03117	Mr J P Hodge	03117/00001/059
03118	Mr G Martin	03118/00001/059
03119	Mr M Teversham	03119/00001/059
03120	Mr And Mrs M R Louch	03120/00001/059
03121	Mr And Mrs A H Madgwick	03121/00001/059
03122	Mr B Willers	03122/00001/059
03123	Mr W N James	03123/00001/059
03124	Mr I Plummer	03124/00001/059
03125	Mr And Mrs Russell	03125/00001/059

Customer Reference	Customer Name	Comment Reference
03126	Mr R Bell-Davis	03126/00001/059
03127	Mr R Damron	03127/00001/059
03128	Mrs B V Kemp	03128/00001/059
03129	Ms K Holden-Crawford	03129/00001/058
03130	Mrs L Pepall	03130/00001/059
03131	Mr & Mrs C Trickett	03131/00001/059
03132	Mrs J Mayne	03132/00001/059
03133	Ms Paula Baker	03133/00001/059
03134	Mr M Vaughan	03134/00001/059
03137	Mr R Windebank	03137/00001/059
03138	Mr B Filer	03138/00001/059
03139	Mrs Catherine Cruz-Alonso	03139/00001/059
03140	Mr M Jenkinson	03140/00001/059
03147	Mrs J Rossell	03147/00001/059
03148	Mr R Marshall	03148/00001/059
03149	Mr R J Whelan	03149/00001/059