

Winchester District Local Plan Review
Analysis of Representations on the Revised Deposit Plan

Issue: 8.1 (Deposit 8.2)

RD08.01- 08.06

Paragraphs 8.3-8.6

Representations:

Support/resolved/withdrawn:

GOSE (261/27)

Support the changes in RD08.03.

Change sought-*none.*

RD08.01-RD08.06

Cadbury Schweppes Plc. (260/2) (260/3) (260/4) (260/5) (260/6) (260/7)

We support the changes reflecting the retail survey and study. In particular, we support the acknowledgement that there will be a possible need for additional retail warehousing in the District over the plan period (RD08.06) and that this will be provided in accordance with the sequential approach and subject to the requirements in Proposal S.F.1.

Change sought-*none.*

Objections:

(223/1)

The wording of RD 08.02 lacks clarity, particularly due to the lack of distinction between Broadway/Friarsgate and the City Centre. There is also ambiguity between 'any further significant retail development' in the middle of the paragraph and 'any other significant development' at the end.

Change sought –*RD 08.02 should mention use of the sequential test in assessing developments outside of the City Centre.*

London and Henley Property Holdings Ltd. (2316/1) (2316/2)

Although generally supportive of the aim to secure redevelopment of the Broadway/Friarsgate area, the policies are too prescriptive and potentially unrealistic. They should be amended to allow for the redevelopment of the area on a block by block basis, rather than pressing for a comprehensive scheme. The policy should make it clear that the burden of costs such as improvement of the bus station are not unfairly allocated to new development on adjacent sites. The proposed reference to the planning brief is also objected to. It is dubious whether the brief merits this reference, which will have policy status, as it depends on the level of genuine consultation that takes place.

Change sought-*none specified.*

City of Winchester Trust (223/2)

RD 08.04 should make it clear that the floor space figures are for gross areas, and the net equivalents should also be

City Council's response to representation

The support is welcomed.

It is accepted that, the new paragraph in RD08.02 does lack clarity. Amended wording is proposed. In regard to the suggestion that the new paragraph RD08.02 should mention the sequential test, it is believed that the reference to Proposal SF.1 is adequate, as this Proposal requires the use of the sequential test.

The London and Henley Property Holdings Ltd representation is responded to in Issue 11.1. Please refer to Issue 11.1 to see the comments.

For further clarity it is recommended that RD08.04 include the net equivalents as suggested in the representation from City of Winchester Trust.

There is uncertainty about the amount of convenience floorspace that can be accommodated within the Broadway/Friarsgate development. As such, it would not be appropriate to identify additional sites at this stage, but the Plan should be amended to refer to the difficulty of accommodating them in the Town Centre and uncertainty over the content of Broadway/Friarsgate.

The Local Plan is a policy document and does not need to go into the level of detail that the Representation suggests. Should a developer be interested in looking at the breakdown of figures, for example floorspace, they can find it in the Winchester Retail Study 2003.

In regard an individual retail application, as with any development application, it will be judged on its merits.

Change Proposed – Last sentence of Paragraph 08.02

Any other significant retail development proposals which are unable to be located in the Broadway/Friarsgate development will be required to demonstrate a need for the development in the proposed location and to meet the other requirements of Proposal SF.1.

Change Proposed –Paragraph RD08.04

The Winchester Retail Study recommends that Winchester provides additional floorspace of approximately 8,500m² gross (6000m² net) for 'comparison' shopping and 5,000m² gross (3300m² net) for 'convenience' shopping. This would meet projected growth in retail spending during the Plan period and help Winchester regain a realistic proportion of the expenditure growth, claw-back, turnover levels, etc. The Broadway/Friarsgate area is the most suitable location for such development, and as much of the additional comparison floorspace as can be reasonably accommodated should be provided there, as part of an overall redevelopment scheme (see Proposal SF.1). It is thought unlikely that the full recommended provision of convenience floorspace can be built within the town centre. How much can be accommodated will depend largely on the final format of the Broadway/Friarsgate scheme. If further retail floorspace is needed in Winchester, it should be provided in accordance with the 'sequential approach' contained within Proposal SF.1.

Winchester District Local Plan Review
Analysis of Representations on the Revised Deposit Plan

shown.

