

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

Issue: 12.1 (Deposit various)
RD12.13 RDMAP41 and 44
General

Representations:

Support/Resolved/Withdrawn:

**Hampshire County Council;
Environment Dept (1433/6, 1433/11)**

Support the changes made to the Plan to identify the boundary of the reserve MDA at West of Waterlooville.

Change Sought - none specified

Objection:

Eagle Star Estates Ltd (352/2)

Object to the identification of a site for the proposed allocation of land West of Waterlooville as reserve MDA (please see H.1)

Change Sought - That the proposed allocation of a reserve MDA at West of Waterlooville is deleted from the District Local Plan Review and further consideration is given to the choice of MDA(s) in Winchester, including a proper evaluation of Micheldever Station Market Town.

G Blakett (82/1), A W Blakett (83/1), P Cooper (157/1), M Norris (1077/1), A R B Norris (1079/1), F Harrison (2081/1), J Harrison (2082/1), D Wright (2090/1), D W Lock (2262/1)

It is premature to delete the 'area of search'. Until the joint panel has agreed on a Masterplan no change on the boundary of the search area should be made. This objection applies to a number of changes throughout the West of Waterlooville section of Chapter 12.

Change Sought - remove all reference to 'the maximum extent of a reserve area' and retain references to the 'area of search' as in the original text throughout the West of Waterlooville section of Chapter 12.

Grainger Trust PLC (2144)

Object to the amendments made to Map 41 for the following reasons:

- Broad location of the cemetery is accepted but the extent of the area shown is excessive. Development would be appropriate alongside the new southern access road in terms of public transport patronage and good design.
- It is unclear on what basis the Masterplan Framework, which informs changes to the Proposals Map, has been determined. A substantial amount of built development is proposed on the Masterplan Framework which does

City Council's response to representation

The support is welcomed.

The identification of a reserve site for 1000 homes at West of Waterlooville MDA is in compliance with the Hampshire County Structure Plan. Policy H.4 in the Structure Plan specifies that reserve housing provision should be identified in local plans, and one of the sites to be allocated for reserve housing provision of 1000 dwellings is West of Waterlooville.

This is a strategic decision and the Local Plan must be in general conformity with the Structure Plan. The possibility of development at Micheldever Station was assessed and rejected by the strategic planning authorities and it is not for the Local Plan to revisit that issue, even if the City Council wished to.

The Structure Plan requires local plans to identify the land required for the reserve provision. The identification of an 'area of search' was an interim measure incorporated in the deposit Local Plan until such time as the reserve provision site could be determined. Work carried out by the City Council and its consultants has enabled a preferred Masterplan Framework for the site to be drawn up and allowed the reserve provision to be specified, taking account of the maximum area of land that will be required to accommodate 2000 dwellings. It will be noted that the County Council has supported the identification of the reserve area and it would not be appropriate to go back to an area of search at this stage.

The representations by Grainger Trust raise a number of detailed issues, relating mainly to the Masterplan Framework diagram. Grainger Trust is one of the development interests involved in drawing up the Masterplan for the MDA and most of the matters raised are detailed matters which will be resolved in that process. However, a brief response to the issues is set out below.

The cemetery arises from a need identified and justified by Havant Borough Council. Even if the land allocated on the Masterplan Framework is excessive, this does not mean that the 'excess' is suitable for development. The aim has been to minimise the amount of development in this part of the MDA due to its more constrained nature (e.g. ecological interest, visual impact, gas main, etc).

The Masterplan Framework has been developed from the 'Atkins' options and also took account of the Capacity Study. Adequate open space to meet the needs of the development is proposed within the development area. Therefore there is no need to allocate the land south of the Purbrook Heath recreation ground for formal recreation or other MDA requirements. The Plan does, however, annotate the area as suitable for the informal recreation needs of the MDA. The Masterplan Framework only annotates the reserve housing provision as having a white background, not other reserve provision such as recreation or schools.

