



**DRAFT PORTFOLIO HOLDER DECISION NOTICE**

**PROPOSED INDIVIDUAL DECISION BY THE PORTFOLIO HOLDER FOR BUILT ENVIRONMENT**

**TOPIC – MASTERPLAN FOR THE DEAN, ALRESFORD**

**PROCEDURAL INFORMATION**

The Access to Information Procedure Rules – Part 4, Section 22 of the Council's Constitution provides for a decision to be made by an individual member of Cabinet.

In accordance with the Procedure Rules, the Head of Legal and Democratic Services, the Chief Executive and the Head of Finance are consulted together with Chairman and Vice Chairman of The Overview and Scrutiny Committee and any other relevant overview and scrutiny committee. In addition, all Members are notified.

If five or more Members from those informed so request, the Leader may require the matter to be referred to Cabinet for determination.

**If you wish to make representation on this proposed Decision please contact the relevant Portfolio Holder and the following Democratic Services Officer by 5.00pm on Monday 20 February 2017.**

**Contact Officers:**

**Case Officer:** Steve Opacic, 01962 848 101, [sopacic@winchester.gov.uk](mailto:sopacic@winchester.gov.uk)

**Democratic Services Officer:** Nancy Graham, 01962 848 235, [ngraham@winchester.gov.uk](mailto:ngraham@winchester.gov.uk)

**SUMMARY**

The emerging Local Plan Part 2 allocates land at The Dean, Alresford for mixed housing and other development including a public car park (policy NA2). There are a number of challenges because the allocated area is in multiple ownerships (with a number of tenants) and some owners have already submitted planning applications for their sites. Various parties with an interest in The Dean have their own aspirations for the development of the land which they control. In order to deal with these issues therefore Policy NA2 requires, amongst other things, a masterplan establishing principles for the disposition of uses, access points and linkages for the whole allocated area to be submitted with each planning application. This is designed to ensure that the site is planned in a comprehensive way despite that fact that it is owned by a number of parties and will not as a result be subject to a single development of the whole area.

The planning applications received so far (for the 'Warwick' and 'Huxley' sites) included illustrative masterplans that were not consistent, so officers have taken the lead in working with the landowners, businesses and other interest groups, such as the Town Council, as well as Ward Members, to develop a single masterplan. This would enable existing and future planning applications to be amended / developed and considered against an agreed masterplan for the entire site. Proposals submitted for parts of the land would therefore be expected to deliver development consistent with this plan.

It is not proposed that the Masterplan would be formally adopted as a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). This could follow in due course, but at present the draft Masterplan has been subject to public consultation and it is recommended that it be agreed (as amended) as a material consideration for determining planning applications where Policy NA2 is relevant. Public consultation took place from mid-December 2016 to mid-January 2017 and the results have been summarised in this report and taken into account in recommending changes to the Masterplan.

### **PROPOSED DECISION**

1. That the Head of Strategic Planning, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for the Built Environment, be authorised to a) update the Masterplan to reflect the current position and changes and events that occurred after publication of the consultation document b) incorporate the proposed changes as set out in Appendix 1 to this Decision Notice and c) correct any errors.
2. That the Masterplan for The Dean, Alresford (amended as set out in (1) above) be agreed and adopted, and be taken into account in determining relevant planning applications, particularly in terms of satisfying the requirements of policy NA2 of the Winchester District Local Plan Part 2.

### **REASON FOR THE PROPOSED DECISION AND OTHER ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED AND REJECTED**

Policy NA2 of the emerging Local Plan Part 2 allocates land at The Dean, Alresford for housing and other development, subject to a number of criteria. The allocated area is in multiple ownerships, with some planning applications having already been submitted – for the 'Warwick' site (McCarthy & Stone) and the 'Huxley' site (Huxley UK Ltd). The criteria of policy NA2 include a requirement for *'a masterplan establishing principles for the disposition of housing, parking, open space, access points and linkages for the whole allocated area to be submitted with each planning application'*.

The planning applications received so far contained illustrative masterplans, but these are not consistent, making it difficult to show that they comply with policy NA2. The need for a masterplan was discussed at the LPP2 examination hearings where the Inspector and many participants suggested that the Council should be taking a lead, and his Final Report welcomes the publication of a draft Masterplan (Inspector's Report paragraph 120). Therefore, Council officers have initiated work

with the landowners and businesses in the allocated area, as well as other interest groups, to develop a single masterplan.

A series of meetings were held during September and October 2016 to which all the landowners and businesses in the allocated area were invited, along with adjoining residents, representatives of New Alresford Town Council, the Chamber of Commerce, and Ward Members. These were very positive and the consultants for one of the landowners coordinated the development of a draft Masterplan which was published for wider public consultation from 16 December 2016 to 16 January 2017.

There are two current applications which have been under consideration for some time and need to be determined. Rather than adopting the more formal and time-consuming process of producing a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), the Masterplan has been subject to consultation and it is recommended it should be agreed (through this Decision Notice) as a 'material consideration' in considering current and future planning applications. If more weight needs to be accorded to the Masterplan in future, it could be adopted as a Supplementary Planning Document following a more formal consultation process.

The Masterplan was published for consultation in December 2016 and can be viewed at: <http://www.winchester.gov.uk/planning-policy/local-plan-part-2/draft-masterplan-land-west-dean-alresford/> The document focusses on broad principles rather than setting out detailed design guidance. This reflects the need to ensure that proposals for the different parcels of land within the allocated area follow key principles, as they are in different ownerships and are likely to be brought forward at different times.

The Local Plan policy allocates the overall area for housing, commercial and parking uses, with a requirement for housing for the elderly and car parking and the option of business uses. The Masterplan has considered the disposition of these uses and proposes mixed housing and commercial development along the frontage to The Dean, with housing (including for the elderly) to the rear of the site, and open uses such as shared surfaces, parking and amenity space in between. Land to the south of the site is identified as the optimum location for a public car park (expected to be of about 50 spaces).

