

CHAPTER 11: WINCHESTER

11.1. General Comments

OBJECTIONS TO DEPOSIT PLAN

Proposal/ Paragraph	Rep Number	NAME
CHAP11	1206/1	Chris Fox
CHAP11	474/7	Redrow Homes (Southern) Ltd

ISSUES

1. Is there a need to allocate greenfield sites and to concentrate more development on Winchester? (474/7)
2. Does more attention need to be given to tree loss in Winchester? (1206/1)

INSPECTOR'S CONSIDERATION AND CONCLUSIONS

- 11.1.1 Dealing with both issues together, the objectors express concern that there is an over-reliance in the Plan on urban capacity sites in the city of Winchester and too much development of this type would threaten its distinctive character, particularly through trees lost to development. One solution to this would be the allocation of greenfield sites. Although I agree with the Council that it has correctly followed the sequential approach advocated by PPG3 and thereby looked to meet its housing needs on previously developed land within built up areas before even considering greenfield development, I also consider that there is some merit in the objectors' arguments. It is partly for this reason that in my report on the objections to Chapter 6 I have favoured the allocation of some greenfield sites as a Local Reserve, to be used if urban capacity sites (together with the Waterloooville MDA) provide an insufficient yield within the period of the Plan. Although the Council must look to achieve PPG3 densities of 30 – 50 dwellings per hectare on brownfield sites they must also exercise some restraint and pragmatically apply the provisions of proposals DP.3 and DP.5 to accept a lower density where the character of a particular site, including its tree cover, demands it.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- 11.1.2 That no modification be made to the Plan.

11.2. The Future of Winchester Study (paragraphs 11.2 - 11.8)

OBJECTIONS TO DEPOSIT PLAN

Proposal/ Paragraph	Rep Number	NAME
11.7	1446/10	Chris Gillham
11.7	333/9	Winchester Landscape Alliance
11.8	967/8	D. W Briggs

ISSUES

1. Is the statement in Paragraph 11.8 that 'not all aspects of Winchester's setting are sacrosanct' in conflict with the reference in the Future of Winchester Study that development should maintain Winchester's core characteristics? (967/8)
2. Does paragraph 11.7 suggest that the qualities of Winchester do not count for much as they could be outnumbered by commercial imperatives? (1446/10)

3. Should a Proposal be added to the Plan that requires an assessment of potential use of existing school playing fields for public recreation before further land is assigned for this purpose? (333/9)

INSPECTOR'S CONSIDERATION AND CONCLUSIONS

11.2.1 In the first two issues, the objectors are unhappy with the wording of paragraphs 11.7 and 11.8 of the Plan and consider that the paragraphs undermine the Future of Winchester Study. However I am satisfied that when read as a whole this part of the Plan (paragraphs 11.2 – 11.8) is a largely factual account of the Future of Winchester Study and the events before and after its publication. In short, I do not see any misrepresentations as the objectors claim.

11.2.2 In the third issue the Winchester Landscape Conservation Alliance refers to the reference in paragraph 11.7 to Winchester making 'better use of what the town already has' and request an additional 'RT Proposal' to secure the increased use of School Playing Fields. However Proposal RT.6 already seeks to achieve this objective and I see no need for an additional policy.

RECOMMENDATION

11.2.3 That no modification be made to the Plan.

11.3. Environment - Winchester's Special Character (paragraphs 11.9 - 11.13, Proposal W.1)

OBJECTIONS TO DEPOSIT PLAN

Proposal/ Paragraph	Rep Number	NAME
11.11	468/70	Cala Homes (South) Ltd
W.1	1371/3	A Ames
W.1	1416/4	B R and E A Bull
W.1	227/14	Bewley HomesPlc And R C H Morgan-Giles
W.1	1405/4	C Butterworth
W.1	1164/1	C Robert Bradshaw
W.1	1412/4	C. W Eames
W.1	468/71	Cala Homes (South) Ltd
W.1	1187/1	E. W Lee
W.1	1419/4	English
W.1	1186/1	G I Kingdon
W.1	1414/4	Geoff and Liz Cox
W.1	1415/4	Geoffrey Wickes
W.1	349/10	Ian White
W.1	1411/4	J Barnet
W.1	1246/2	J Burrows
W.1	1401/4	J P English
W.1	1406/4	J.A Foreman
W.1	1413/4	James Cullen
W.1	1168/1	Jean Bradshaw
W.1	1421/4	Joan Foreman
W.1	1247/2	John Burrows
W.1	1404/4	Josianne Wong
W.1	877/14	Kier Land
W.1	1369/3	M E Moore
W.1	1184/1	M. J Maidens
W.1	1403/4	Margaret Raw