The Local Plan allocates land north of the Waterlooville Town Centre access road as employment land. The precise split between 'traditional' employment and mixed-use development will be determined through the Masterplan process. It would not be appropriate to pre-judge the outcome of this work by changing the Plan at this stage.

Whilst it accepted that the role and design of the main access points will need to be tested through the Masterplanning and Transport Assessment processes, it is considered at this stage that the London Road/Milk Lane access is likely to be one of the main access points to the development. It is, therefore, considered inappropriate and premature to indicate that this should be a cycle/pedestrian access only. The role of this access is also likely to depend on the role of

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

not follow the work undertaken for the Capacity Study, or the 'Atkins' Masterplan Options. No public open space of a practical nature is indicated in this area (under the power lines is considered inappropriate). This is a deficiency for the proposed development.

- South of Purbrook Heath Recreation Ground has previously been shown as an area to meet future MDA requirements including recreation. The notation of this area as entirely public open space is inappropriate at this stage.
- The playing fields to the north of the cemetery will not be required until the additional 1,000 dwellings are triggered. This should be annotated by a white background. This also applies to area of open space to the north of this, to the west and other uses such as second primary school.
- It is recommended that land uses immediately north of the Waterlooville Town Centre access road into the MDA are mixed uses rather than pure employment uses. This is necessary to create an attractive approach to the MDA. Mixed uses could be located to the north west of the business park with mixed uses fronting Hambledon Road.
- The requirement for the London Road/Milk Lane link to be a full vehicular access as shown on the Masterplan will need to be tested through the masterplanning/ Transportation Assessment process. There is merit in it being a cycle/pedestrian access only, if the other proposed accesses can deal satisfactorily with the predicted MDA traffic.
- It is suggested that playing pitch space should be provided at the northern end of the MDA. The Masterplan Framework currently concentrates most playing pitches to the south. This will also enable existing residents east of the Hambledon Road further opportunities for recreation.
- Although within Havant Borough and the subject of separate representation to its Local Plan, the size and extent of the urban park area abutting the A3 is considered inappropriate and will prevent the proper integration of the MDA with the existing built up area.

Change Sought - That changes be made to Map 41 to reflect the objections raised by the respondent.

the Southern Access Road and when it is provided in the development process.

The urban park area is within the Havant Borough Local Plan area and not, therefore, something the Winchester Local Plan can change. The detail of the urban park is, however, something that can be considered as part of the Masterplanning process.

Change Proposed – none.

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

Issue: 12.2
RD12.03 and RD12.15
Masterplan Framework

Representations:

Objections:

Laing Homes Ltd (236/2), (236/5)

Object to the failure of the Plan to set out that the Masterplan Framework represents the preferred option of the Council for the implementation of the MDA. Also, in order to give the necessary status of the Framework as the basis for bringing about the intended process stated in RD 12.03, the failure of the Plan to include in Proposal NC.2 a direct reference to it as the appropriate context for fulfilling the requirements of this Proposal. Also object to the failure of the Plan to include the Masterplan Framework as a Proposals Map Inset. Additionally, explanatory text relating to the Framework should be included.

Change Sought -

- *amend the two last sentences as follows, 'The proposals for the MDA set out in this Plan are shown on the Masterplan Framework (Inset 'x'). This will form the context for more detailed work, including the preparation of the masterplan. Further explanation is provided at Proposal NC.2'.*
- *Include in NC.2 a direct reference to the Masterplan Framework as the Council's proposal for the achievement of the requirements of NC.2 and state that the masterplan should be in accord with it.*
- *Add explanatory text under NC.2 amplifying the Masterplan Framework. Include the Masterplan Framework as a Proposals Map Inset.*
- *Delete the remainder of paragraph 12.41. This is a retained element of the 1st deposit draft, it was included in the context of the anticipation in the sentence which the Council proposes to remove from the Plan. The paragraph, as proposed to be changed, fails to reflect the changed circumstances. If appropriate, substitute reference to community involvement prior to the adoption of a Masterplan.*

Havant Borough Council (2117/1)

The Masterplan Framework shows the high land located to the south of the Plant Farm building as being allocated for housing development. This would result in housing located in a prominent position on