The aim is to rationalise access to the site into two main accesses, one to the north and one to the south. Existing access points may continue to be used until the new accesses are available, to allow development to proceed and to avoid access to some parcels of land being 'ransomed' by their neighbours. The Masterplan also proposes improved pedestrian and cycle access, with new links through the site to the Arlebury Park Recreation Ground and between various land parcels.

The Masterplan provides general guidance on improving the public realm, open space, landscape and the character of development. The means of implementing the public car park allocation has been considered, taking account of the potential difficulty of funding the acquisition of land at market values. Because the Local Plan allocation is for the whole area, the approach has been taken that any individual developments on component parts of the site should play a part in helping to deliver the various requirements of policy NA2, including the public car park.

While the City Council would need to fund the cost of acquiring and laying out a public car park, if it resolves separately to develop it, development is being expected to help bridge the gap between the value of the relevant site for the Masterplan proposals (car parking and some housing) and its market value (based on the Local Plan allocating the area primarily for housing). All parts of the allocated area would be expected to contribute towards meeting this gap, when each site is brought forward through a planning application, while ensuring such a contribution is lawful (including satisfying the requirements of the Community Infrastructure Levy and other relevant regulations), proportionate, and takes account of viability considerations.

Consultation on the draft Masterplan took place over a 4 week period, from 16 December 2016 to 16 January 2017. A total of 21 representations were received: 5 from landowners and businesses within or adjoining the area; and 16 from others, mostly residents. The results are summarised in Appendix 1 of this Decision Notice, with the main issues raised being:

- The majority of respondents welcome the production of the Masterplan and support/accept its overall proposals;
- Several of the residents that responded express concern about the transport impacts of the development and make suggestions for improvements, mainly changes to the junction of The Dean/West Street/Pound Hill/Jacklyn's Lane or parking arrangements in The Dean;
- Other issues tend to be raised by only one or two respondents and include:
  - requests for clarity about the amount of housing or size of car park proposed;
  - support specifically for the provision of a public car park, footpaths, open spaces, or housing for the elderly;
  - concerns about the adequacy of sewerage disposal;
  - suggestions that there should be a requirement for comprehensive development or more detailed phasing;
  - references to the potential benefits for the Conservation Area;
  - concerns about an existing business having to relocate, or impact on an adjoining business;
  - opposition to a particular footpath linkage due to changes in levels;
  - objection to all developments being expected to contribute to the car park.

The following changes are recommended to the draft Masterplan as a result of the comments received:

- Expand Section 1 to clarify the likelihood that the area will be developed in phases rather than comprehensively;
- Changes in Sections 3 and 5 to refer to the potential for development to enhance the adjoining Conservation Area;
- Changes in Section 3 and to the Outline Masterplan Diagram to refer to the existing electricity sub-station and access to adjoining property to the south-east of the site;
- Expand Section 5.2 to add more detail of the proposed car park;
- Changes to Section 5.6 to clarify the requirements for sustainability;
- Amendments to the Outline Masterplan Diagram to remove a section of 'potential pedestrian links' notation.

In addition, it will be necessary to make changes to update the Masterplan and correct any errors. In particular, Section 1 (Introduction) should be updated to delete references to submission of comments and add text to clarify the status of the Masterplan.

Given the general support for the production of the Masterplan and its content, the desirability of clarifying the future of the allocated area, and the need to determine current and future planning applications, it is recommended that the Masterplan be agreed, subject to the proposed amendments. It would then provide a consistent basis for the assessment of planning applications which come forward across the allocated site.

### **RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS:**

One of the current planning applicants (Huxleys) provided substantial consultancy time to draft the Masterplan, at no cost to the Council. Development of the draft Masterplan, consultation on it and consideration of comments has also required significant input from various teams across the Council (Strategic Planning, Development Management, Estates, etc). This has been provided within current resources and it is anticipated that the Masterplan can be agreed and published online, also using existing resources.

The key potential resource issue for the Council relates to the possible development of a public car park on part of the allocated area. The Council is responsible for operating public car parks and this proposal is part of the Local Plan allocation, justified on the basis of a wider community need. Therefore, the City Council would be primarily responsible for funding the development of the car park but, through the Masterplan process, contributions can be sought from developers of the allocated area as a whole to partially offset the costs of land acquisition.

The possible acquisition of land for the public car park would need to be progressed separately and the cost will be subject to negotiation and contract. Approval of the Masterplan clarifies where the car park would optimally be located but does not in

itself commit the Council to acquire land or develop the public car park. There will be a separate decision on whether to proceed, taking account of the likely costs and benefits to the Council as well as benefits to New Alresford and wider community.

### **CONSULTATION UNDERTAKEN ON THE PROPOSED DECISION**

The draft Masterplan was developed in consultation with the landowners and businesses in the allocated area. Ward Members and representatives of the Town Council and Chamber of Commerce were also involved and the draft Masterplan was subsequently subject to public consultation. The results of this are referred to elsewhere in this report and summarised at Appendix 1, with changes recommended to the draft Masterplan as a result.

### **FURTHER ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED AND REJECTED FOLLOWING PUBLICATION OF THE DRAFT PORTFOLIO HOLDER DECISION NOTICE**

n/a

### **DECLARATION OF INTERESTS BY THE DECISION MAKER OR A MEMBER OR OFFICER CONSULTED**

None.

