

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

Issue: 9.1 (Deposit 9.6)
RD09.01
(Proposals RT1, RT2)

City Council's response to representation

Support is welcomed.

Change Proposed - none

Representations:

Support/resolved/withdrawn:

GOSE (261/35)

Support the changes in RD09.01.

Change sought- none.

Denmead Parish Council (2246/1)

Support the four sites designated as RT1/RT2 status in Denmead.

Change Sought- none.

Issue: 9.2 (Deposit 9.4)

City Council's response to representation

RDMAP20.03

New Alresford - Railway

It should be noted that the "Responses to Representations on the Deposit Plan" document published in May 2003 incorrectly referred to land eastwards from Bridge Road (Issue 9.4). This should have read 'westwards'. Also the RT1 designation covers land from the end of new housing at Bridge Road westwards as far as New Farm Road and on the other side of that road, as far as the policy boundary. Nevertheless, the land is correctly shown on the Revised Deposit Plan's Proposals Map.

Representations:

The support is welcomed.

Support/resolved/withdrawn:

New Alresford Town Council (1386/1)

Supports RT1 designation from Bridge Road to New Farm Road.

Change Sought- none.

B K Purkiss (949/1), P R Ferris (2003/1), D N Goodham (2004/1), T Purkiss (2007/1), Mr & Mrs W. G Allen (2008/1), R Fleming (2009/1), R Parsons (2012/1), A M Targett, P H Targett, S Targett (2013/1), N Trowbridge (2014/1), S Dimmer (2020/1), J Ogilvie R A (2079/1), Mortimore (2078/1), M Slater (2080/1), A M Trowbridge (2086/1), P R Ruffle (2089/1), A H Dimmer (2100/1), S H Jennings (2109/1), Mrs Lewis (2111/1), B A Gatie (2115/1), S J Gatie (2116/1), E Palmer (2119/1), A Lettice (2264/1), E R Trickle, H A Trickle (2265/1), R Atkins (2266/1), P Jennings (2319/1), M Billingham (2320/1), C Billingham (2321/1), A White (2325/1)

Support RT1 designation as the site is a haven for wildlife and provides a green lung within the built-up area. Local residents enjoy the wildlife and visual amenity. Access should be made for footpaths to allow enjoyment of this area. Oppose development of the site.

Proportions of the site and change in levels make development difficult. Access to site is narrow and difficult. The Bridge Road area is congested and not suitable for any additional traffic. Oppose infilling and removal of trees. Concern about possible health hazards and heavy traffic associated with infilling.

Change Sought- none

Issue 6.28 of "Responses to Representations on the Deposit Plan" dealt with the objection seeking that the area of the former railway cutting remaining between New Farm Road and Bridge Road should be identified as 'brownfield land' in the Urban Capacity Study (UCS) and considered for housing development. The Council responded that the site is not appropriate for specific mention within the UCS, as it does not meet the criteria for a 'good' development opportunity. The Council considers that the WDLPR identifies sufficient land within the policy boundaries/development frontages (Proposals H2/H3) and the Major Development Areas (with reserve provisions if necessary) to avoid the need for any additional allocations of housing.

It is not considered that the designation of this site as RT1 land is an unproductive use of the land if it is an important visual amenity or otherwise important to the community. The physical dereliction and fly-tipping on the site is a management matter outside the control of the Local Plan. There is debate amongst respondents about the suitability of the site for housing development in terms of access and traffic issues. However, notwithstanding its location within the policy boundary and possible locational advantages of the site, the key issue is whether the area should retain the RT1 designation, in which case it would not be considered suitable for development for housing or other purposes.

The Council is currently conducting an assessment of the need for open space and recreational land throughout the District, as discussed further in Issue 9.5 of this Report. Whilst the Winchester District Open Space Strategy does identify a need for recreation space in New Alresford and makes provision for this, the Council is not claiming that this allocation is to rectify any deficiency in recreational space. RT1 designations refer to 'important amenity areas' not to areas for 'recreation'. The Plan defines these as 'open areas with significant amenity value that help define the character of towns and villages' (para 9.7 WDLPR). It is considered that this area provides an important visual amenity and acts as a green

Objections:

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

S Cope (1049/1), D Middleton (1050/1), A Moreau (2001/1), W Moreau (2002/1), T G Hall (2021/1), M A Hall (2022/1), S P Matthews (2023/1), K Bloodworth (2024/1), J Woodham (2025/1), A Cleeve (2026/1), Z Cleeve (2027/1), S Cleeve (2028/1), J Cleeve (2029/1), Jaye Cleeve (2030/1), J Cope (2031/1), D M Binfield (2032/1), B Shepherd (2033/1), S W Shepherd (2034/1), Paul Shepherd (2035/1), P Shepherd (2036/1), R Willett (2037/1), D Willet (2038/1), J Fairbairn (2039/1), L Felstead (2040/1), J Curtis (2041/1), G D Easton (2042/1), J A Rogers (2043/1), R Curtis (2044/1), C Evans (2045/1), M L Bagshaw (2046/1), S McEwan (2047/1), T Henderson (2048/1), F Walker (2049/1), S Ramsay (2050/1), P J Chalk (2051/1), A Chalk (2052/1), R G Davies (2053/1), L Barron (2054/1), N Hall (2055/1), S Lindon (2056/1), J Felstead (2057/1), D Cleeve (2058/1), S Prior (2059/1), V R Prior (2060/1), J A Smith (2061/1), S Brown (2062/1), P Bunting (2063/1), C R Bunting (2064/1), C I Cook (2065/1), J A Jolly (2066/1), V M Felstead (2067/1), M T Swain (2068/1), J W Swain (2069/1), W A Swann (2070/1), B H Nicholls (2071/1), E Evans (2072/1), D P Evans (2073/1), B Cope (2074/1), K E Brown (2075/1), M Titmus (2076/1), R Hiskett (2077/1)

Object to the RT1 designation. It would be more beneficial to the community to record the land in the Urban Capacity Study and consider it for affordable housing, or other beneficial use rather than leaving it to dereliction.

Change Sought- *include site in Urban Capacity Study and consider it for affordable housing or other uses (not specified)*

L F Cook (1048/1)

Object to the RT1 designation. Main points summarised as follows:

- i. LPA not complied with government policy to consider all previously developed land for housing.
- ii. The land should be considered as previously developed land within the policy boundary where development would normally be permitted.
- iii. Alresford desperately needs affordable housing and this is the largest and only available derelict site in New Alresford within the defined settlement boundary. Does not make the most productive use of the land to leave it derelict as it stands. Not to use this site for housing is to ensure that a greenfield site will be needed to meet demand

corridor. The last Appeal Inspector discussing a proposal for housing development on this site considered in 2001 that the site had a wildlife benefit. PPG17 'Planning for Open Space, Sport and Recreation' lists a wide range of open spaces of 'public value' and makes it clear that these can include 'natural and semi-natural urban greenspaces... scrub... wastelands and derelict open land and green corridors' (PPG17 Annex). The Annex further states that open spaces of public value can include areas of visual amenity 'even without public access'.

The Local Plan Sustainability Appraisal makes it clear in paragraph 30 that the 'RT Proposals' may appear to score negatively on land use and the protection of resources (individual allocations have not been subject to separate sustainability appraisals). However, the protection of land for amenity purposes is an important component of the quality of life for residents of the District and is therefore also an important consideration in sustainability terms. A balanced view has to be taken and it is considered that this space should be protected for its amenity value. Sufficient land is provided for development purposes under other Proposals in the Plan.

This site is not small enough to fall under the category of 'minor open space' as suggested by the respondent. It is considered that development would unacceptably harm the visual amenity of this area and that an RT1 designation is necessary to protect the site from development which would be harmful to the character of the area.

It is not the role of the planning appeal Inspectors to recommend policy changes to Local Planning Authorities. The Inspector that considered the most recent appeal was also not required to consider the suitability of the land for infilling as this was not part of the scheme before him for consideration. He did not therefore indicate that there was no objection to infilling. However, the most recent appeal Inspector (2001) did conclude that development of only one dwelling would:

- a) 'have an unacceptable impact on the character and appearance of the area by reason of the loss of protected trees' (part of the area is subject to a Tree Preservation Order); and
- b) 'be likely to result in unacceptable harm to an area of ecological interest', despite an earlier report from the County Council stating that the area was of little nature conservation interest. A new ecological survey has been commissioned from the County Council and it is hoped that the results will be available in spring 2004. However, in the absence of any active management of the site, it is unlikely that its wildlife value has decreased since the Inspector commented on its importance.

