

Settlement Boundary Review Addendum

Winchester District Local Plan Part 2: Development Management and Site Allocations Publication (Pre-Submission)



Winchester District Local Plan Part 2

Settlement Boundary Review – Addendum (2015)

Introduction

The Draft Winchester District Local Plan Part 2 – Development Management and Site Allocations, was published for a period of consultation from 24 October to 5 December 2014. A small number of the responses received made objections to the changes proposed in the Draft Plan to settlement boundaries. Where these relate to a change that was considered in the Settlement Boundary Review 2014 the specific locations have been reviewed with the outcome and recommendations being recorded in this paper. It should be noted that the methodology used is the same as in the Settlement Boundary Review 2014 and is not repeated here.

Colden Common

Map Ref	Location / Description	Criteria	Consideration / Recommendation	Action
1	Gardens to the rear of properties fronting Main Road (part SHLAA site 2497)	3(e)	<p>There are a number of mature specimen oak trees of high amenity and biodiversity value in the rear gardens. Their canopies are visible from the public realm i.e. from the recreation ground opposite; also glimpses from Main Road between houses and seen above rooftops. Oak trees are a key characteristic of the local area. Trees within the site are not currently protected although nearby oak trees do have Tree Preservation Orders (TPOs). Extending the settlement boundary will increase the vulnerability of trees within gardens. One of the oak trees is located on the rear boundary of 49 Main Road. This particular oak tree is situated on an old raised bank, which runs along rear garden boundaries. The bank, which supports diverse hedgerow species and ground flora as well as trees, is considered to be a locally characteristic feature worthy of retention and enhancement.</p> <p>Other constraints: The area beyond gardens is sensitive as it is a locally designated Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC) with its boundary adjoining rear gardens. The SINC includes Taylors Copse which is also designated ancient woodland. Together they provide an effective countryside setting and backdrop for the existing settlement. A yard with extensive areas of hard standing, parking, various buildings and storage areas lies between Taylors Copse and rear garden boundaries which does not presently maintain or the enhance woodland setting and is visually unattractive. Extending the settlement boundary would further compromise and suburbanise this area, which would not support Policy CP20. A suitable access</p>	Boundary to remain as illustrated on the Local Plan Review (2006) Policies Map.

Map Ref	Location / Description	Criteria	Consideration / Recommendation	Action
			<p>to rear gardens is also unclear. Any access into the site from the northern or eastern boundaries would have visual and landscape impacts.</p> <p>Conclusion: The rear gardens support local characteristics which visually relate to the adjacent countryside as set out in Principle 3 criterion (e). Therefore the site should not be included within the settlement boundary.</p>	

Swanmore

Map Ref	Location / Description	Criteria	Consideration / Recommendation	Action
4	Garden land behind Chapel Road and Droxford Road (SHLAA sites 2001 and part 2447)	3(e)	<p>The land involved is largely unbuilt-on at the rear. The area is not visible from Chapel Road, but is quite prominent in views approaching the National Park from Droxford Road, where it can be seen as a heavily treed area. It is clearly not a built-up area and presents a soft green edge to the National Park. The area could be considered to have back garden character and also a countryside character given its location on the edge of open countryside and the National Park.</p> <p>Other considerations: The development of this area is not needed to provide flexibility given the large allocation at The Lakes, which could provide additional capacity if needed, subject to acceptable environmental impacts. It is therefore not necessary to alter the boundary for the sake of neatness and the area does not provide an obvious and suitable candidate for inclusion within the boundary as discussed within paragraphs 20 and 21 of the Settlement Boundary Review.</p> <p>Conclusion: It is therefore considered that it does not clearly fall within Principle 2 criterion (c) and there are no overriding reasons to include this area within the settlement boundary. It is therefore recommended to retain the Local Plan Review (2006) settlement boundary in this area of Swanmore.</p>	Boundary to remain as illustrated on the Local Plan Review (2006) Policies Map.
7	Land to rear of property fronting Church Road (part SHLAA site 2514)	3(e)	This consideration now only relates to the part of SHLAA site 2514 that lies to the rear of Greenfields Lodge. There is built development to the east in the form of the garden of houses within Bucketts Close and to the west in the form of an extension to the primary school. The school extension is largely outside of the settlement boundary. To the rear of the	No change. Boundary to remain as illustrated on the Local Plan Review

Map Ref	Location / Description	Criteria	Consideration / Recommendation	Action
			<p>garden area lies a field, leading to more fields and into the South Downs National Park.</p> <p>The site area comprises a garden area to the rear of Greenfields Lodge. It is not visible from the public realm and is not physically, functionally or visually related to the main area of development in Swanmore. The area is a rectangular area approximately 36m in width and some 46m in depth, which represents a substantial wedge of green open area at the rear of Chapel Road.</p> <p>Other considerations: There is no requirement to find additional small sites for development and development of the site does not have local support.</p> <p>Conclusion: There is no reason to change the assessment within the SBR 2014 that the site falls under Principle 3 criterion (e) in that it is a large garden/open area that visually relates to the open countryside rather than the settlement. As such the site should not be included within the settlement boundary.</p>	(2006) Policies Map.