### **DISPENSATION GRANTED BY THE STANDARDS COMMITTEE**

n/a

**Approved by: (signature)**

**Date of Decision**

**Councillor Victoria Weston – Portfolio Holder for Built Environment**

### **APPENDICES:**

Appendix 1 – Summary of comments received on the draft Masterplan

**Appendix 1 – Summary of comments received on the draft Masterplan with Proposed Changes**

<u>Rep No.</u>	<u>Respondent</u>	<u>Summary of Comment</u>	<u>Recommended Response / Change</u>
1	Dr Judith McCullouch  (Email address only)	Looks like a good use of the site. Success will rely on:  - all commercial activities moving out as the Dean is only suitable for domestic cars;  - a coordinated design to avoid repeating the present ad hoc building designs, frontages, parking etc. There are good examples in Alresford.	The comments are noted and support welcomed.  <b>No change</b>
2	T B Constable  (Orchard Dean)	If land west of The Dean is converted from commercial to residential use this must be linked to infrastructure developments, most importantly restructuring the junction of The Dean with West Street, Pound Hill and Jacklyn's Lane. There might also be a requirement to remove some on-street parking at the south end of The Dean which limits traffic to a single carriageway.	The area covered by the Masterplan is an existing commercial site. Some sites and buildings are vacant but the whole area can be used for commercial purposes. Future developments must be considered in this context, which establishes substantial transport capacity. Traffic generation from the proposed uses is likely to be significantly less than from existing uses, this being one of the advantages of redeveloping the area for residential uses.  Nevertheless, policy NA2 of Local Plan Part 2 (reproduced in the Masterplan) requires development schemes to ' <i>contribute to any off-site junction or pedestrian improvements necessary</i> '. This provides a basis for securing

<u>Rep No.</u>	<u>Respondent</u>	<u>Summary of Comment</u>	<u>Recommended Response / Change</u>
			<p>improvements if justified, although this has not proved to be the case for the current planning applications (for the Warwick and Huxley sites). The Highway Authority has recently improved this junction, and there is a pedestrian controlled junction in West Street to aid pedestrian crossing movements.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
3	Keith Divall (Fair View)	<p>Welcome the production of a masterplan, which looks sensible overall. Alresford parking is full on many occasions and the Sun Hill development, along with the possibility of losing parking at the Station, means parking allocated to a good central location like The Dean should be maximised.</p> <p>There should be 100+ extra spaces, the 40(?) that seems possible from the masterplan is too little (overlay of the masterplan on the Warwick trailer development provided). The area between the Dean and marked car park would be the ideal extension. There should be a holistic and flexible approach e.g. other developments buying out the buildings currently on the site.</p>	<p>The general support is welcomed. Policy NA2 of Local Plan Part 2 requires the provision of a public car park of 50-100 spaces. This is quoted in the Masterplan, which has been developed to accommodate the lower end of the range. This is likely to be adequate, although use of a larger part of the south-eastern area of the site could achieve the higher number, as suggested by the respondent. It is recommended that section 5.2 of the Masterplan should be expanded to clarify the scale of public car park proposed.</p> <p>The 'Implementation Plan' section of the Masterplan already indicates that all developments should make an appropriate contribution to delivering the car park.</p> <p><b>Change Section 5.2 to add at the end of the final paragraph: 'The Outline Masterplan Diagram shows the general location for a car park of at least 50 spaces, which could be</b></p>



<u>Rep No.</u>	<u>Respondent</u>	<u>Summary of Comment</u>	<u>Recommended Response / Change</u>
			<i>expanded to include more of the south-east part of the area should a larger car park be needed.'</i>
4	Felicity Dwyer (Pound Hill)	As a resident backing onto the site I support the principles and believe it will improve the area. Buildings should not be of a height inappropriate for the environment, but there is nothing in the plan to suggest this will be a concern. The mix of residential, commercial and footpaths / landscaping are positive aspects, as is the provision of additional car parking. I support the provision of care for the elderly and am very supportive of the planting of native trees as part of the development.	The comments are noted and support welcomed. <b>No change</b>
5	Maureen and John Mackrell (Orchard Dean)	We think the plans are good and well thought out. Our only concern is the road junction at the south end of the Dean which is already very busy and there have been several accidents. We feel it would need traffic lights at this 4 way junction, with pedestrian crossings incorporated, which would also slow down traffic travelling too fast.	See the response above (Rep. No. 2) in relation to similar transport matters. <b>No change</b>
6	Roger Lawes (Maple Close)	Do not agree with redeveloping the Dean, which seems to be driven more by the desire for a "tidy up" rather than any clear planning strategy. If employment in the town is to be maintained, space needs to be made available for the displaced businesses but if they move to the	The principle of redeveloping The Dean is promoted through Local Plan Part 2 and policy NA2 has been found 'sound' by the Local Plan Inspector. Traffic generation from the proposed uses (including the car park) is likely to be significantly less than from existing uses and

<u>Rep No.</u>	<u>Respondent</u>	<u>Summary of Comment</u>	<u>Recommended Response / Change</u>
		<p>Sun Lane site the expectation of 200 new jobs is undermined. The traffic and environmental justification is undermined by the proposal for 50-100 car parking spaces.</p> <p>The analysis in the Masterplan majors on visual problems but fails to ensuring that what replaces the current multiplicity of uses is any more coherent. Although there is some new information on ownership and levels there is nothing that gives any confidence that there is a coherent plan for how the site will develop. There are no dimensions and scales: for example how many parking spaces could be accommodated, how much residential accommodation will be provided and how much commercial development is proposed? Without these it is difficult to imagine what the final development might look like and how issues such as the junction requirements at the crossroads at Pound Hill and increased pedestrian movement will be managed.</p> <p>The fundamental flaw is the lack of any attempt to explore how the development of the site could be phased to accommodate the multiplicity of ownerships. How will the parcels of land be aggregated to ensure that piecemeal implementation will be a success? Is the implementation to be left to the market, or does</p>	<p>policy NA2 requires improvements where necessary (see response to Rep. No. 2 above).</p> <p>Local Plan policy NA2 indicates the scale of housing and car parking provision expected (reproduced in the Masterplan), although it is agreed that the Masterplan should be expanded in relation to car parking spaces (see response to Rep. No. 3 above).</p> <p>The production of the Masterplan illustrates the willingness of the various landowners to work together to implement Local Plan policy NA2. The Masterplan gives landowners flexibility as to when they bring forward their sites, while ensuring that developments link well with each other. This is considered preferable to prescribing a rigid phasing schedule.</p> <p>The Masterplan's 'Implementation Plan' section explains how this can be achieved. The Council would need to acquire land to deliver the proposed public car park but would anticipate working with landowners and developers to achieve this, rather than using compulsory purchase powers to implement this (or other) elements of the Masterplan.</p> <p><b>Change Section 5.2 to add to final paragraph</b> (see response to Rep. No. 3 above)</p>

