

**SENT BY EMAIL ONLY** ([ldf@winchester.gov.uk](mailto:ldf@winchester.gov.uk))

email address: [will.thompson@cgms.co.uk](mailto:will.thompson@cgms.co.uk)  
Direct Dial:

Our Ref: WT/AC/12681

Head of Strategic Planning  
Winchester City Council  
City Offices  
Colebrook Street  
Winchester  
Hampshire  
SO23 9LJ

140 London Wall  
London EC2Y 5DN

Tel: 020 7583 6767  
Fax: 020 7583 2231

[www.cgms.co.uk](http://www.cgms.co.uk)

Offices also at:  
Birmingham, Cheltenham,  
Dorset, Edinburgh,  
Kettering, Manchester,  
Newark

17 September 2012

Dear Sir/Madam

**CONSULTATION RESPONSE – COLDEN COMMON VILLAGE DESIGN STATEMENT 2012**

I write on behalf of the Land Owners of Land off Upper Moors Road, Colden Common, in response to the Council's consultation on the above document.

- 1). P.2** – The aspiration to manage change and not prevent it is supported.
- 2). P.9** – The statement that the avenue of lime trees leading from Brambridge House to the B3335 is a key landscape feature outside the development boundary is shared.
- 3). P.9** – The aspiration to protect the four key landscape features' listed on page 9 is supported.
- 4). P.11** – Should 'map B' referred to at point 1 of the planning guidance be 'map C' ? Point 3 refers to an un-named map (xx).
- 5). P.13** – The purpose of the statement that "few houses are to be found along the length of the B3335 within the Parish boundary" is unclear. Whilst trees and hedges are dominant characteristics of the landscape, it should be acknowledged that the built form of housing is readily apparent from the B3335 when looking east.
- 6). P.17** – A residential density of at least 30 dwellings per hectare is supported, which is in accordance with Governments objective of boosting housing supply (part 6 of the National Planning Policy Framework – March 2012).

**7). P17** – Whilst provision of gardens to the front and rear of the houses is an admirable aspiration, and the provision of suitable residential amenity space for households is supported, it must be recognised that a disproportionate amount of amenity space might be counter-effective in terms of development viability and delivering a sufficient amount of housing. This statement (point 2 of general planning guidance) might prevent the ability to deliver 30 dpha as set out in point 1 of the general planning guidance, as might the provision of space for expansion (point 4).

**Recommendation:**

It is recommended that these aspects of the VDS are changed so that point 2 supports inclusion of 'gardens for houses' (not specifically front and rear) and so that point 4 supports provision of a 'wide choice of homes', but without a requirement for space for expansion on individual plots.

Please do not hesitate to contact this office should there be any queries. I look forward to acknowledgement of receipt of these representations.

Yours faithfully

**Will Thompson**  
**Director**