Elaine Bonnon

From:	lan Taylor
Sent:	16 September 2012 16:15

To: Steve Opacic

Cc: LDF

Subject: RE: Colden Common VDS 2012 DRAFT CONSULTATION - Specific Items 3 - Groundwater Source Protection Zones

The VDS needs to make reference to the wider importance of the area to the Itchen River Basin etc. the village is crisscrossed and bounded by several important water courses and these must be taken into consideration and referred to in the VDS in rather more detail to support the documented feedback that villagers feel there should be no more development on our green fields.

Much of the village falls under 'special protection' via The Environment Agency, in several cases this is SPZ1 and in others (to the East) SPZ2 and the River Basin Management Plan.

This appears to mean that in some areas certain types of development will be opposed and in others special measures are required are necessary.

Whilst I wouldn't expect the VDS to quote detailed technicalities it would be worth emphasising the importance of the area to the local water courses and perhaps overlaying the current Groundwater Source Protection Zones on an existing or further map as part of section 3 – The Natural Environment.

Thank You

Ian Taylor

From: SOpacic@winchester.gov.uk [mailto:SOpacic@winchester.gov.uk] Sent: 20 August 2012 12:53 To:

Subject: RE: Colden Common Village Design Statement 2012 DRAFT CONSULTATION

Dear Mr Taylor,

Thank you for your comments on the draft Colden Common Village Design Statement. I acknowledge receipt of these and your indication that more detailed comments are to follow. These will be taken into account by the City Council's Local Development Framework Committee, along with others received, when it decides whether any changes are needed to the VDS before it is adopted.

Yours sincerely,

Steve Opacic

Head of Strategic Planning Winchester City Council Colebrook Street Winchester, SO23 9LJ T 01962 848101 (Direct) F 01962 841365 sopacic@winchester.gov.uk From: Ian Taylor Sent: 16 August 2012 13:36 To: LDF

Subject: Colden Common Village Design Statement 2012 DRAFT CONSULTATION Dear Sir

The (much awaited) Colden Common Village Design Statement 2012 (CC VDS) in its current state is a disappointment. Whilst it paints an interesting historical picture of our rural village it lacks some clarity of purpose and more importantly accuracy of information and supporting evidence to protect The Village. For example The Environment Agency (EA) and Hampshire Biodiversity Information Centre (HBIC), other wildlife and countryside agencies had not previously been contacted with information requests. I obtained this sometime ago as a 'member of the public' whilst the CCVDS was in draft but this valuable information has not been incorporated.

There are also footpaths and Tree Preservation Orders missing from 'Map D' and other important views from 'Map C'.

The document itself is very large to download and when printed there are issues with the shaded text boxes that make it hard to read, particularly page 3, 7 and 8. These technical issues will need attention before final issue.

I will provide more detailed comments and supporting information before the deadline of 17th September however I want to record at this stage that a major concern is the fact that the CCVDS seems to offer little hope of protection from more large scale development within **and around** the village boundaries. Developers will simply ride roughshod through CCVDS and expose the loopholes. I am equally concerned that the Winchester District Local Plan 2006 (WDLP2006) and supporting documents may be watered down in a similar way; at least WDLP2006 currently offers some inferred protection via area policy H3.

The village has seen aggressive tactics (they have been working on this proposal since at least 2010 and have been promoting actively this year) being employed by one developer for a valuable village open space that also forms an important green space that prevents more ribbon development. This Plot (Ref: 1874), mistakenly marked 'previously developed' on the Winchester District Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment Nov 2011 is on Upper Moors Road and separates The Village from Highbridge Road. This is a large site adjoining the South Downs National Park and historic Brambridge Park/Garden. This particular area is not covered by CCVDS 'Planning Guidance Areas' even though it is described as being on one of the 'oldest thoroughfares' in the village'.

There seems nothing in the CCVDS to alert developers that a proposal to build the whole 20 year target of 250 homes, in one go, in one field will not be welcome. I'd estimate that nearly 200 people attended a Parish Council Meeting in March this year when this particular proposal was discussed and there is no doubt that this size of development is not appropriate in The Village. (see PC Minutes here:

http://www.coldencommon.hants.gov.uk/ParishNews2005.html)

It is also important that CCVDS consultation is well publicised, as far as I am aware it has only been circulated by email to those on the 'CommonView' e-mailing list but this is hardly all encompassing, I haven't yet seen any posters or flyers in The Village.

The consultation notice does not make it clear if comments on CCVDS will ultimately be available to other members of the public to view, please can you clarify as soon as possible? Ian Taylor

Village Resident

Click here to report this email as spam.

This email and any files transmitted with it are intended solely for the addressed individual. The information in this email may be confidential; if you have received it in error, please accept our apologies and notify the sender as soon as possible, and delete it from your system without distributing or copying any information contained within it. Under UK Data Protection and Freedom of Information legislation, the contents of this email might have to be disclosed in response to a request. We check emails and attachments for viruses before they are sent, but you are advised to carry out your own virus checks. Winchester City Council cannot accept any responsibility for loss or damage caused by viruses.