City Council's response to representation:

Guidance about development principles and requirements, and land uses in the MDA, has been included in Proposal NC.2 and its explanatory text to give an indication of the key requirements for the development. However, the Masterplan Framework was deliberately not included as an Inset Map as it was felt to go into too much detail for a Local Plan. Furthermore, it would not be possible for a formal part of the Local Plan to cover areas outside the City Council's boundary. It was felt important that the Masterplan Framework should be able to illustrate the overall proposals for the MDA, including parts outside the Local Plan area, whilst avoiding formal representations on the Local Plan getting into matters of excessive detail.

As the Masterplan Framework is not a formal part of the Local Plan it would not, therefore, be appropriate for Proposal NC.2 to require compliance with it. It is also likely that the Masterplan Framework will be superseded by the draft Masterplan, which is expected to be the subject of public consultation in early 2004. This may result in variations to the Masterplan Framework and further variations may occur as the planning applications are drawn up and determined and the Local Plan progresses through its Inquiry stage. Accordingly, it would not be appropriate to tie the Masterplan Framework formally into the Local Plan as requested by the respondent.

The part of paragraph 12.41 that has not been deleted is still appropriate. The community is going to be able to take an active part in the process as there will be public consultation when the Masterplan proposals have been drawn up and before they are adopted.

The concerns of Havant Borough Council are acknowledged. Work on the details of the Masterplan is still being carried out and there will be the opportunity for further public consultation on the Masterplan. This work is not yet sufficiently advanced to warrant proposing a change at this stage, but it may be necessary to produce further pre-inquiry changes in response to the outcome of the consultation process on the Masterplan.

Change Proposed – None.

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

the ridge of high ground, with a visual impact on areas to the North of the MDA.
Change Sought - the area shown for the residential development west of the proposed Urban Park should be reduced to avoid development in such a prominent location. See plans submitted.

Issue: 12.3 (Deposit - various)
RD12.05 to RD12.13
Deleted paragraphs 12.31-12.38
and Proposal NC.2 (General)

Representations:

Support/Withdraw/resolved:

GOSE (261/39, 261/40, 261/41, 261/42, 261/43, 261/44, 261/45, 261/46)

Support the changes in RD12.05 to RD12.12.

Change sought - none.

Laing Homes Ltd (236/3)

Support NC.2 in principle and the changes to Inset Map 41.

Change Sought – none.

Mrs Southam (389/1), J Jantes (408/1), S Hatherley (796/1), Hampshire County Council (1433/4)

Withdrawn objections and support changes to NC.2.

Change Sought – none.

Objections:

Laing Homes Ltd (236/4)

- The use of 'maximum' in respect of the area for housing is inappropriate. The same qualification is not applied to the area for employment, which is stated to be defined. It suggests that a proposal for significantly less than 2000 dwellings might be acceptable.
- The MDA requires provision to be made 'for at least 2000 dwellings in the period 2001-2011' and not 'up to 2000 dwellings'.
- The rationale for the deletion of 'adjacent' and the inclusion of 'as extensions' is unclear thus a lack of clarity as to the intention of this element of the proposal.
- The location of the resource centre should not be subject to further study of the Masterplan.
- The insertion of 'and where appropriate the existing local communities' is contrary to circular 1/97.
- NC.2 (xii) should provide more definitive guidance on what will constitute the most efficient use of land, particularly for housing. The

City Council's response to representation:

The support is welcomed.

A maximum area of housing is referred to in order to provide flexibility. The development boundary was drawn up on the assumption of an average net density of 40 dwellings per hectare. However, the preparation of a detailed Masterplan for the MDA and design statements for the early phases of development may show that a higher net density for the site could be achieved. This would mean that the latter phases of land would not need to be released. If not all land was needed having finished the detailed design and Masterplanning process, there may be a need to revise the area of land allocated for the reserve provision. The area defined is, therefore, likely to be the maximum required.