W.1	1402/4	Mary E Butterworth
W.1	1409/4	N A McPherson
W.1	1410/4	P G Stubbs
W.1	1418/4	P S And S J Early
W.1	907/2	Paul Roderick
W.1	474/1	Redrow Homes (Southern) Ltd
W.1	1125/1	Rosemary Poole
W.1	1420/4	S J Keigher
W.1	1111/3	Sarah Burrows
W.1	175/4	Save Barton Farm Group
W.1	1121/2	Toni West
W.1	1417/4	V J and G M Denham

ISSUES

1. Should the Local Plan contain a ban on buildings higher than 3 storeys in Winchester? (1125/1)
2. Does the Plan strike a balance with the need to maintain the special character of Winchester and to meet other sustainability targets and achieve carefully planned future growth? (887/5, 888/7, 468/71, 468/70, 227/14, 1371/3)
3. Should reference to a reserve site at Barton Farm be deleted? Have its potential effects been properly considered and is the allocation contrary to the Future of Winchester Study? (175/4, 349/10, 1184/1, 1121/2, 1246/2, 1111/3, 1247/2, 907/2, 1401/4, 1402/4, 1403/4, 1404/4, 1405/4, 1406/4, 1409/4, 1410/4, 1411/4, 1412/4, 1413/4, 1414/4, 1415/4, 1416/4, 1417/4, 1418/4, 1419/4, 1420/4, 1421/4, 1186/1, 877/14, 1164/1, 1168/1, 1369/3)
4. Should land to the north of Francis Gardens be included within the defined policy boundary of Winchester? (474/1)
5. Should national criteria for playing field provision apply to Winchester? (1187/1)

INSPECTOR'S CONSIDERATION AND CONCLUSIONS

- 11.3.1 In the first issue the objector appears to seek a provision in the Plan to preclude buildings no higher than three storeys plus basement. Although I sympathise with the thrust of the argument, to have such a ban would be too prescriptive and in any event criterion (ii) of Proposal DP.3 provides an adequate safeguard.
- 11.3.2 In the second issue, higher densities and the development of sites within the urban areas as part of the Plan's strategy of promoting urban capacity to meet the housing targets is raised in the context of paragraphs 11.9 – 11.13 and Proposal W.1. I have commented on this debate at various points in my report and concluded that the absence of a policy similar to Proposal EN.1 in the adopted Plan (which identifies and protects areas of special character) need not be a drawback to the Plan if the Council gives sufficient weight to other Plan policies including the criteria of Proposal DP.3 in its interpretation of the guidance in PPG3.
- 11.3.3 The third issue refers to the reserve MDA housing site at Winchester City (North) in the context of Proposal W.1. In commenting on Proposal NC.3 in the section of my report on the objections to Chapter 12 of the Plan I have taken full account of the impact of the development, if in fact it goes ahead, on the setting and character of the City of Winchester. The Future of Winchester Study, together with 'Winchester City and its setting' and other relevant documents inform my analysis of Proposal NC.3 and the objections thereto but suffice it to say that in the context of this part of Chapter 11, I see no irreconcilable conflict with proposal W.1 and the supporting paragraphs which would warrant a recommendation for their amendment in the light of the objections received.
- 11.3.4 Issue 4 refers to land to the north of Francis Gardens. I have dealt with this objection in the Chapter 6 Housing Omission Sites section of this report.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- 11.3.5 That no modifications be made to the Plan.