The site does not necessarily fall within the definition of previously developed land as it has reverted to a largely natural state. However, even if it was previously developed land within the definition in PPG3, this does not mean that it should necessarily be developed. Nor does the possibility that it may be accessed or close to public transport mean that it must be developed. Account needs to be taken of the effect of developing it on the features of the site and the character of the area. The land is clearly not suitable for inclusion in the Urban Capacity Study as it fails to meet the criteria for 'good' sites. For example, it is constrained by the presence of a Tree Preservation Order and trees that are of amenity value to the area, as well as potentially of ecological interest. It also appears to be in multiple ownership.

In the light of the government's view of the benefits of such spaces to communities, the appeal Inspector's opinion that trees on the site provide an important visual amenity and that the site has a wildlife value, and the representations to this effect from the local community, it is concluded that this site does continue to have significant amenity value and that an RT1 designation is appropriate.

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

- iv. Land is suitable for housing development as it has access, can easily be serviced and is close to public transport. ***Change Proposed - none***
- v. LPA has not referred to any assessed need for open space in Alresford as required by PPG17 and there is no shortage of open space in the area.
- vi. There is no public access to the site, so it cannot be an important open space amenity for recreation and tourism.
- vii. The site is not physically suitable for sport or recreation use.
- viii. There is no evidence of the land being of particular value for wildlife, or acting as a wildlife corridor.
- ix. Housing development has been refused on grounds of damage to important trees. The claim that the site contains trees that are subject to a TPO and contribute to the visual amenity of the area is not true.
- x. Site should fall under the category of development within a minor open space which is not of significant recreation importance.
- xi. LPA have adequate powers to control the site without a RT1 designation.
- xii. Site could be used for infilling using clean materials. Two Appeal Inspectors have found no objection to infilling this site.

Change Sought-include the above land in urban capacity study and give formal consideration to this site for housing purposes.

H N Woodham (1051/1)

Consider that the two Appeal decisions that refused housing development on this site could have been overcome and that current government policy would favour housing on this tatty 'green lung'. Neither Inspector recommended RT1 designation on the land.

The possible national park nearby may influence the use of the land. Site needs tidying to preserve its amenity, development would give a managed and preserved environment, an area could be designed so as to be set aside from development if desired. RT1 designation would perpetuate its dereliction, it must be included in some beneficial plan for Alresford. There are no ecological or environmental reports underpinning the designation of this site as RT1. It is not clear how the Sustainability Appraisal was applied to this area. This piece of land does not have public access and few can see into it. There is no substantive

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

evidence that it contributes to back garden wildlife. There are no important plants or wildlife.

Change Sought-delete the proposal to make old railway cutting RT.1. Keep the cutting within the development boundary as at present.

C Shaw (2011/1)

This land is private area which does not perform a public amenity function and is clearly not an open area. The trees on the site are the only feature that contribute to the amenity of the area and they are already protected by TPOs, therefore the RT1 designation is unnecessary. RT1 designation will not address the fly-tipping and neglect that has blighted this site.

Change Sought-remove proposed RT.1 designation.

A Cook (2017/1)

Government policy emphasises the need to build on brownfield sites and the Council should be using sites within town boundaries such as this, rather than utilising greenfield sites. The railway site would be an ideal location for affordable homes.

Change Sought-delete RT.1 classification on the railway cutting and identify this land for affordable housing

A Hanson (2009/1)

Land should be considered as a brownfield site in the Urban Capacity Study. Options should be kept open for the future use of the site.

Change Sought-cancel proposed change to RT.1.

Issue: 9.3(Deposit 9.2)

RD09.02
(Proposal RT2)

Representations:

Objections:

House Builders Federation (266/4)

Criteria (ii) delegates matters to SPG which should properly be included in the local plan. It is therefore contrary to para 3.17 of PPG12, in that it avoids public scrutiny, in accordance with the statutory procedures.

Change Sought-identify sites on the Proposals Map subject to a modifications inquiry to test the appropriateness of individual designations. Alternatively delete the policy.

Hampshire County Council (1434/7)

HCC has identified surplus school playing field land. Much of this land is within urban areas and could be identified for housing.