Change sought – *Insert the word ‘gross’ after 8000 and 5000, then also include the net equivalent figures in brackets.*

WM Morrison Supermarkets Plc (2277/1)

Although identification of the likely requirement of floorspace is welcomed, it is not thought that the site allocated at Broadway/Friarsgate is likely to be adequate. The final sentence in RD 08.04 should be amended to clarify that alternative locations will be acceptable in accordance with the sequential approach.

Change sought – *amend the final sentence of paragraph RD 08.04 to read: ‘if all of the floorspace for which a need has been identified cannot be accommodated within the Broadway/Friarsgate area, then additional sites will be considered in accordance with the sequential approach set out in proposal SF.1. If further retail floorspace is needed during the plan period, it should also be provided in accordance with proposal SF.1.*

B&Q Plc. (325/2)

The text does not provide a break down of the various forms of comparison shopping for the purposes of calculating expenditure or the provision of existing floorspace, and therefore the supporting text draws very generalised conclusions.

Change sought – *it should be made clear that the retail requirements outlined in the retail study are only a guide for future retail development and that individual retail applications will be judged on their own merits in the light of the retail need at the time.*

Issue: 8.2 (Deposit 8.4)

RD08.07

Chapter 8: paras 8.7

Representation:

Objections:

Fareham Borough Council (1423/1)

The addition of the word ‘District’ in RD08.07 does not help to clarify the role or hierarchy of centres.

Change sought – *none specified.*

City Council’s response to representation

The word ‘District’ was included into 8.7 in response to a representation on the Deposit Plan from Fareham Borough Council. It was considered that the reference to Whiteley as a ‘town/village centre’ could cause confusion, as it is referred to as a District Centre in the Fareham Local Plan. Thus changes were made to include ‘District’.

In regard to identifying a hierarchy of centres, SF.1 sets out the main centres. It is not considered necessary to make any further amendments.

Change Proposed – None

Winchester District Local Plan Review
Analysis of Representations on the Revised Deposit Plan

Issue: 8.3 (Deposit 8.3)

RD08.08

Proposal SF.1

Representations:

Objections:

Cala Homes (South) Ltd. (468/13)

Object to the omission of Winchester City (North) MDA in the list of areas to concentrate commercial and leisure development. These uses are referred to in the structure plan as a requirement for an integrated approach in planning MDAs.

Change sought – a clear role should be given to Winchester City (North) in the District's retail hierarchy.

B & Q Plc. (325/3)

Policy SF.1 is still confusing as it does not set out all of the requirements of PPG6.

Change sought-amend proposal to say that new shopping development outside of Winchester, Bishop's Waltham, Denmead, New Alresford, Whiteley and Wickham will be permitted where:

- a) there is a need for the proposal
- b) the proposal is located in accordance with the sequential approach
- c) either alone or cumulatively with other developments the proposal would not adversely affect the vitality and viability of local centres
- d) access and car parking are satisfactory and the local roads could accommodate any traffic generated
- e) the site is readily accessible or can be made accessible by foot, cycle and public transport.

City Council's response to representation

As stated in the Analysis of Representations on the Deposit Plan 'the Winchester City (North) MDA is only a 'reserve' allocation and, if it is triggered, a Masterplan will be drawn up for it. The retail assessments carried out so far, taken in conjunction with the 'sequential approach', do not suggest any need for significant retail development at Winchester City (North) even if the MDA is triggered. For further comments refer to Issue 8.3 in the Analysis of Representations on the Deposit Plan.

As a result of earlier representations on the Deposit Plan Proposal SF.1 was changed in order to include reference to the 'sequential test', to identify the tests involved to establish retail need and whether a suitable sites exists and generally to make the policy more user-friendly. The policy sets out the points in PPG6 which reads as follows:

- include criteria-based policies to provide certainty to developers who may propose retail developments outside town centres, and make clear how they will:
 - a) assess the impact of proposals on the vitality and viability of existing town
 - b) assess their accessibility by a choice of means of transport
 - c) appraise and take account of the overall impact on travel in each.

It is considered that the Changes Proposed in the Revised Deposit Plan are appropriate, cover these points, and do not need editing.