<u>Rep No.</u>	<u>Respondent</u>	<u>Summary of Comment</u>	<u>Recommended Response / Change</u>
		the Council envisage a role in land acquisition to ensure a comprehensive and coordinated development? The document states that it “seeks to demonstrate how the allocated land can be comprehensively masterplanned to deliver the land uses identified in Policy NA2 ....” but the lack of any details and the failure to address implementation mean it does not.	
7	Cedrick Fawcett (Email address only)	With the number of dwellings envisaged there will be an increased number of vehicle and pedestrian movements in and out of the Dean. Presently there can be delays at the junction of the B3046 with Jacklyns Lane and the Dean, particularly during peak times and when the school day ends at Perins. Consideration should be given to traffic lights at this junction, to facilitate vehicle movements and pedestrians, particularly as the accommodation is partly designed for older residents.  Otherwise, I fully support the Draft Masterplan.	The support is welcomed. See the response above (Rep. No. 2) in relation to similar transport matters.  <b>No change</b>
8	McCarthy & Stone Retirement Lifestyles Ltd and YourLife Management Services Ltd	Welcome the publication of the Masterplan as a means of providing a broad framework, but have some reservations.  Section 1: Introduction – support the Masterplan’s broad intent but the Masterplan needs to recognise more explicitly that the development of The Dean is likely to evolve in	The general support is welcomed.  It is agreed that the Introduction section should clarify that the area is unlikely to be developed comprehensively, but in phases, as this is one of the main reasons why a Masterplan is needed.  It is true that Policy NA2 requires a masterplan to be submitted with each planning application

<u>Rep No.</u>	<u>Respondent</u>	<u>Summary of Comment</u>	<u>Recommended Response / Change</u>
	(Ringwood)	<p>phases and that comprehensive redevelopment is highly unlikely. Also, the Masterplan appears to infer that redevelopment should accord with the Masterplan, but should make clear that, while it is an option, it is not the only option for redevelopment of the site. The Local Plan policy does not require the adoption or endorsement of a masterplan and allows individual site proposals to proceed. The Masterplan should recognise that there could be more than one masterplan illustrating how development on one site can move forward without prejudicing all / part of the remainder. The Masterplan should make this point more clearly and policy NA2 is less prescriptive than suggested.</p> <p>Sections 3, 4, 5: Linkages – The desire to improve pedestrian and cycle access is noted but the constraints should be more explicit. The site plan and indicative sections underscore the significant changes in ground level and the Masterplan should state that linkages will not be sought where ground level changes make them impractical, where they would result in a disproportionate landtake, or where they would serve little practical purpose. We have very significant concerns as to the practicality and desirability of providing access between The Warwick Brothers site and land to the north,</p>	<p>(rather than being adopted or endorsed), and for subsequent applications to accord with the principles established. However, given the multiple ownerships involved, and that comprehensive development is unlikely, it is important for any masterplan to be deliverable. The two planning applications submitted so far have included different illustrative masterplans and have made proposals for other land ownerships which may not be deliverable.</p> <p>Therefore the Council has taken the lead in developing a masterplan in conjunction with landowners / businesses, to help ensure its principles can be delivered. While an alternative masterplan could potentially be developed, the draft Masterplan is currently the only one which has the general support of the various landowners and Council officers. It provides a framework to help deliver the development envisaged by policy NA2 and, therefore, enables planning applications to achieve the principles set out.</p> <p>With regard to linkages, the constraints posed by ground level changes are acknowledged. Most of the references to linkages / level changes are general and seek to promote the principle of permeability (sections 3.4, 3.5, 4.1, 4.2 and 5.2), with the only specific requirements relating to the</p>

<u>Rep No.</u>	<u>Respondent</u>	<u>Summary of Comment</u>	<u>Recommended Response / Change</u>
		<p>which is lower by over 3 metres. This would require significant earth works or a long ramp to achieve an appropriate pedestrian gradient and would not be practical. We also question why someone would use such a link, given the gradients involved.</p> <p>Section 4.2: Development Principles – the broad aims are acceptable but the comments regarding ground levels and linkages apply to Development Principles 2 and 3.</p> <p>Section 5.4: Context, Character and Design – The Dean abuts the Conservation Area and the Planning (Listed Buildings &amp; Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires ‘special attention’ be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of conservation areas. Redevelopment that removes a negative feature, such as the Warwick Brothers buildings, could result in an overall enhancement and the Masterplan should recognise that redevelopment of this site provides an opportunity to enhance the setting of the Conservation Area.</p> <p>Section 5.6: Sustainability Considerations – the general sustainability objectives are noted but Policy CP11 of the Winchester District Local Plan Part 1 is out of date as the Code for Sustainable Homes has been withdrawn. This</p>	<p>respondent’s site being in the Outline Masterplan Diagram (section 5.7). Permeability is an important principle which the Masterplan should continue to promote, while acknowledging the constraints imposed by level changes (in sections 3.5, 4.2 and 5.2).</p> <p>Nevertheless, work undertaken in conjunction with the respondent’s planning application has demonstrated that the level changes between this site and land to the north would be problematic to overcome (without excessive gradients). It is accepted that the constraints outweigh the benefits of achieving this link, given other opportunities to link sites and to access Arlebury Park Recreation Ground. Accordingly, while references in the text of the Masterplan to improving permeability should be retained, the ‘potential pedestrian links’ notation on the respondent’s site (Warwick Brothers) shown in the Outline Masterplan Diagram (section 5.7) should be removed.</p> <p>It is agreed that development in the southern part of the area has the potential to enhance the Conservation Area, and should seek to do so. Therefore the Masterplan should make reference to the Conservation Area and the importance of ‘preserving or enhancing’ it. References to the adjoining the Conservation</p>