City Council's response to representation

Issue 9.10 of 'Responses to Representations on the Deposit Plan' dealt with a similar objection to 266/4, that Proposal RT4(i) appeared to delegate criteria for planning decisions to SPG. The Council responded that the Winchester District Open Space Strategy merely amplifies the type of provision needed to meet shortfalls in the defined areas and details other smaller scale improvements relating to identified local shortfalls. The Winchester District Open Space Strategy is a background paper to the Local Plan, rather than SPG. It is prepared in consultation with the parish councils and is reviewed annually, it identifies existing provision and recreational deficiencies. The criteria for determining planning applications remains within the Local Plan at RT2 and the supporting text. It is considered that the Proposal accords with the advice contained at paragraph 3.14 of PPG12, to avoid excessive detail in Development Plans.

The Council's response under Issue 9.2 to objections to the Deposit Plan, explained that it would not be practical to identify all the important recreational areas outside of policy boundaries, as many are small-scale and/or located in the countryside. RT2 was altered as a result of objections at the Deposit stage, to show where interested parties could find the identified sites ie on the Proposals Map, or in the Winchester District Open Space Strategy.

Objector 1434 made similar representations on the Deposit Plan. The

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

RT2 should provide for an exception in relation to surplus school playing field land.

Change Sought –add the following to RT2: “Exceptions to Proposal RT.2 may be permitted in the case of surplus school playing field land. In appropriate cases the disposal of such land may be acceptable to enable reinvestment of the proceeds into educational facilities as part of a County Council rationalisation strategy”. Add text to the supporting paragraphs to explain the context to this exception.

Bewley Homes & RCH Morgan-Giles (227/1)

Comments submitted in respect of the First Deposit are still considered to be of relevance. In addition...the Open Space Strategy fails to indicate how the Council intends to secure the proposed extensions to recreational provision in New Arlesford. If improvements are required, the District/Parish Council should negotiate a realistic strategy for deliverance of improvements with the landowner. The Council is invited to enter into negotiations re Arlebury Park at the earliest opportunity. The Open Space Strategy should be released as SPG in order to be subject to public consultation.

Change Sought -reword Proposal to reflect this objection and subject Open Space Strategy to public consultation.

Headbourne Worthy Parish Council (2326/1)

Continue to object that allotments are not covered by RT2 designation on the Proposals Map. Policy SF5 and paragraph 8.36 only mention allotments in the context of new provision and does not give protection to existing allotments.

Change Sought –not specified

Council's response at Issue 9.2 referred to the guidance in PPG17 on the need to protect playing fields and also described how there is a shortage of recreational land within Winchester itself and in many other parts of the District. In the light of this, it is considered unlikely that playing field land would be seen as surplus to the recreational requirements of the District in planning terms. It would not be appropriate to provide an exception to RT2 for educational land. Applications to develop playing fields would have to fulfil the criteria under RT2 and paragraph 15 of PPG17 and each case would be treated on its own merits.

The respondents' earlier comments relevant to this objection, have been dealt with under the Council's responses to representations on the Deposit Plan under Issues 9.2 and 9.14 (representations 227/12 & 227/13 respectively). Much of this objection is substantially the same as before and there is no further need to comment on this. However, there is a new comment in relation to the Open Space Strategy. The Open Space Strategy identifies existing shortfalls in recreational provision and proposes specific improvements. However, it does not identify how these improvements would be achieved. This would be subject to individual negotiations between the landowner(s), the Parish Council and the District Council and may be achieved in a number of ways. It is considered that the respondents' comments regarding New Arlesford could best be addressed through such negotiations and are not a matter that the Local Plan can deal with.

The objection relating to allotments has been responded to in Issue 15.1 of the responses to representations on the Deposit Plan. It is worth mentioning however, that Proposal SF6 gives protection to existing allotments where they are of benefit to the local community.

Change Proposed - none

Issue: 9.4(Deposit 9.5)
RD09.05
(New Proposal)

Representations:

Support/resolved/withdrawn:

Bishops Waltham Society (212/3)

Welcome new Proposal and text RD09.03 – RD09.05 to protect certain small open spaces. This resolves the objection to the Deposit Plan, 212/20/DEPOS

Change Sought –none

Sport England (312/1)

Support new Proposal RD09.05, that protects smaller areas of open space which have significant amenity value

Change Sought –none

City Council's response to representation

Support is welcomed.