11.4. Housing (paragraph 11.14)

OBJECTIONS TO DEPOSIT PLAN

Proposal/ Paragraph	Rep Number	NAME
11.14	210/23	Berkeley Strategic Land Limited

ISSUE

Is the Local Plan correct to suggest that Winchester has a 'considerable' scope for housing development within its defined built-up area? (210/23)

INSPECTOR'S CONSIDERATION AND CONCLUSIONS

11.4.1 I have dealt with this issue elsewhere in my report, where I broadly agree with the Council's position that, notwithstanding the need to conserve its character, there is substantial capacity in Winchester for more housing. I therefore see no need to alter the Plan in respect of the comment in paragraph 11.14 that 'Winchester has considerable scope for housing development within its defined built up area'.

RECOMMENDATION

11.4.2 That no modification be made to the Plan.

11.5. Broadway / Friarsgate (paragraphs 11.17 - 11.19)

OBJECTIONS TO REVISED DEPOSIT PLAN

Proposal/ Paragraph	Rep Number	NAME
RD1103	2297/14	P Garber
RD1103	474/22	Redrow Homes (Southern) Ltd
RD1104	2297/15	P Garber
RD1104	474/23	Redrow Homes (Southern) Ltd
RD1105	1401/3	J P English
RD1105	2316/3	London And Henley Property Holdings Ltd
RD1105	2297/16	P Garber
RD1105	474/24	Redrow Homes (Southern) Ltd
RD1106	2297/17	P Garber
RD1106	474/25	Redrow Homes (Southern) Ltd
RD1107	223/3	City Of Winchester Trust
RD1107	2297/18	P Garber
RD1107	474/26	Redrow Homes (Southern) Ltd
RD1108	2297/19	P Garber
RD1108	474/27	Redrow Homes (Southern) Ltd
RD1109	2297/20	P Garber
RD1109	474/28	Redrow Homes (Southern) Ltd
RD1110	2297/21	P Garber
RD1110	474/29	Redrow Homes (Southern) Ltd

RD1111	2297/23	P Garber
RD1111	2297/22	P Garber
RD1111	474/30	Redrow Homes (Southern) Ltd
RD1112	474/31	Redrow Homes (Southern) Ltd

OBJECTIONS TO REVISED DEPOSIT PLAN

Proposal/ Paragraph	Rep Number	NAME
RD0802	2316/1	London and Henley Property Holdings Ltd
RD0804	2277/1	Wm Morrison Supermarkets Plc

OBJECTION TO PRE INQUIRY CHANGES

Proposal/ Paragraph	Rep Number	NAME
PIC1101	2337/2	London Henley (Winchester) Ltd

ISSUES

1. Are there insurmountable difficulties with the Broadway / Friarsgate site that mean that it should not be allocated for housing and alternative housing allocations should be made elsewhere? (474/22/REVDEP - 474/31/REVDEP, 2297/14/REVDEP - 2297/23/REVDEP)
2. Should the Broadway/Friarsgate planning brief be mentioned in the Local Plan and should it continue to promote comprehensive development of the site? (2316/1/REVDEP, 2316/3/REVDEP, 2337/2/PIC)
3. Should the last sentence of RD11.07 be amended? (223/3/REVDEP)
4. Is the Broadway/Friarsgate site unlikely to provide enough retail floorspace, in which case is there a need to clarify what alternative locations will be acceptable for additional retail floorspace? (2277/1/REVDEP)
5. Is the reference to improving this area of the city meaningless when the Plan also allocates a reserve housing site at Winchester City (north) and should references to the reserve MDA thus be deleted? (1401/3/REVDEP).