<u>Rep No.</u>	<u>Respondent</u>	<u>Summary of Comment</u>	<u>Recommended Response / Change</u>
		<p>section ought to be omitted or amended to reflect the lawful position.</p>	<p>Area should be added to section 3.1 (Site &amp; Context, 5<sup>th</sup> paragraph). Reference to the opportunity to enhance the Conservation Area should be added at section 3.8 (Constraints &amp; Opportunities, opportunity 5) and section 5.4 (Context, Character &amp; Design).</p> <p>Section 5.6 refers to policy CP11, which would normally require Level 5 of the Code for Sustainable Homes in relation to energy use. Following the Government announcement on this matter, the equivalent of Code level 4 is now sought and the Masterplan is correct in referring to this. However, it should be amended to refer to <i>'the equivalent'</i> to Code level 4 as the Code for sustainable Homes has been withdrawn.</p> <p><b>Changes Proposed:</b></p> <p><b>Section 1: Introduction – add after 1<sup>st</sup> sentence:</b> <i>'The area is in a number of ownerships which make it likely that it will be developed in phases rather than comprehensively developed in one go.'</i></p> <p><b>Section 3.1: Site &amp; Context – add at end of 5<sup>th</sup> paragraph:</b> <i>' , with the land adjoining the southern edge of the site falling within the New Alresford Conservation Area.'</i></p> <p><b>Section 3.8: Constraints &amp; Opportunities – add to point 5 under 'Summary of key</b></p>

<u>Rep No.</u>	<u>Respondent</u>	<u>Summary of Comment</u>	<u>Recommended Response / Change</u>
			<p><b>opportunities</b>': <i>'and to enhance the character or appearance of the adjoining Conservation Area'</i>.</p> <p><b>Section 5.4: Context, Character &amp; Design – amend 1<sup>st</sup> sentence to read:</b> <i>'Proposals should be sensitive to the local context, which includes the adjoining New Alresford Conservation Area, and respond positively to the character, appearance and variety...'</i></p> <p><b>Section 5.6: Sustainability Considerations – add to point 1 (after 'policy CP11 expects')</b>: <i>'...policy CP11 expects the equivalent of Code for Sustainable Homes Level 4...'</i></p> <p><b>Section 5.7: Outline Masterplan Diagram – delete the southern 'leg' of the 'Potential pedestrian links' notation</b> (running through the Warwick Brothers site).</p>
9	G Goddard (Valdean Home Park)	Not against housing but very concerned about the amount of extra traffic that would be generated and the junction with Jacklyn's Lane, etc. There is no indication of the number of houses that could be built or how many entrances will there be to access development when completed. Suggest widening The Dean using the grass verge to make it safer for all concerned.	See the response above (Rep. No. 2) in relation to similar transport matters. The Local Plan policy (NA2) estimates a capacity of about 75 dwellings, although it is likely that significantly more units could be achieved. The Masterplan seeks to consolidate the existing accesses and ultimately to reduce the number of entrance points. While redevelopment would enable The Dean to be widened, there is no indication that this would be necessary (or desirable) given that

<u>Rep No.</u>	<u>Respondent</u>	<u>Summary of Comment</u>	<u>Recommended Response / Change</u>
			<p>traffic generation from the proposed uses is likely to be significantly less than the existing uses.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
10	Jenny and Michael Wallis (Mallard Close)	<p>Fully support the plan which will be a great advantage in helping our older population.</p> <p>Have one concern regarding the junction of The Dean with West Street, Pound Hill and Jacklyns Lane, which currently has many heavy lorries and delivery vehicles. In future there will be many more cars, some of which could be driven by older drivers whose reactions may be slow. Better traffic control should be in place before building works and occupancy take place.</p>	<p>The support is welcomed. See the response above (Rep. No. 2) in relation to similar transport matters.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
11	Stuart McCullouch (Arle Gardens)	<p>The scheme described is very desirable and I support its implementation as soon as possible.</p>	<p>The support is welcomed.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
12	Butler & Co. (The Dean)	<p>Object strongly to the development of Bennett House (our office) due to the issues this would create for our business and the impact on Alresford.</p> <p>The Dean historically has been a commercial area and Butler &amp; Co have been located on The Dean for the last 6 years. Our offices are perfectly fit for purpose and we are the only accountants in Alresford, specialising in farming</p>	<p>The Local Plan allocation (policy NA2) includes commercial uses and does not require the whole allocated area to be developed for housing. Similarly, the draft Masterplan promotes a mix of residential and commercial uses, with the Outline Masterplan Diagram (Masterplan Section 5.7) promoting 'Residential / Commercial' use in the area of this property. Accordingly, there is no requirement in emerging planning policy or</p>



<u>Rep No.</u>	<u>Respondent</u>	<u>Summary of Comment</u>	<u>Recommended Response / Change</u>
		<p>and Inheritance Tax. We have many elderly local clients who are able to visit our office and it may not be possible for these clients to travel to new premises. We also bring visitors from further afield and footfall for local businesses is imperative to keep our high streets alive. We employ over 25 staff who live locally and make use of local amenities.</p> <p>We appreciate the requirement to develop certain areas of the Dean, and for assisted living for the elderly, but development of all of the Dean would be detrimental to the local businesses. Parts of the Dean, including Bennett House, should be kept commercial and should be excluded from the Masterplan. There are insufficient other commercial locations in Alresford and redevelopment could force our firm (as well as other businesses) out of Alresford.</p>	<p>the draft Masterplan for the relocation of commercial uses or for the redevelopment of Bennett House.</p> <p>However, it is understood that the respondent company's property is rented and its future is therefore a matter between the company and its landlord. The details of the lease are not known and, while the Council would not want to see companies being displaced against their wishes, it cannot use its planning powers to override lease arrangements or landlords' aspirations.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
13	Simon Brown and John Sutton (The Dean)	<p>Concerned that the Outline Masterplan Diagram 5.7 shows proposed residential/commercial fronting The Dean directly against our property boundary (Belmont House), where we have windows and would not want any of these obstructed or to affect the light into our building.</p> <p>We have an established access into our premises over the proposed development.</p>	<p>These arrangements are noted and acknowledged. There is also an existing electricity sub-station adjoining this access, in the south-eastern corner of the allocated area, which will need to be taken into account by future development. Therefore, Section 3.8 (Constraints and Opportunities) and the Outline Masterplan Diagram (Section 5.7) should be amended to refer to the existing access and sub-</p>