This Proposal refers to small areas of open space which are an intrinsic part of surrounding housing and have been well used for informal recreation. This will generally have been for a substantial period of time during the life of the development, whether that development is recent or not. However, it may sometimes be the case that these areas of land have fallen into disuse through various reasons such as lack of maintenance, or, indeed, that the opposite situation may have occurred. It may still be the case in these instances, that these areas may provide valuable informal recreation opportunities and that they should be retained. It is therefore considered that it is not possible to be more precise about the 'period of time' that an area should have been used, as this will vary depending on the particular circumstances of each site. Any development applications will be treated on their own merits accordingly in light of the individual circumstances that prevail.

Change Proposed- none

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

Objections:

Bewley Homes (386/17)

Hawthorne Kamm Ltd (374/18)

Reference to 'a period of time' in criteria (ii) is not clear, particular in relation to recent development.

Change Sought –reword criteria (ii) to ensure no dispute about the use of the space.

Issue: 9.5(Deposit 9.9)

RD09.06

(New paragraph RD09.06)

Representations:

Support/resolved/withdrawn:

Sport England (312/2)

Welcome the new paragraph which provides further detail on the Open Space Strategy.

Change Sought: none

Objections:

Cala Homes (468/14)

It is not sufficient at this stage to refer to ongoing work in the form of a 'District-wide audit of open space' to justify a possible revised standard that would be imposed upon future developments.

Change Sought-none specified

Westbury Homes (469/3, 469/6)

This new paragraph acknowledges existing deficiencies in recreation provision, but fails to allocate available alternatives. If these deficiencies are not allocated now in the form of mixed use development on appropriate sites, will they ever be provided? Some of the deficiency could be met on sites such as those north and south of Lovedon Lane, Kings Worthy.

Change Sought-allocate additional sites and change Proposals Map accordingly.

City Council's response to representation

Support is welcomed.

The issue of a recreational audit and needs assessment has already been dealt with in Issue 9.8 of the 'Responses to Representations on the Deposit Plan'. The Council accepts that PPG17 requires Councils to undertake thorough audit of recreational provision and assessment of the recreational needs of their districts. It is considered that the Winchester District Open Space Strategy is a useful tool to use when determining requirements for recreation land and facilities, as it results from an audit of local facilities covering the whole of the District, is produced in conjunction with the parish councils and is updated on an annual basis. However, it is accepted that a more comprehensive audit may need to be undertaken and that an assessment of the recreational needs of the District should be carried out in order to develop local recreation standards. It has unfortunately not been possible to complete this work yet. However, it is not considered reasonable to delay progressing the Local Plan in order that this work is completed. It is hoped that it will be possible to produce the results of this work before the Revised Plan is Adopted and incorporate any (possible) revised standards into the WDLPR in an appropriate manner. It is considered reasonable to continue using the standard in the Plan in the meantime, which is a local adaptation of the NPFA standard, as it includes an allowance for general informal use.

The Local Plan does identify sites for future recreation provision at RT4 where there are significant shortages. Where there are less significant recreational land deficiencies, these are identified in the Winchester District Open Space Strategy. The Strategy outlines improvements necessary within each parish to alleviate these shortfalls. Sometimes it has been possible to identify potential sites in the Strategy, such as in Kings Worthy. However in some parishes it has not been possible to identify sites and in these cases the shortfall would be addressed by means of negotiations between developers and the parish and district council, using the Strategy as a guide.

Respondent 469 suggested allocating land north and south of Lovedon Lane for housing at the Deposit stage. The Council has responded that these sites have a rural character and are an important part of the countryside setting of Kings Worthy. It is therefore not considered appropriate to change the settlement boundary to accommodate housing development. The same response would apply to the proposal to use the site(s) for mixed housing and open space use, as this is not generally acceptable within the countryside. It is also not considered necessary to designate the site(s) for recreation use as Kings Worthy already has an RT4 designation and a strategy for dealing with shortfalls in provision, as outlined in the Winchester District Open Space Strategy. The Strategy identifies a need for children's play facilities in the north and western parts of the village, which the RT4 land would fulfil. There is also a small shortfall in sports ground provision in the two parishes of Kings Worthy and Headbourne Worthy, which the RT4 land would be in a better location to satisfy than the sites

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

suggested by the respondent.