The part of Proposal NC.2 that refers to 'up to 2000 dwellings' has not been amended at the Revised Deposit stage and this aspect of the objection is not, therefore, duly made and is not responded to.

The employment allocations next to Brambles Business Park are described as extensions rather than an adjacent development because it is intended that they will be an integrated part of the business park. As there are two road links proposed and roads will extend through the old and new development it is appropriate to refer to them as extensions.

A resource centre is referred to specifically, rather than as part of the employment allocation, as it is right that a site for this use is specifically allocated. The resource centre is an opportunity to achieve a more sustainable development, and should be a requirement of the Plan. There are many specific issues surrounding the proposal for a resource centre and it is considered appropriate that this issue should be subject to public consultation to enable a resolution of these issues. Objections to the detail of the proposed Resource Centre are considered at Issue 12.5 below.

Guidance for major development areas in paragraph 117 of the Hampshire County Council Structure Plan envisages that the decision to release such large areas of land should be balanced by policies to ensure as much environmental gain as possible. Development should be designed to ensure that it can contribute to physical regeneration and improve accessibility to social, community and transport facilities in existing, adjacent urban areas. The Structure Plan policy MDA1 states that provision may need to be made for facilities/infrastructure that serves a wider area, where such need is identified during the preparation of the Local Plan. Whilst it is accepted that developer contributions should be aimed principally at addressing the needs of the new development, the facilities and services provided may also benefit the wider community.

The relevant additional text refers to 'where appropriate' and if the tests of Circular 1/97 are not met it would not be appropriate to require developer contributions. The facilities proposed for the MDA are needed as a result of the proposed development. Whilst they may be of benefit to existing residents, they do not arise only from an existing need. However, in some cases there could be an existing gap in provision of a particular facility as well as a need expected to arise from the MDA. In such cases there may be a need to apportion

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

plan should determine the disposition of housing densities. i.e. it should stipulate that the housing component of that part of the MDA to the north of the proposed employment area that is within Winchester District should be capable of accommodating some 390 dwellings.

- Object to the introduction of 'the amount of housing permitted in the early phases of development'.
- There should be reference to local factors i.e. environment, access to facilities/services, household composition;
- Overall, NC.2 is a retrograde step and is too abbreviated.

Change Sought:

- *Delete 'maximum' in the 2nd sentence. Insert the following amended sentences 'The part within Winchester District is defined on Inset Map 41. This and the Masterplan Framework also define the extent of the areas for at least 2000 dwellings, mixed use, community facilities and other associated buildings and infrastructure, as well as employment, which should be developed for these purposes by 2011'.*
- *At NC.2 (iv) second point add an explanation to clarify the meaning of 'extensions to' as opposed to 'adjacent'.*
- *(iv) third point amend as follows: 'the reservation of land, as shown on the Masterplan Framework within the proposed employment area...'*
- *(iv) fourth point, delete 'and where appropriate the existing communities'.*
- *(xii) should be deleted and replaced with wording to the similar effect of 'it can be demonstrated that the proposal would be consistent with the Masterplan Framework in terms of principal land use and would not prejudice its full implementation'.*
- *Delete 'and the extent of the land permitted to accommodate the 2000 dwellings' and replaced with 'and the number of dwellings permitted and completed within the area for housing, mixed use, community facilities and other associated buildings and infrastructure shown on Inset 41'.*
- *The last paragraph should be deleted and replaced with 'development which is demonstrably consistent with the Masterplan Framework (as amplified by a Masterplan), and would not prejudice comprehensive development in accord with it, will be permitted'.*

the costs of a facility depending on the burden imposed by the MDA.

The Masterplanning process is designed to ensure the efficient use of land. The exact densities and forms of development that would constitute the most efficient use of land within different parts of the site are still to be assessed. It would not, in any event, be appropriate to stipulate within the Local Plan the exact housing numbers for certain areas of the site. The amount of development that can be accommodated within the first phase of development will require careful monitoring. If more dwellings than were expected are achieved on a particular area of land, less of the greenfield 'reserve' provision may be needed. This method is aimed at helping to ensure the most efficient use of land and avoiding the unnecessary release of greenfield land.