<u>Rep No.</u>	<u>Respondent</u>	<u>Summary of Comment</u>	<u>Recommended Response / Change</u>
			<p>station.</p> <p><b>Changes Proposed:</b></p> <p><b>Section 3.8: Constraints and Opportunities – add new constraint to ‘Summary of Key Constraints’:</b> <i>‘8. Existing electricity sub-station and access to adjoining property on south-east edge of the site.’</i></p> <p><b>Section 5.7: Outline Masterplan Diagram – add an ‘Existing access’ notation (arrow) in the south east corner of the site.</b></p>
14	R B Jordan (The Dean)	<p>Generally approve of the proposals, the current non conforming industrial units close to a town centre are not appropriate and redevelopment for residential use is the best way forward. However as we live in The Dean we will be affected and our main concerns are:</p> <p>1.Highways. Ours is the last but one house before the river where The Dean is single track with unlimited parking opposite our entrance, causing difficulty accessing our driveway. There is very little room to manoeuvre and last year the fire engine was not able to get access due to cars parked overnight. Parking will be exacerbated further when The Dean and the River Walk are promoted as a tourist attraction, notwithstanding the parking proposals in the study. Parking should be prohibited in this</p>	<p>The support is welcomed. See the response above (Rep. No. 2) in relation to similar transport matters. New development will be required to provide parking to meet its own needs and the Masterplan proposes a new public car park, meaning that the Masterplan proposals would not themselves exacerbate parking problems or require a change to parking restrictions. Local Plan policy NA2 includes specific requirements regarding connection to the sewerage network, enabling concerns about this matter to be addressed when planning applications are made.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>

<u>Rep No.</u>	<u>Respondent</u>	<u>Summary of Comment</u>	<u>Recommended Response / Change</u>
		<p>narrow area of The Dean by double yellow lines.</p> <p>2. Access to The Dean. Access to and from The Dean from West Street/Jacklyns Lane and Pound Hill is extremely poor with bad visibility. A major improvement is urgently required for this junction with traffic lights probably being the best solution.</p> <p>3. Sewerage. We live opposite the sewerage pumping station that has failed a number of times over the last few years. At times tankers are pumping for nearly 24 hours to deal with the breakdown in the pump house. It would be totally irresponsible for new residential development to take place before adequate steps were taken to alleviate the current overloaded effluent system and we acknowledge that this point is recognised in the Masterplan.</p> <p>We would be happy to meet with officers to illustrate the difficulties that we are experiencing at the present time even before development takes place.</p>	
15	Neil and Sarah Sibbald (Arle Gardens)	Broadly welcome the intentions and substance of the plan, The Dean is not been in keeping with high standard set by the rest of the town centre. Development of this significant amount of land would benefit Alresford for decades to	<p>The support is welcomed. See the response above (Rep. No. 2) in relation to similar transport matters.</p> <p>While a single comprehensive development may be preferable (and is provided for by both the</p>

<u>Rep No.</u>	<u>Respondent</u>	<u>Summary of Comment</u>	<u>Recommended Response / Change</u>
		<p>come. We have a couple of comments:</p> <p>Piecemeal Development. The plan acknowledges the land is owned by many parties which would lead to development in phases. Consideration should be given to developing the area in a more considered manner.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Development at different times by different developers could lead to a number of 'styles' making the area feel less like an estate. This could also be achieved by planning the whole site with different but complementary styles.</li> <li>2. Individual developers will seek to maximise their return, resulting in a higher density of housing at the expense of the 'open space'. Lack of open space is a criticism of modern developments, especially low cost housing. The statement that the creation of a link to Arlebury Park would mitigate the need for specific open spaces seems to be an undesirable 'get out' clause for developers.</li> <li>3. A number of development phases would cause more disruption to the area than a single period of building.</li> <li>4. Access could be better managed if development was planned as a single, coherent project. The Outline Masterplan Diagram</li> </ol>	<p>Local Plan policy and the draft Masterplan), it cannot be required given the variety of ownerships in the area. In developing the draft Masterplan the Council has worked with the various landowners to produce an overall framework for development that addresses the concerns raised so far as possible. The only means of ensuring a single phased development would be for the Council (or another landowner) to acquire the whole site, requiring compulsory purchase of the land. This would not be a realistic or desirable option when the existing landowners have indicated a willingness to bring the site forward in a suitable manner.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>

<u>Rep No.</u>	<u>Respondent</u>	<u>Summary of Comment</u>	<u>Recommended Response / Change</u>
		<p>indicates three primary access options but the plans submitted for the Warwick Brothers site shows access to the Dean almost exclusively for their development.</p> <p>These points could be best addressed as part of a single overall development plan rather than just the framework that the Masterplan seeks to create.</p> <p>Access to The Dean. Removal of the existing commercial uses would reduce the amount of HGVs etc. but the additional light vehicles would more than offset this, especially at peak times.</p> <p>1. The safety of the crossroads at the top of The Dean was the subject of a petition and a deputation in 2008. Nothing has been done to address the current concerns beyond the zebra crossing, which can only be exasperated by an increase in traffic. The morning peak coincides with the arrival of the students at Perins School.</p> <p>2. Visibility is restricted by parking on The Avenue and West Street and The Dean is frequently impeded by traffic waiting to leave the road and on street parking. Whilst some of this parking may be mitigated by the Masterplan, much is local residents and will therefore remain.</p>	
16	The Alresford	The Society has been keen on this redevelopment since work we did in 2013 and it	The support is welcomed. See the responses above in relation to similar transport matters

<u>Rep No.</u>	<u>Respondent</u>	<u>Summary of Comment</u>	<u>Recommended Response / Change</u>
	Society (Email address only)	<p>has been on the town's agenda for much longer. We appreciate the difficulties when the land is in different ownerships but owners now seem keen to get on. Given that a car park is financially much less interesting than housing, it seems there is acceptance that '... cost and impact [should be] spread across the area as fairly as possible'.</p> <p>A few specific points:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. There is welcome emphasis on landscaping and permeability (footways, cycle paths), including access to Arlebury Park Recreation Ground. This should ensure this mix of housing and industry realises its potential to become a distinctive part of the town centre that is attractive to residents and visitors (benefiting tourism).</li> <li>2. Development will be phased and Warwick Trailers and Huxleys have already submitted planning applications. We have responded to both applications and are broadly in favour although have asked WCC to look again at density and ensuring affordable housing on the Huxley site.</li> <li>3. There is brief mention in the masterplan of 'commercial', along the west side of The Dean; this may refer to interest in building housing and</li> </ol>	<p>(Rep. No. 2) and sewerage (Rep. No. 14). The draft Masterplan is considered to address the points made by this respondent.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>