Change Proposed – none

Issue: 9.6 (Deposit 9.9)
RD09.07
(Paragraph 9.20)

City Council's response to representation

The support is welcomed.

Change Proposed - none

Representations:

Support/resolved/withdrawn:

Sport England (312/3)

Welcome the new paragraph which provides further detail on the Open Space Strategy.

Change Sought: none

Issue: 9.7 (Deposit 9.16)
RD09.09
Proposal RT.6

City Council's response to representation

The support is welcomed.

Change Proposed – none.

Representations:

Support/resolved/withdrawn:

GOSE (261/36)

Support the changes in RD09.09.

Change sought- none.

Issue: 9.8 (Deposit 9.18)
RD09.12
(New paragraph RD09.12)

City Council's response to representation

The support is welcomed.

Change Proposed - none

Representations:

Support/resolved/withdrawn:

East Hampshire AONB (2283/7)

Support the inclusion of paragraph RD09.12 regarding CROW Act and Rights of Way Improvement Plans.

Change Sought –none.

Issue: 9.9 (Deposit 9.18)
RD09.13
(Proposal RT8)

City Council's response to representation

The support is welcomed.

Change Proposed - none

Representations:

Support/resolved/withdrawn:

Winchester Landscape Conservation Alliance (333/2)

Resolved objection 333/8/DEPOS

Change Sought- none

East Hampshire AONB (2283/8)

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

Support the inclusion of the new clause relating to the character of the route and its setting

Change Sought- none

Hampshire County Council Estates (1432/3)

Withdraw objection (1432/8/DEPOS)

Change Sought- none

Issue: 9.10 (Deposit 9.19)

RD09.14

(Paragraph 9.34)

Representations:

Support/resolved/withdrawn:

Hampshire County Council Estates (1432/9)

Withdraw comments on RT9

(1432/9/DEPOS)

Change Sought- none.

City Council's response to representation

The support is welcomed.

Change Proposed - none

Issue: 9.11 (Deposit 9.20)

RD09.15

(Proposal RT10)

Representations:

Support/resolved/withdrawn:

East Hampshire AONB (2283/9)

Support inclusion of text relating to the appropriateness of materials etc

Change Sought- none

City Council's response to representation

The support is welcomed.

Change Proposed - none

Issue: 9.12 (Deposit 9.21)

RD09.16

(Paragraph 9.38)

Representations:

Objections:

East Hampshire AONB (2283/10)

Golf related development is also unlikely to be appropriate within the proposed South Downs National Park (if confirmed) as well as within the AONB area. There may be other places within the Local Plan Review where similar comments would apply ie noisy sports

Change Sought- none specified.

City Council's response to representation

The part of paragraph 9.38 referring to where golf-related development is unlikely to be appropriate has not changed from the Deposit Plan, so there is no need for the Council to comment on this point. Notwithstanding this, it is considered that it would be premature for the WDLPR to contain reference within this Proposal and supporting text to the South Downs National Park at this time. The principle and boundary of the proposed National Park are subject to objections and, even if confirmed, the Park will not come into operation until late in the Plan period.

Change Proposed - none

Issue: 9.13 (Deposit 9.21)

RD09.17

(Paragraph 9.40)

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

Representations:

Support/resolved/withdrawn:

Hampshire Wildlife Trust (330/10)

Support the additions to the Plan at RD.17.

Change Sought-none.

Environment Agency (253/19)

Changes at RD09.17 & RD09.18 resolve previous objection 253/22/DEPOS.

Change Sought-none.

Issue: 9.14 (Deposit 9.23)

RD09.19

(paragraph 9.48)

City Council's response to representation

The support is welcomed.

Change Proposed - none

Representations:

Support/resolved/withdrawn:

J Hayter (138/24)

Resolved objection 138/10/DEPOS

Change Sought-none.

Issue: 9.15 (Deposit 9.23)

RD09.20

(Proposal RT13)

City Council's response to representation

The support is welcomed.

Change Proposed - none

Representations:

Support/resolved/withdrawn:

J Hayter (138/17)

Resolved objection 138/10/DEPOS

Change Sought-none.