

CHAPTER 15: APPENDICES, GLOSSARY AND MAPS

15.1 Appendix 1

OBJECTIONS TO DEPOSIT PLAN

Proposal/ Paragraph	Representation Number	Name
Appendix 1	286/9	Itchen Valley Parish Council
Appendix 1	335/9	P Windsor-Aubrey

ISSUE

Should the Itchen Valley Management Strategy be adopted as Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) and should the headings on pages 151 and 152 be revised to show which documents are included therein?

INSPECTOR'S CONSIDERATION AND CONCLUSIONS

15.1.1 Amendment RDAp1.07 has amended the heading to clarify which documents are listed as comprising SPG. On the substantive issue, the Itchen Valley Parish Council and the Upper Itchen Valley Society wish the document 'Itchen Valley Management Strategy' to be adopted as Supplementary Planning Guidance and listed as such in Appendix 1 of the Plan. The Council considers that the strategy is primarily a management document and could not therefore be legitimately adopted as SPG. In any event it precedes the currently adopted Local Plan and would not therefore be supplementary to the Review Plan. Accordingly it is listed in Appendix 1 as 'Other Background Documents'.

15.1.2 I have noted the further response of the Upper Itchen Valley Society to the Council's Response Note 15.01 expressing the view that the strategy is inextricably linked with planning policy and that the increased conservation status of the Valley in recent years reinforces the case for the document to be adopted as SPG. However, sympathetic as I am to the points raised, I do not consider that whether or not a particular document is adopted as SPG is within my remit in this Inquiry. This is a matter for the Council and the classification of documents in Appendix 1 does not provide sufficient *nexus* for me to make a recommendation.

RECOMMENDATION

15.1.3 That no modification be made to the Plan.

15.2 Appendix 2

OBJECTIONS TO DEPOSIT PLAN

Proposal/ Paragraph	Representation Number	Name
Appendix 2	473/4	George Wimpey UK Ltd
Appendix 2	474/2	Redrow Homes (Southern) Ltd
Appendix 2	227/18	Charles Planning Associates

ISSUES

1. Should Land at Albany Farm, Bishops Waltham be included within the Proposal H.2 settlement policy boundary? (473/4)
2. Should Land at Francis Gardens Winchester be included within the Proposal H.2 policy settlement policy boundary? (474/2).
3. Are the Landscape Character Area Key Characteristics too vague and should they not form part of the Development Plan? (227/18)

INSPECTORS CONSIDERATION AND CONCLUSIONS

15.2.1 Issues 1 and 2 have been dealt with in the relevant sections of the Housing Omissions section of my report. Issue 3 has been covered in my report on the objections to Chapter 13 at paragraph 13.1.1.

RECOMMENDATION

15.2.2 That no modification be made to the Plan.

15.3 Glossary

OBJECTIONS TO DEPOSIT PLAN

Proposal/ Paragraph	Representation Number	Name
Glossary	878/4	A Foster

ISSUE

Should the Glossary include additional definitions and should the definition of 'Affordable Housing' be amended?

INSPECTORS CONSIDERATION AND CONCLUSIONS

15.3.1 The objector considers that the terms 'Built-up area', 'Urban area', 'Gross' and 'Net' density should be defined and is concerned that the definition of the term 'affordable housing' does not accord with that in Circular 6/98. The Council has defined 'built-up area' in an amendment incorporated in the Revised Deposit (RDGLO.02) in the Glossary of the Plan. However, in view of my recommendation in respect of Proposal H3, this requires further modification to delete the references to development frontages as being a built-up area. The Council says that the term 'Urban area' is not used in the Plan and does not therefore require a definition. 'Gross' and 'net density' are in fact explained in the Glossary, although I note the Council have added to this in RDGLO.03 in view of the addition to Proposal DP.3 relating to the exclusion of areas that are important to the character of the wider area. I consider these definitions to be satisfactory.

15.3.2 As regards the definition of 'affordable housing', the Pre-Inquiry Change PICGLO.02 proposes a modification to the definition to '*Housing provided, with subsidy, for people who are unable to resolve their housing requirements in the local housing sector market because of the relationship between housing costs and incomes*'. From my consideration of the affordable housing section in Chapter 6 it will be apparent that I accept this revised definition subject to the removal of the word *sector*.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- 15.3.3 That the Plan be modified by:
- a) deleting the reference to development frontages in the definition: *built-up area*;
 - b) deleting the word *sector* from the definition of affordable housing.