Change Proposed – none

Issue: 8.4 (Deposit 8.5)

RD08.10

Paragraph 8.12

Support/resolved/withdrawn:

GOSE (261/28)

Support the changes in RD08.10.

Change sought-none.

City Council's response to representation

The support is welcomed.

Change Proposed - None

Issue: 8.5 (Deposit 8.6)

RD08.11

Paragraph 8.16

Support/resolved/withdrawn:

GOSE (261/29)

Support the changes in RD08.11.

Change sought-none.

City Council's response to representation

The support is welcomed.

Change Proposed - None

Winchester District Local Plan Review
Analysis of Representations on the Revised Deposit Plan

Issue: 8.6 (Deposit 8.8)

RD08.12

Proposal SF.2

Support/resolved/withdrawn:

GOSE (261/30)

Support the changes in RD08.12.

Change sought-none.

City Council's response to representation

The support is welcomed.

Change Proposed - None

Issue: 8.7 (Deposit 8.9)

RD08.13

Proposal SF.3

Support/resolved/withdrawn:

GOSE (261/31)

Support the changes in RD08.13.

Change sought-none.

City Council's response to representation

The support is welcomed.

Change Proposed - None

Issue: 8.8 (Deposit 8.10 and 8.11)

RD08.14 to RD08.16

Proposal SF.4

Representation:

Support/resolved/withdrawn:

GOSE (261/32 and 261/33)

Support the changes in RD08.14 and RD08.15).

Change sought-none.

Cadbury Schweppes Plc. (260/8)

We support the changes to proposal SF.4

Change sought-none.

City Council's response to representation

The support is welcomed.

Change Proposed - None

Issue: 8.9 (Deposit 8.15)

RD08.18-RD08.22

New Proposal

Representations:

Objections:

Hampshire County Council (1434/6)

Although generally supporting the new paragraphs, the exclusion of nursery, primary and secondary educational establishments is objected to. There is an increasing demand for new/enlarged facilities within school sites

Change sought-the proposal should be revised to read: 'development which is essential for the operation of existing educational establishments in the countryside will be permitted provided that...'

City Council's response to representation

The New Proposal RD08.20 was introduced to the Revised Local Plan as a result of representations on the Deposit Plan in relation to the lack of policies for free-standing, large educational establishments in the Countryside. The apparent need for the introduction of this Proposal becomes obvious when one views the Hampshire County Structure Plan. The policies in this document provide for educational development and student accommodation within built-up areas, but does not provide for essential development at free-standing educational facilities in the Countryside.

In respect to nursery, primary and secondary educational establishments and/or general education facility development, Proposal C.5 in the Countryside and Natural Environment allows for the development of essential facilities and services to service the local community, which could include educational facilities (refer to Proposal C.5 of the Countryside and Natural Environment Chapter for further detail).

Representation 2308 states that 'it is inconsistent not to acknowledge a role for essential education development in the countryside

Winchester District Local Plan Review
Analysis of Representations on the Revised Deposit Plan

King Alfred's College (2308/1)

RD08.20 should allow essential education development in the countryside required by educational institutions within the settlement areas in circumstances where there are no other suitable alternatives within the settlement area.

Change sought—*amend the proposal to say development will be permitted in the countryside for education establishments for which a countryside location is essential, rather than merely for those in the countryside*

associated with education establishments located within settlement areas'. The Local Plan is consistent with Government Guidance in that any further development in the Countryside must be essential. As paragraph 4.4 of the Countryside and Natural Environment states, 'inappropriate development threatens the character of the countryside. Only essential new development will be permitted within the area defined as countryside in the Plan'. As such, educational establishments located within settlements will need to prove that there is no alternative within the settlement before consideration will be given to any proposal for new development within the Countryside. Further, it is not considered that the Local Plan is inconsistent by not specifically mentioning that educational facilities within settlements may have an essential need to develop new facilities in the Countryside.

For the purpose of clarifying that Proposal C.5 is not only for development of new facilities, it is recommended that the following changes be made.

Change Proposed – Paragraph 4.9 Countryside and Natural Environment Chapter

In exceptional circumstances, it may be necessary to locate or expand some facilities or services in the countryside.