Change Proposed – None.

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

RD12.13

Proposal NC.2 (iv) Integrated and balanced mix of housing including social infrastructure and community facilities

Representations:

Objections:

East Hampshire District Council (1437/3)

The layout of the residential area should apply the principles of home zones.

Change Sought - not specified.

Hampshire County Council, Estates Practice (1434/8)

Need to include other County Council services i.e. social and emergency services as these services may be in danger of being excluded in the consideration.

Change Sought - acknowledge and specifically identify the full range of potential County Council service facilities that may be required and ensure they are physically appropriate and adequate. The County requests full dialogue with the City Council at the earliest opportunity to discuss these matters.

East Hampshire District Council (1437/1)

The Plan only sets out the main development contributions towards facilities, services and infrastructure that will be required from the developers. The Masterplan process must set out the developer contributions that are required towards improvements to the off-site community facilities, public services, leisure and cultural uses.

Change Sought - not specified.

East Hampshire District Council (1437/2)

The Proposal for a new health centre should not lead to the closure of existing local health centres and efforts should be made to ensure the new dentist surgery provides for NHS patients.

Change Sought - not specified.

Grainger Trust PLC (214/3)

- Information is requested on the unsuitability of the existing household waste recycling centre and the need for a new facility. The appropriateness of waste management operations in this location (on the MDA) is also questioned and further flexibility to reflect this in the policy would be welcomed. More of this or resources centre

In depth issues of street layout and design, such as whether the roads are to be designed as home zones, are too detailed to be included in the Local Plan. Street layout will be dealt with in the Masterplanning process, although it is accepted that the principles of home zones may be appropriate for inclusion.

Work has been undertaken which identifies the full range of community facilities and other service requirements of the MDA. The City Council has been in discussion and consultation with relevant County Council Departments about the provision of services and facilities. The results will be included in the 'financial appraisal' report by the consultants C B Richard Ellis. There is an extensive list of infrastructure that may be needed, which is too detailed for inclusion in the Local Plan.

In terms of physical infrastructure it is acknowledged within the Local Plan that off-site provision of certain community facilities will be required. There is a specifically highlighted need for off-site transport, education (secondary school provision) and sewerage works. As suggested by respondent 1437, any more detailed provision is only appropriate to consider in the Masterplanning process. The C B Richard Ellis report provides detail beyond what is appropriate to include in the Local Plan, but the overall conclusions of the infrastructure assessments will be available for public consideration in due course.

The amount of health care provision required was decided after liaison with East Hampshire Primary Care Trust. They found that there would be a need to supplement the existing health care provision. As this will be providing for a newly generated need it is not expected that existing provision will be affected. Whilst it would be hoped that the new dentist surgery would provide for NHS patients, this is not a planning matter.

Affordable housing is dealt with below at Issue 12.13 and the resource centre is dealt with below at Issue 12.5.

With regard to the comment about the cemetery provision, Havant Borough Council has a pressing need for such provision. It is therefore concluded that the provision of a cemetery, whether in conjunction with a place of worship or not, should be a firm requirement and that the Plan should not refer to 'potential provision'.

It is agreed that development which will not harm the ecological interests in the southern part of the MDA area may be acceptable. It is not, however, simply a matter of avoiding development on specific features or areas that are of interest. Account also needs to be taken of the wider impact of development, which may also lead to disturbance of wildlife. It is, therefore, considered that the principle of minimising built development in the southern part of the area is a valid one, and complements the aim of reducing the visual impact of the development from Portsdown Hill.

With regard to allotments, it is accepted that consideration needs to be given to the overall recreation needs of the MDA and provision is made within the Masterplan Framework for additional allotments. However, the existing allotments are a highly valued amenity, close to the existing residential areas that they serve. Their use over several years has made them highly suitable for continued cultivation, rather than establishing a replacement site, and they should therefore be retained.

Change Proposed – None.