15.4 Maps

OBJECTIONS TO DEPOSIT PLAN

Proposal/ Paragraph	Rep Number	NAME
MAP 38	328/4	Twyford Parish Council

OBJECTIONS TO REVISED DEPOSIT PLAN

Proposal/ Paragraph	Rep Number	NAME
RDM20.03	2026/1	Alan Cleeve
RDM20.03	2017/1	Andrew Cook
RDM20.03	2016/1	Andrew Cook
RDM20.03	2001/1	Anne Moreau
RDM20.03	2052/1	Audrey Chalk
RDM20.03	2074/1	B Cope
RDM20.03	2033/1	Ben Shepherd
RDM20.03	2065/1	C I Cook
RDM20.03	2045/1	Catherine Evans
RDM20.03	2064/1	Clive Richard Bunting
RDM20.03	2032/1	D M Binfield
RDM20.03	2058/1	Dale Cleeve
RDM20.03	2038/1	Daph Willett
RDM20.03	1050/1	Debbie Middleton
RDM20.03	2072/1	E Evans
RDM20.03	2049/1	Fran Walker
RDM20.03	2042/1	G D Easton
RDM20.03	1051/1	H. N Woodham
RDM20.03	2066/1	J A Joly
RDM20.03	1047/1	J Cope
RDM20.03	2031/1	J Cope
RDM20.03	2039/1	J Fairburn
RDM20.03	2043/1	J Rogers
RDM20.03	2069/1	J W Swain
RDM20.03	2025/1	J Woodham
RDM20.03	2030/1	Jane Cleeve
RDM20.03	2041/1	John Curtis
RDM20.03	2057/1	John Felstead
RDM20.03	2061/1	Judy Ann Smith
RDM20.03	2029/1	Julie Cleeve
RDM20.03	2075/1	K E Brown
RDM20.03	2024/1	Kevin Bloodworth
RDM20.03	2054/1	L Barron
RDM20.03	1048/1	L. F Cook
RDM20.03	2040/1	Louise Felstead
RDM20.03	2022/1	M A Hall
RDM20.03	2046/1	M L Bagshaw
RDM20.03	2068/1	M T Swain
RDM20.03	2076/1	M Titmus
RDM20.03	2055/1	N Hall
RDM20.03	2036/1	P Shepherd
RDM20.03	2063/1	Patricia Bunting
RDM20.03	2035/1	Paul Shepherd
RDM20.03	2051/1	PJ Chalk
RDM20.03	2078/1	R A Mortimore
RDM20.03	2053/1	R G Davies
RDM20.03	2077/1	R Hiskett
RDM20.03	2044/1	Ray Curtis
RDM20.03	2037/1	Roy Willett
RDM20.03	1049/1	S Cope

RDM20.03	2073/1	S P Evans
RDM20.03	2023/1	S P Matthews
RDM20.03	2034/1	S W Shepherd
RDM20.03	2056/1	Sarah Lindon
RDM20.03	2028/1	Scott Cleeve
RDM20.03	2047/1	Sharon McEwan
RDM20.03	2062/1	Sue Brown
RDM20.03	2059/1	Sue Prior
RDM20.03	2021/1	T G Hall
RDM20.03	2067/1	V M Felstead
RDM20.03	2060/1	V R Prior
RDM20.03	2070/1	W A Swain
RDM20.03	2002/1	W.L Moreau
RDM20.03	2027/1	Zena Cleeve
MAP41A	362/5	P Hill
RDM41.01	2107/4	Grainger Trust Plc
RDM41.01	214/4	Grainger Trust Plc
MAP 45	373/13	Bryan Jezeph Consultancy
RDM45.03	2273/5	Kier Land

ISSUE

Whether the Maps and changes to them are appropriate (All objectors).

INSPECTOR'S CONSIDERATION AND CONCLUSIONS

- 15.4.1 I have dealt with the issue forming the basis of objections to RDM 20.03 (the addition of an RT.1 designation for the former railway cutting) in my comments in the Housing Omissions section of New Alresford (Chapter 6).
- 15.4.2 The objection to MAP 38 is by Twyford Parish Council who consider that the Twyford settlement boundary should not cut through the Doctor's Surgery. I have dealt with this under the Housing Omissions section of my report in Chapter 6. Secondly the Parish Council point out that in the Twyford Map in the Urban Capacity Study (UCS), the lawns of the Elms, a listed building in the Conservation Area, are shown suitable for infill, whilst the Old Fire Station is in active use as an office and its change would be contrary to policy. However although the UCS informs the Plan, it does not form part of it and is not within my remit to recommend alterations thereto. In any event, I understand that the Council are soon to update the UCS when there will be an opportunity to address any anomalies.
- 15.4.3 The objections to RDM 41.01a include representations from the Grainger Trust plc and are to the effect that Inset Map 41a be further amended to reflect the decisions reached by the West of Waterlooville Forum at its meeting in April 2004 and the further subsequent refinements to the Masterplan carried out on behalf of the objector since that date. The Council has advanced FPC12.03 to propose modifications to Inset Map 41a in light of the agreed Masterplan.
- 15.4.4 A second objector requests that MAP 41a should make it clear that there will be a separate or possibly no link to Purbrook Heath Road. This matter has been addressed in Chapter 12 in terms of textural references thereto. Whilst the Council's FPC12.03 proposes modifications to the Inset Map 41a, to take account of the most recent agreement between the constituent bodies relating to the West of Waterlooville MDA Masterplan, it does not mention the alignment of the Southern Access Road which I note has varied slightly from that shown on the Revised Deposit version and I consider that for the sake of conformity that too should be shown.
- 15.4.5 The objection to MAP 45 is that the area of land is inadequate to provide for the proposed Reserve MDA for Winchester City (North) and the possibility of extensions to the urban settlements of Littleton and Harestock should be reconsidered. I have dealt with the adequacy of the Reserve MDA in my comments on objections to Chapter 12. The request for additional housing land to be allocated at Littleton and Harestock is dealt with in the Housing Omissions section of Chapter 6.

15.4.6 The objection to RDM 45.03 is to the effect that there is a more appropriate site than Barton Farm to accommodate the Reserve MDA , namely at St John Moore Barracks / Littleton Stud. I have dealt with this issue in my report on the objections to Proposal NC3 (RD 12.51).

RECOMMENDATIONS

15.4.7 That the Plan be modified in accordance with FPC12.03 together with the depiction of the alignment of Southern Access Road as shown on the approved Masterplan.