INSPECTOR'S CONSIDERATION AND CONCLUSIONS

- 11.5.1 In the first issue, two objectors are doubtful as to the feasibility of the redevelopment of Broadway/Friarsgate as envisaged in new Proposal RD11.05 and supporting paragraphs RD11.02 – 11.04 and RD11.06 – 11.12. In Chapter 8, new paragraphs RD08.02 and RD08.04 and Proposal SF.1 (RD 08.08) are also relevant. Amongst the aspects raised by the objectors are those of archaeological and flood risk constraints, difficulties of multiple land ownerships and the dubious likelihood of implementation within the Plan period.
- 11.5.2 I acknowledge that with any substantial scheme of redevelopment in a town or city centre, particularly where there are several land ownerships, it is legitimate to at least question the rationale behind the project and its feasibility. That said, from my inspection of the area I consider that the new Proposal is important for the urban regeneration / environmental improvement of this part of the city centre.. Not only will the Proposal provide a policy framework, it will also serve as a catalyst for action and I note that pursuant to the draft policy a Planning Brief has already been finalised following public consultation. The retail content of the mixed use scheme is supported by the findings of the 2003 Winchester Retail Study (referred to in the Plan in RD08.02 and RD08.04) and the revision of the housing content from 100 units to between 300 and 400 will act as an economic driver towards implementation, as well as providing benefits of affordable housing and an increase in residence in the city centre.
- 11.5.3 The comprehensive nature of the development (Issue 2) is in my view essential. Certainly this increases the complexity of the scheme but I agree with the Council that without it there would be a real risk that the objectives set out in the Planning Brief would not be achieved. Development on a block by block basis may well be

appropriate in some developments in some locations. But from my inspection of the area and reading the Plan and the documents that inform it, I am satisfied that in this instance such an approach would run the risk of the proposal failing to meet its social, economic and transport objectives as well as making it harder to achieve a distinctive contribution to the townscape of the City centre.

- 11.5.4 I have noted the further representations submitted on behalf of an objector to the effect that the Retail Study of 2003 was flawed; that the balance of the scheme is in any event shifting from retail to housing thereby not meeting the commercial need, and that the Council has engaged with a single developer rather than provide opportunities for others, including landowners. The objection thus makes it very clear that there is disquiet with both the content of the scheme and the process by which the Council has sought to progress the matter through the Planning Brief to its current stage. However I do not regard the accuracy of the Retail Study, the content of the Planning Brief or indeed the Council's implementation methods as being within my remit in respect of this Plan. And for the reasons stated in respect of the totality of the objections to the Broadway / Friarsgate scheme, I am satisfied that as a policy framework, the Plan and the further modifications proposed set out reasonably appropriate considerations and parameters for the redevelopment to proceed in a form consistent with the strategies for housing, commercial development, transport and townscape / conservation.
- 11.5.5 In the third issue, the Council has proposed Pre-Inquiry Change PIC11.01 to delete the final sentence of RD11.07 and thereby ensure consistency with the approved Planning Brief. And as the latter has now been approved following public consultation I see no reason why it should not be referred to in the Plan, albeit that paragraph RD11.06 will need to be updated as part of the general update that the Plan will need before adoption.
- 11.5.6 In the fourth issue, the objector seeks amendment of the final sentence in RD08.04 to cater for the possibility that alternative locations will be acceptable if the Broadway/Friarsgate redevelopment proves incapable of accommodating the level of retail floorspace required in the city centre envisaged by the Winchester Retail Study. However the Council has proposed FPC08.A and PIC08.02 to amend the last sections of paragraphs RD08.02 and RD08.04 respectively and I consider that these provide the additional flexibility sought by the objector.
- 11.5.7 In the fifth issue, the substance of the objection relates to the Reserve MDA at Winchester City (North) in Chapter 12 of the Plan and I see no need to comment in respect of the passing reference made to Broadway / Friarsgate.

RECOMMENDATION

- 11.5.8 That the Plan be modified in accordance with PIC11.01 and by updating RD11.06.

11.6. Recreation and Tourism (paragraphs 11.20 - 11.27, Proposal W.2)

OBJECTIONS TO DEPOSIT PLAN

Proposal/ Paragraph	Rep Number	NAME
W.2	1446/11	Chris Gillham
W.2	223/3	Mrs P Edwards City of Winchester Trust
W.2	330/8	The Wildlife Trusts
W.2	331/3	Winchester City Residents Association
W.2	333/12	Winchester Landscape Alliance

ISSUES

1. Is it appropriate for Proposal W.2 to provide for sports facilities, informal recreation and small-scale recreational uses at Bushfield Camp, Winchester? (223/3, 330/8, 331/3, 333/12, 1446/11)
2. Is it appropriate for the Local Plan to provide for or park and ride facilities at Bushfield Camp, Winchester (Proposals W.2, W.3 and W.6)? 331/4, 331/5.
3. Should national criteria for playing field provision apply to Winchester?.