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

- The need for a cemetery is accepted, although we would welcome the inclusion of 'potential provision' under this bullet point in case of changing needs, particularly in relation to a place of worship.
- New paragraph (RD12.23) states that proposed development is located away from the southern part of the MDA to minimise the impact of the development on sensitive ecology features to the west of Purbrook and on the Rowans Hospice. Not all of this area is sensitive. Development which takes into consideration such ecology features should be acceptable.
- It is not justified to include a 50% affordable housing requirement in paragraph 12.50 (RD12.28). Also, paragraph 12.51 (RD12.29) split between rented and shared equity is stated as to be determined in the light of up to date survey work. This is contrary to Circular 6/98 which does not encourage prescriptive attempts to dictate what constitutes affordable housing and how it should be provided.
- The reservation of land for the resource centre is too significant for this purpose (RD12.32). The replacement of the household waste recycling centre still has to be justified and the workings of the bio-mass plant investigated.
- New paragraph (RD12.46) refers to the protection of existing allotments. The provision of the allotments needs to be considered in terms of the overall recreation provision.

Change Sought - not specified.

Issue: 12.5 (Deposit 12.14)
RD12.31 RD12.32 and RD12.39
Proposal NC.2 (iv) Resource
Centre

Representations:

Support/Withdrawn/Resolved:

Future Energy Solutions (320/2)

Welcome change RD12.32 that recognises the potential of the new resource centre to accommodate a small biomass plant capable of generating a small amount of heat and power from coppice arisings.

Change sought - none.

Objections:

**Hampshire County Council;
Environment Dept. (1433/7)**

City Council's response to representation

The support is welcomed.

The proposed resource centre reservation is included at the request of the minerals and waste authority, Hampshire County Council. The area is proposed partly as a replacement for the existing household waste recycling site nearby, but most of the area is reserved for a 'resource recovery park'. The County Council is currently consulting on its Material Resources Strategy, which considers the options for dealing with waste and recycling in Hampshire in the future. The precise nature of the uses to be accommodated within the resource centre will depend partly on the outcome of this consultation exercise and the strategy that is developed. Because of the uncertainty, it is not considered necessary at this stage to change the name of the facility to 'resource recovery park'.

Whilst the fears of Havant Borough Council and nearby residents/businesses are appreciated, it is not possible at this stage to provide more detail of what is proposed, or of the HGV routeing proposals. The Masterplan Framework suggested a location for the resource centre adjacent to the existing business park, within the new employment allocation. This has raised fears from some businesses about the effect on them, as well as concerns about the

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

Change the title to more accurately describe the nature/function of the proposal.

Change Sought - Change 'resource centre' to 'Resource Recovery Park'.

Havant Borough Council (2117/4)

Object to the proposal for a larger reservation of approximately 2.8ha for a resource centre. RD12.13 is not clear in terms of scale and nature of activities. RD12.31 and RD 12.32 do not clearly justify the scale and nature of the activities proposed in the centre i.e. traffic. The requirement of RD21.32 to provide for the satisfactory routing of heavy vehicles to minimise any adverse impact on Denmead, Hambledon and Southwick should be extended to include the adjoining residential roads within Havant Borough.

Change Sought - provide a clear explanation and justification of the scale and nature of the activities proposed in the resource centre, including consideration of the traffic and other environmental impacts arising from the activities. Extend the requirement to minimise any adverse impact from the routing of heavy goods vehicles to include the adjoining residential roads within Havant Borough.

G Blackett (82/2), W Blackett (83/2), R McIntosh (117/1), A Cooper (156/1), P Cooper (157/2), C Crascall (167/2), J Crascall (168/1), S Harvey (684/1), J Harvey (685/1), J Morgan (731/1), D L Morgan (755/1), M Norris (1077/2), A R B Norris (1079/2), F Harrison (2081/2), J Harrison (2082/2), D Wright (2090/2), P Wright (2091/1), R Platt (2094/1), C Tarrant (2101/1), N J Tarrant (2102/1), R C Dodson (2103/1), H V Dodson (2104/1), D W Lock (2262/2)

Only 1.2 acres of a 7acre resources centre is to be a Waste Recycling Centre, with no indication of what the rest of the site will be used for. Lorry traffic will use the southern access road onto Ladybridge roundabout, thus adding to a disruptive environment for the Rowans Hospice. Purbrook will be jammed and Stakes Road will be a rat-run.