<u>Rep No.</u>	<u>Respondent</u>	<u>Summary of Comment</u>	<u>Recommended Response / Change</u>
		<p>a new veterinary surgery on the old CLC site, although no application has been submitted yet. HGV traffic will reduce significantly but the overall volume of other traffic will increase and doubtless the traffic engineers will consider these matters further, including access to the cross roads at the junction with West Street, Jacklyns Lane and Pound Hill.</p> <p>4. There has been a history of sewerage problems in the area and this must be a priority to avoid future difficulties.</p> <p>5. There is also mention of housing areas needing to include informal open space and 'Equipped area for Play'. Provision is important but there is already a significant equipped play area in Arlebury Park recreation ground next door; presumably this suffices, provided there are clear links to it?</p> <p>Overall, the masterplan offers a welcome framework for re-use of an outmoded industrial area, with poor access and parking. This land is currently under utilised in comparison with its considerable potential, whilst the Local Plan ensures provision of new employment opportunities at Sun Hill.</p>	
17	Dorothy Hamilton	Welcome the Vision Statement (2.1), especially affordable housing and high quality landscaping.	The support is welcomed and the draft Masterplan is considered to address the points

<u>Rep No.</u>	<u>Respondent</u>	<u>Summary of Comment</u>	<u>Recommended Response / Change</u>
	(Arle Gardens)	<p>Also in 4.1: 'in keeping with the character of the town' and 'enable permeability'.</p> <p>It is important that the car park is screened by housing, as shown, and that access is obtained to the recreation ground.</p> <p>The eventual building design should be sympathetic to the attractive character of the houses opposite.</p>	<p>made by this respondent.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
18	Savills Planning (Southampton)	<p>There are a number of concerns with the current draft, linked back to Policy NA2 of Local Plan Part 2.</p> <p>Land Ownership. The document says 'The masterplan has been prepared jointly by Winchester City Council and landowners / businesses in The Dean to show how the key policy requirements for the area can be delivered'. Given the number of separate land ownerships within the study area, the document should list which landowners took part and which did not.</p> <p>Contamination. Section 5.1 (P.22) does not fully reflected the requirements of Policy NA2 and thus the text should be expanded to reflect that a site-wide study is required.</p> <p>Car Park. Policy NA2 requires the provision of a public car park, and thus paragraph 5.2 (Page</p>	<p>All known landowners (and tenants) were invited to be involved in developing the Masterplan through a series of events. It is believed that all landowners took part or were represented, but this is not a matter that the Masterplan needs to go into detail about.</p> <p>The draft Masterplan quotes the Local Plan policy (NA2) in full at section 3.7 so it is not considered necessary for its requirements regarding contamination or other matters to be repeated further in other parts of the Masterplan.</p> <p>The Local Plan requirement is to 'include provision for' a public car park and the means by which the various elements of future development achieve this will be a matter for discussion and negotiation as part of the planning application process. Given uncertainty about the detailed timing of such applications and the details of how they may 'include</p>



<u>Rep No.</u>	<u>Respondent</u>	<u>Summary of Comment</u>	<u>Recommended Response / Change</u>
		<p>22) should be re-worded to state ‘A public car park will be provided.....’ The document should expand on the timing and any trigger points linked to the remaining development, and/or obligations to secure its timely delivery via Legal Agreement.</p> <p>Public Open Space. Section 5.3 (P.23) cross refers to Policy CP7 and that open space could be provided on-site, or by way of extensions/ improvements/ links to the recreation ground. This ignores Policy NA2’s specific reference to on-site open space provision in the form of informal open space and a Local Equipped Area of Play (LEAP). Policy NA2 is the principal policy so the masterplan should be amended to reflect the provisions set out within Policy NA2.</p> <p>Implementation and Obligations. Section 6 refers to ‘Development of any part of the area should make an appropriate and viable contribution to delivering these requirements to that the cost and impact is spread across the area as fairly as possible’. It will be necessary to produce an Infrastructure Delivery Plan to set out the infrastructure to be delivered and how each component will make an ‘appropriate’ contribution. As these will be development specific infrastructure projects, the IDP should set out how the future pooling of contributions</p>	<p>provision’, it is not realistic to expand on the timing or trigger points at this stage. It will also ultimately be a decision for the City Council, as the provider and operator of any public car park, whether and when it would be feasible to provide it.</p> <p>With regard to open space provision, the explanatory text of Local Plan policy NA2 (paragraph 4.5.19) clarifies that provision to meet the requirements of policy C7 should be <i>‘on-site or by way of extensions/improvements to the adjoining Arlebury Park recreation area where practical’</i>. The draft Masterplan reflects this flexibility, provided access to the Recreation Ground is achieved.</p> <p>The Masterplan refers to the various infrastructure requirements and it is acknowledged that any financial contributions will need to meet the requirements of the CIL Regulations. As explained above, in relation to the car park, it is not necessary or realistic to expand on the details at this stage, or within the Masterplan.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>

