

WINCHESTER DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN REVIEW

ADDENDUM TO INSPECTORS' REPORT

INTRODUCTION

1. In a small number of cases, respondents to the Council's consultation on the Deposit Plan ticked the 'support' box on the comment form when they were in fact submitting objections. These therefore appeared as supporting comments in the Council's 'skeleton' and as a result were inadvertently omitted from our report.
2. At the Council's request we have now considered the objections and attach our comments and conclusions in this addendum to our report in respect of the 'Omissions' section of Chapter 6 of the Local Plan Review.

**E C Grace DipTP(Nottm), FRTPI, FBEEng, PPIAAS
M R Andrews MA, BSc(Econ), DipTP(Dist), MRTPI**

6.21. Omission Site - Bishops Waltham

OBJECTIONS TO DEPOSIT PLAN

Proposal/ Paragraph	Rep Number	NAME
H.02	463/1	P Lovejoy

ISSUE

Whether the Proposal H.2 settlement boundary for Bishops Waltham should be extended to include land at Albany Road (463/1).

INSPECTOR'S CONSIDERATION AND CONCLUSIONS

1. The physical extent of Bishops Waltham was defined in both the Southern Parishes Local Plan (1991) and the adopted Winchester District Local Plan (1998). The objection site referred to in the above issue was considered for inclusion in the settlement boundary by the Inspectors holding Inquiries into both these Plans and in each case this argument was rejected.
2. The current Local Plan Review maintains the previously approved policy boundary and although the objector argues that the land does not form part of a farm holding and is not of any agricultural value, I can find no reason to disagree with the conclusions of my predecessors. Development would be intrusive into the countryside and have an adverse effect on the countryside setting of Bishops Waltham. The site is not clearly defined or well contained by any natural features. I also consider that in addition to the visual harm caused by an incursion of development into the countryside in this location, the proposed SINC designation is indicative of the potential harm that would be caused to nature conservation value of the site if the settlement boundary were to be altered.

RECOMMENDATION

3. That no modifications be made to the Plan.

6.22. Omission Sites - Colden Common

OBJECTIONS TO DEPOSIT PLAN

Proposal/ Paragraph	Rep Number	NAME
H.02	460/1	Mr T Clay and Mrs Freemantle
H.02	459/1	Mr T Clay
H.03	456/1	Mr & Mrs Howes
H.03	457/1	Peter Wheeler

ISSUES

1. Whether the Proposal H.2 settlement boundary of Colden Common be amended to include additional land for residential development. (459/1), (460/1).

2. Whether land fronting Hensting Lane and Main Road should be included within a new Proposal H.3 frontage designation. (456/1), (457/1).

INSPECTOR'S CONSIDERATION AND CONCLUSIONS

1. In the first issue, the objectors seek an amendment of the policy boundary for Colden Common so as to include 0.8ha land off Church Lane and 3.1ha of land off Lower Moors Road. In both cases an argument is put forward that the Urban Capacity potential of Colden Common is unlikely to be realised and that additional greenfield land on the edge of the settlement will therefore be required. However as I have already made clear in my report on the Council's housing strategy, I do not share the view that sites within the settlements will definitely not come forward to the extent anticipated in the Plan. Furthermore in the case of Church Lane, the development of the objection site at a density commensurate with the requirements of PPG3 would be fundamentally at odds with the adjoining frontage / linear low density development pattern. This would not be the case at the second objection site in Lower Moors Road, where there is already some development in depth. But nonetheless the change in character from rural to urban of over 3ha of prominent land between Lower Moors Road and Main Road through the use of agricultural land for large scale housing development would be harmfully intrusive.
2. In the second issue, the objectors seek development frontage designation under Proposal H.3 for an extensive length of Hensting Lane and a smaller area along an adjoining section of Main Road. However earlier in this report I have recommended the deletion of Proposal H.3 and the development frontage concept and its replacement with a criteria based policy that would distribute the limited amount of development outside the Proposal H.2 settlements to more sustainable locations where it would better meet local housing needs. In the light of this recommended deletion it would be inappropriate for me to express any view on the merits or otherwise of these objections.

RECOMMENDATION

3. That no modifications be made to the Plan.