INSPECTOR'S CONSIDERATION AND CONCLUSIONS

- 11.6.1 In the first issue, a number of objectors including the City of Winchester Trust and the Winchester City Residents Association express concern as to the appropriateness of Bushfield Camp for sports, recreation and tourism related facilities, as suggested in Proposal W.2. I note however that the uses suggested for the Camp are not new; they are very similar to those in Proposal W.19 of the adopted Local Plan which in turn came from the recommendations of the 1995 Draft Bushfield Camp Study, subsequently adopted in 1997.
- 11.6.2 Having read the objectors' representations – and indeed having heard some of them at the Inquiry – I essentially agree with the Council's comment that the objections are less to what the Plan (Proposal W.2) actually proposes and more to what they fear the landowners may put forward or the Council might permit. And in my view the objectors' fears are not particularly well founded. The criteria of Proposal W.2 and paragraphs 11-23 – 11.26 make it clear that the sensitivity of the site, particularly in landscape and ecological terms, will have to be taken fully into account and that before planning permission is granted for any aspect of the development, comprehensive principles will need to be established which have regard not only to Proposals DP.1 and DP.3, but also the conclusions of the Bushfield Camp Study. As a policy framework, which is all the Plan can legitimately provide, I consider that this is sufficient. There is additionally the further restraint imposed by the location of Bushfield Camp with the Local Gap under Policy C.4 of the Plan. And with the Council's open space strategy identifying a substantial shortfall of formal open recreation land, including sports grounds, the use of the most appropriate parts of the 63ha Camp is in my opinion essential to meet the needs of the City residents.
- 11.6.3 I acknowledge that the concerns of the objectors are justified to the extent that too intensive a development and the provision of the 'wrong' type of facilities could inappropriately alter its character by to some degree 'urbanising' the area and threatening the landscape setting of the Itchen Valley. But nothing I have read either in the Plan itself, or in the background documents which inform Proposal W.2, lead me to suppose that the objector's fears would be realised. Apart from the principles of Proposal W.2, I have also considered the objections as to its detail, including the exact wording. But in my view the alterations suggested would in part be inappropriate terminology for a Local Plan and in part weaken and limit the legitimate scope of the policy.
- 11.6.4 In the second issue, although the objectors refer to Proposals W.3 and W.6 dealing with Park and Ride car parks for the city as a whole and general parking provision respectively, the final paragraph of Proposal W.3 refers specifically to a Park and Ride scheme at Bushfield Camp in association with the recreational development envisaged in Proposal W. 2. As with the recreation proposals I consider that this proposal has a good pedigree in that it formed part of the Bushfield Camp Study. Ecological and landscape constraints will clearly be at the forefront in the detailed planning and in terms of the longer views towards the site it will be essential to ensure that the City of Winchester Trust's fears of a 'sea of car roofs reflecting in the sunlight' expressed at the Inquiry are not realised. But nonetheless as a principle I endorse the Plan's concept of a Park and Ride Facility in this location on the basis that both the parking itself and the public transport to and from the city would be available for a 'dual use' to serve both commuters and users of the recreational facilities.

- 11.6.5 In respect of the third issue, the objector queries whether national criteria for playing field provision should apply to Winchester, bearing in mind that the population profile of the city is not such as to require facilities for team games. However I give greater weight to the analysis of the Plan and the Council's supporting documents which identify a shortage of recreational facilities and the need to make additional provisions.

RECOMMENDATION

- 11.6.6 That no modifications be made to the Plan.

11.7. Park and Ride (paragraphs 11.31 - 11.35, Proposal W.3)

OBJECTIONS TO DEPOSIT PLAN

Proposal/ Paragraph	Rep Number	NAME
W.3	468/72	Cala Homes (South) Ltd
W.3	205/1	G Humphrey
W.3	286/8	Itchen Valley Parish Council
W.3	204/2	K Larkin
W.3	882/4	Keith Story
W.3	1369/4	M E Moore
W.3	331/4	Winchester City Residents Association
W.3	333/13	Winchester Landscape Alliance

ISSUES

1. Should the Plan ensure that brownfield sites are used for Park and Ride where possible, and that the impact on Greenfield sites is minimised if they are used? (1370/2) (286/8) (882/4) (331/4) (286/8)
2. Should specific potential Park and Ride sites be allocated in the Plan and should a comprehensive Park and Ride plan be produced before the Local Plan states an intention to grant further planning permissions? (204/2) (205/1) (1369/4)(468/72) (333/13)