Change sought - the resources centre should be reduced in size to accommodate the recycling centre only.

Havant Borough Council, Highways (2118/1)

No mention of satisfactory routing of heavy goods vehicles associated with the proposed resource centre to protect the residential roads within the Borough.

Change sought - add to the last sentence of RD12.32: 'and the residential roads of the Borough of Havant.'

impact on existing or proposed residential areas. The precise location of the resource centre within the proposed employment area is something that can be adjusted through the Masterplanning process. It is, however, considered important that provision is made for such a facility within the development, and the employment allocation is the most suitable place to do so.

It is likely that much of the resource centre will be concerned with recycling through the reception and processing of material. This is likely to involve 'dis-assembly', as opposed to traditional industrial uses that involve assembly. Nevertheless, the implications in terms of the effect on neighbouring uses, traffic generation, noise and pollution may be similar to normal industrial uses. Once more details are known of the processes proposed, the most suitable location within the employment allocation can be identified.

The reservation of land for the resource centre includes the possibility of a biomass plant, which would provide the opportunity for a small combined heat and power plant. This is not intended to be an incinerator, provision for which has already been made in other parts of the County. Neither is it intended that the whole of the resource centre reservation will be used for the biomass plant. The biomass plant is intended to be a small-scale facility with limited emissions and traffic generation. Full investigation of the impact on residential and commercial property will be required before it is permitted and if this indicates unacceptable impacts permission can be withheld.

With regard to HGV movements, it is premature at this stage to suggest what the scale of traffic generation will be and, therefore, how HGV routeing should be dealt with. It is, however, accepted that this is something that should be assessed through the Masterplan process and before any planning permissions are granted. Account should also be taken of the need to avoid adverse impacts on residential areas within Havant Borough, in addition to those within Winchester District. Accordingly, a change is proposed to the final sentence of paragraph RD12.32.

Change Proposed – paragraph RD12.32

....Detailed proposals for any of the elements of the resource centre will need to provide for the satisfactory routeing of heavy goods vehicles to minimise any adverse impact on nearby settlements and residential areas, including Denmead, Hambledon and Southwick.

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

R Havill (572/2, 572/1)

The resource centre is too close to the existing business park. The noise, waste and traffic arising from a plant of this size will cause problems for the existing and future businesses. The general access routes and internal road layout for the existing and future businesses is also a cause for concern.

Change sought - *the waste resource centre would be better located away from the business park and new housing with an access route separate to the existing roads.*

A Beeston (2018/1)

The plan should give more detail about the proposed biomass site. It is unclear whether the whole site will be used for this. HGV traffic may be increased and there may be environmental consequences.

Change sought – *provide enough detail about the bio-mass site so that it can be determined there is no negative impact on both the new development and surrounding facilities.*

Denmead Village Association (2293/1)

The biomass plant proposed is near to residential development so the term needs clarification to reassure that it will not be an incinerator.

Change sought - *clarify biomass plant.*

East Hampshire District Council (1437/5)

Consideration should be given to the provision of a combined heat and power plant at the proposed resource centre.

Change sought - *not specified*

M Synnett (2296/2)

The proposed layout of the waste management centre will be at the back of our building at Pagasus Ltd, Waterberry Drive. This would impact on congested roads with increased traffic/lorries.

Change sought - *none specified.*

P J Sanders (2306/1)

Object to location, lack of information, access and environmental effect on current industrial area-noise, dust and general pollution.

Change sought - *not specified.*

Environment Department Hampshire County Council (1433/8)

The concept of the resource recovery park should be safeguarded through the masterplan framework. Details should be left for the Minerals and Waste Development Framework.