<u>Rep No.</u>	<u>Respondent</u>	<u>Summary of Comment</u>	<u>Recommended Response / Change</u>
		towards infrastructure would not conflict with the CIL regulations.	
19	Ceejay Systems Ltd (The Dean)	Support the response submitted to the Masterplan by McCarthy and Stone Retirement Lifestyles Ltd.	Noted. The issues raised by McCarthy & Stone are addressed above (Rep. No. 8). <b>Changes Proposed:</b> - as listed in relation to Rep. No. 8 above.
20	Huxley (UK) Ltd (The Dean)	<p>Huxley (UK) Ltd are landowners within the northern part of the site, for which a planning application is currently pending consideration.</p> <p>Object to Part 6 of the masterplan document (page 27) and the Implementation Plan, specifically the following text:</p> <p><i>“The Local Plan Part 2 policy for the site as a whole (NA2) includes several requirements which landowners will need to work in cooperation to achieve. These include the provision of linkages between sites, open areas and the public car park. Development of any part of the area should make an appropriate and viable contribution to delivering these requirements so that the cost and impact is spread across the area as fairly as possible.”</i></p> <p>There is no basis in policy NA2 or its explanatory text for requiring a financial contribution towards a car park from sites coming forward in The</p>	<p>Local Plan Part 2 policy NA2 includes a specific requirement to <i>‘include provision for a public car park’</i>. As with the references to sewerage connections and education contributions (in the same part of the policy), these requirements apply to the whole allocated area. Policy NA2 does not specify which part of the allocated area should accommodate the car park (although the explanatory text refers to the southern part of the site being most suitable), so the requirement to <i>‘include provision for’</i> the car park applies to the whole allocated area.</p> <p>It is, therefore, reasonable for the Masterplan to require development of any part of the allocated area to make an <i>‘appropriate and viable contribution’</i> to the car park and other ‘cross-cutting’ requirements. For those landowners/developers that do not control land proposed for the car park, this contribution is likely to be financial provided this is <i>‘appropriate</i></p>

<u>Rep No.</u>	<u>Respondent</u>	<u>Summary of Comment</u>	<u>Recommended Response / Change</u>
		<p>Dean. The Local Planning Authority should have expressly stated within NA2 their intention to seek a financial contribution for a car park, as it has for a contribution Sun Hill Infants and Junior Schools.</p> <p>At no stage during the Local Plan consultation process was Huxley aware this would be sought and it is unreasonable to seek such a requirement now that the Local Plan Inquiry has concluded. The requirement for a financial contribution should have been clearly stated within the policy, justified through an evidence base and taken through the Local Plan review. It could then have properly been debated at the Local Plan Inquiry and considered by the Local Plan Inspector. To now place a considerable financial burden upon all landowners post the Local Plan Inquiry could compromise the ability of the allocation to come forward and the aims and objectives of the Local Plan, most notably housing provision.</p> <p>Huxley's land ownings are situated in the northern part of the allocation, some distance from the preferred location for a car park. As one of the major landowners in The Dean, they are already making a significant contribution towards achieving Policy NA2 by designing a scheme which facilitates access to a number of adjoining</p>	<p><i>and viable</i>'. The Masterplan also seeks to spread the cost and impact across the area 'as fairly as possible'.</p> <p>This approach was discussed with landowners during the preparation of the Masterplan and, while not universally accepted, did appear to have broad support. The representations on the draft Masterplan suggest this remains the case.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>

<u>Rep No.</u>	<u>Respondent</u>	<u>Summary of Comment</u>	<u>Recommended Response / Change</u>
		<p>sites, enabling these sites to be developed to their full capacity and increasing their value, at the expense of losing valuable developable land. Placing a highly onerous burden on the site, over and above what it is currently providing, could have significant implications on not only this site but other adjoining sites.</p> <p>Object to the inclusion of any wording that requests a financial contribution towards a car park. The policy is quite clear where any car park should be located and to place onerous burdens compromises not only this site coming forward, but a number of other sites in The Dean and the allocation as a whole. The text on page 27 of the draft masterplan should be deleted.</p>	
21	Brian J Ranger (The Dean)	<p>I live at The Dean 30m from The Dean/ West St./Jacklyns Lane/Pound Hill cross roads. I have no objection to the planned redevelopment of The Dean but have grave concerns regarding traffic management at the West St./Jacklyn's Lane/Pound Hill/The Dean cross roads. At present it can take several minutes to exit The Dean, there have been accidents at this junction and there are often school children from Perins School attempting to cross.</p> <p>The Masterplan speaks of c.75 new dwellings, commercial and parking uses and a public car park with 50-100 places. There is only one</p>	<p>The support is welcomed. See the response above (Rep. No. 2) in relation to similar transport matters. Given the current variety of ownerships within the allocated area, it would not be reasonable, desirable or practical to require access to be provided via the Recreation Ground which is in a further separate ownership. This would also be likely to require a new / improved access onto The Avenue, with potential impacts on the character of the Conservation Area as well as on the operation of the Recreation Ground. The Masterplan does not ignore traffic considerations, but neither</p>

<u>Rep No.</u>	<u>Respondent</u>	<u>Summary of Comment</u>	<u>Recommended Response / Change</u>
		<p>vehicular way in and out of the area and the plan will considerably increase the volume of vehicles, exacerbate congestion at the West Street junction and greatly increase pedestrian activity. The possibility of another vehicular access via Arlebury Park has not been considered to relieve this congestion. It seems there are only three options available to ease this situation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Convert The Dean/etc junction into a mini roundabout (not enough space for a full-size roundabout);</li> <li>• Introduce traffic lights;</li> <li>• Create a new access road via Arlebury Park</li> </ul> <p>I assume a new access road to The Avenue is very unlikely to be agreed, a mini-roundabout would still not be adequate, and only the introduction of traffic lights would give reasonable traffic flow and safe pedestrian crossing.</p> <p>I also have great concern about congestion and pedestrian danger arising from site building traffic during construction. There will be a large amount of heavy commercial vehicles using the West St./etc junction which will create further problems and another (even temporary) access road would alleviate this problem. My property is</p>	<p>should it make unrealistic proposals or go into unnecessary detail.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>

<u>Rep No.</u>	<u>Respondent</u>	<u>Summary of Comment</u>	<u>Recommended Response / Change</u>
		<p>a listed building in a Conservation Area but is already being vibrated by large commercial vehicles, which site traffic will exacerbate.</p> <p>It is remiss of planners to have ignored vehicle traffic considerations and there is no mention of local traffic considerations in either the 'Draft Masterplan' or the emerging Local Plan Part 2 (policy NA2) in spite of the suggestion that the Masterplan will establish principles for the arrangement of uses, access points and linkages.</p>	