INSPECTOR'S CONSIDERATION AND CONCLUSIONS

- 11.7.1 In the first issue, the thrust of the objections is that brownfield rather than greenfield sites should be used for Park and Ride sites. The debate on this subject is informed by the Winchester Movement and Access Plan which forms one of the Area Transport Strategies in the Hampshire Local Transport Plan. As an historic city with the status of a Conservation Area, I entirely endorse the principle in the Movement and Access Plan that to reduce traffic in the central area, Park and Ride services should be provided 'operating from car parks located at strategic sites close to major access corridors on the outskirts of the town'. With this locational requirement, and indeed the further indication in the Transport Plan that sites in the Winnall area (to serve traffic from Junction 9 of the M3) and to the north of the city (to serve traffic from the A34 and Andover), there are clearly substantial constraints on the choice of suitable sites. The reality of the position is duly reflected in paragraph 11.34 of the Plan which states that it may not be possible to find suitable sites within the built up area of the city.
- 11.7.2 Taking this into account, I am satisfied that the wording of Proposal W.3 and the restrictions on siting indicated in paragraph 11.35 go as far as they reasonably can to ensure that the provision of Park and Ride causes the minimum harm to the environment generally, and the landscape setting of the city in particular. Being realistic, it is probable that greenfield sites will be needed. But in my view this should

not be an overriding constraint, as the fundamentals are firstly that they are placed in locations where they will actually work and secondly that their visual impact is reduced to the maximum extent. Overall, I am satisfied that Proposal W.3 and the supporting text does provide the policy framework to ensure that these fundamentals are duly met, including in the Winnall area notwithstanding the 'in principle' objection of the Itchen Valley Parish Council.

- 11.7.3 As regards the second issue, the objectors have a point in that the Plan could have been more specific in terms of Park and Ride provision, including specific sites. That said, the Local Transport Plan in general and the Winchester Movement and Access Plan in particular, are subject to separate public consultation procedures and, as I indicate above, I am of the view that the Plan provides an adequate policy framework for the subsequent of particular schemes. Consultation on individual planning applications for the schemes will provide a further opportunity for informed debate and there is no recommendation that I could make which would enable the Council to insert specific sites with a full evaluation having first been made.

RECOMMENDATION

- 11.7.4 That no modifications be made to the Plan.

11.8. Town Centre Traffic Management (paragraph 11.36, Proposal W.4)

OBJECTIONS TO DEPOSIT PLAN

Proposal/ Paragraph	Rep Number	NAME
W.4	209/1	Consignia
W.4	892/2	Judith Pope

ISSUE

Should proposals restricting/excluding town centre traffic be removed or should Proposal W.4 be amended to include reference to 'appropriate exemptions for certain essential business traffic? (892/2, 209/1)

INSPECTOR'S CONSIDERATION AND CONCLUSIONS

- 11.8.1 Proposal W.4 seeks to preclude development which would generate significant additional cross-town private vehicular traffic. One objector is concerned that this would deter shoppers and thereby affect the viability of the city centre whilst Consignia plc wish to maintain existing levels of access for Royal Mail vehicles. However Proposal W.4 and the supporting text make it clear that the policy refers only to new development and in tandem with Proposal W.5 has the objective of reducing unnecessary traffic in the centre, thereby increasing the opportunity for environmental improvements. As Proposal W.4 is only part of the policy framework for future traffic management measures, I do not consider it prejudices the accessibility of visitors to the city centre or that of the businesses and residents who occupy it.

RECOMMENDATION

- 11.8.2 That no modifications be made to the Plan.

11.9. Parking Controls and Servicing (paragraphs 11.37 - 11.42, Proposals W.5 - W.7)

OBJECTIONS TO DEPOSIT PLAN

Proposal/ Paragraph	Rep Number	NAME
W.5	1258/2	Clare Allen
W.5	1369/5	M E Moore
W.5	1379/2	Richard Bayley
W.6	331/5	Winchester City Residents Association

ISSUES

1. Should the Plan ensure that brownfield sites are used for Park and Ride where possible, and that the impact on Greenfield sites is minimised if they are used?(1379/2)
2. Should specific potential Park and Ride sites be allocated in the Plan and should a comprehensive Park and Ride plan be produced before the Local Plan states an intention to grant further planning permissions? (1369/5)
3. Should the Plan continue to contain references to a reduction of car parks within town centres and the development of park and ride as an alternative? (1258/2)
4. Should Proposal W.6 be amended so it does not suggest that a minimum if any parking will be provided on sites in the town centre? (331/5)

INSPECTOR'S CONSIDERATION AND CONCLUSIONS

- 11.9.1 Issues 1 and 2 refer to the provision of Park and Ride in the city in respect of which Proposal W.3 sets out provisos and identifies Bushfield Camp as a site. I have dealt with objections to the latter as part of my report on objections to Proposal W.2 above. Although one objector considers that the emphasis should be on parking provision at Micheldever and Winchester rail stations and that Park and Ride sites in the countryside would be harmful and unpopular, as I have explained in Section 11.7 above, I am satisfied that Proposal W.3 exercises the necessary restraint on such sites and ensures that they would only be permitted where their advantages clearly outweigh the drawbacks. Micheldever station is not in my view an optimum location having regard to the need to intercept the main traffic flows, whilst Winchester rail station's location on the edge of the city centre would not reduce car trips within the city. A second objector identifies other sites for Park and Ride provision that should be included in the Plan, but paragraph 11.33 reports that the Local Transport Plan has identified two additional general locations. If detailed sites are put forward, Proposal W.3 in tandem with the Hampshire 'Local Transport Plan' (2001-2005) and any revision thereof, plus public consultation on planning applications, will provide an adequate mechanism to inform a decision whether to proceed with their implementation.
- 11.9.2 In the third issue the objector considers that the reduction of parking in the city centre and changes to short stay spaces to encourage the use of Park and Ride schemes will disadvantage many residents and adversely affect local businesses. However to my mind the strategy is sound and provided, as Proposal W.5 and the text say, it is long stay rather than short stay spaces that are controlled I consider that the Plan strikes the appropriate balance between maintaining viability and decreasing congestion.

11.9.3 In Issue 4, the Winchester City Residents Association seeks the amendment of Proposal W.6 to remove the reference to minimal, if any, on-site parking provision in the City centre. However this element of the policy is central to the Plan's strategy and, indeed the requirements of national guidance in PPG13, to increase non-car modes of transport to and from, and within, sustainable locations. Furthermore the reduction of on-site parking enables higher density housing and is commensurate with conserving the townscape of the Conservation Area. I therefore see no need to amend the Proposal.

RECOMMENDATION

11.9.4 That no modifications be made to the Plan.

11.10 Pedestrians, Cyclists and Disabled (paragraphs 11.44 - 11.52, Proposals W.9, W.10)

OBJECTIONS TO DEPOSIT PLAN

Proposal/ Paragraph	Rep Number	NAME
W.9	79/1	Nigel Lindley
W.10	333/10	Winchester Landscape Alliance

ISSUES

1. Is Criterion (i) of W.9 incorrect because it involves private land where there is no public right of way? (79/1)
2. Should a new Proposal linked to W.9 be included in the Plan to ensure the maintenance and repair of the Itchen Navigation and Hockley Viaduct? (333/10)

INSPECTOR'S CONSIDERATION AND CONCLUSIONS

11.10.1 In Issue 1, the proposed footway from Jewry Street to North Walls is opposed by agents for the landowners who say that the proposal affects their private property. However this does not affect the merits of the proposal which in my view would provide a valuable link for pedestrians and improve public safety. The acquisition of a right of way will be the subject of separate negotiations with the landowners if the Council decides to implement the proposal.

11.10.2 In the second issue the objectors seek an additional proposal (W.11) to be linked with Proposal W.10 for the Itchen Navigation's structural integrity to be maintained. However meritorious this suggestion may be, I agree with the Council that the imposition of maintenance requirements on several agencies is not a 'land use' matter that can be properly included in the Plan.

RECOMMENDATION

11.10.3 That no modification be made to the Plan.