Change sought - *detailed changes along the lines in the original representation.*

Environment Agency (2324/1, 2324/2),

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

K Bedford (599/1), A Pratt (600/1), I Udal (2255/1)

The waste resource centre is too close to the existing business park. Noise, dust, rubbish and additional traffic will be generated that will devalue the business park. The road access is also a concern, as it will bring much more traffic through the business park.

Change sought - move waste resource centre to the edge of the planned development with the access directly from a major road.

Issue: 12.6 (Deposit 12.15)
RD12.33-RD12.35 RD12.27
Proposal NC.2 (v) Paragraph
12.48
Transport

Representations:

Support/Withdrawn/Resolved:

Portsmouth City Council (297/1, 297/2 and 297/3)

Withdrawn objection to NC.2 (RD12.33). Support for RD12.34 and RD12.35.

Change sought - none.

Denmead Village Association (2292/1)

Support the deletion of the park and ride facility from the Masterplan (RD12.35).

Change sought - none.

Objections:

J R G Cobbett (2274/1, 2274/3)

Object to the deletion of the Park and Ride facility. There needs to be a larger buffer zone between the Newlands Lane and the reserved sites of at least 100m to ensure no access will ever be made onto Newlands Lane from the reserved site.

Change Sought - not specified.

Denmead Village Association (2293/2)

Should the need be triggered for an additional 1000 houses, a buffer zone of 100m between Newlands Lane and development is strongly recommended to protect the countryside.

Change Sought - not specified.

East Hampshire District Council (1437/9)

The Masterplan must ensure that sufficient improvements are made at secondary schools in the Cowplain/Waterlooville area to accommodate children from the MDA. The Horndean Secondary School does not have room for expansion and its use by residents of the MDA would generate unsustainable school trips and

City Council's response to representation:

The support is welcomed.

The proposal for a Park and Ride site was reviewed in the light of public consultation. It was considered that the role of the Park and Ride was unclear and was likely to be limited. For this reason the proposal for a park and ride site was removed.

There is no intention for development to be accessed from Newlands Lane. The precise width and extent of any undeveloped land between Newlands Lane and the MDA has yet to be determined through the Masterplan and the Masterplan Framework is designed to be for illustrative purposes only. However, the importance of concentrating the development around Waterlooville town centre and the need to minimise intrusion into the Denmead Gap are fully recognised. There is therefore no intention to extend the development any further west than is necessary, but it would not be appropriate to specify an arbitrary figure for the width of a 'buffer zone' between the development and Newlands Lane.

In response to respondent 1437's statement that sufficient improvements need to be made to schools in the Cowplain/Waterlooville area, the Plan states that contributions to secondary school improvements will be required (paragraph 12.66) so that the extra need generated can be accommodated. The education authority's current view is that there should be improvements to Cowplain Secondary Schools to accommodate children from the MDA. However, this may need to be reviewed as the MDA is planned and built and it would not therefore be appropriate to be too specific in the Local Plan.

Walking and cycling routes are a detailed matter for the Masterplan and subsequent planning processes. However the Plan already refers to the need for safe routes to the secondary school to be established (paragraph 12.65).

In relation to respondent 1437's comment on rapid transit, work is going on through the 'financial appraisal' report by the consultants C B Richard Ellis with regard to off-site transport requirements, which may indicate that further amendments are required to the Local Plan or Masterplan Framework. If so, these would need to be promoted as further pre-inquiry changes.

Respondent 2276 is concerned that they have not been consulted on the Masterplan. The initial Masterplan that will be subject to full public consultation has not yet been completed. The potential need for off-site infrastructure provision is currently being assessed in the 'financial appraisal'. An addition to RD12.40 is proposed to make it clear that off-site infrastructure provision that might be required could include improvements to the trunk road network.

The wording suggested by Hampshire County Council is considered

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

congestion.

Change sought - not specified.

**East Hampshire District Council
(1437/10)**

No detail is provided on how the encouragement of walking and cycling to the local secondary schools will be achieved. Cycling is particularly difficult at present on Hambledon Road. Milton Road also requires a cycle route to the Cowplain Secondary School.

Change sought - not specified.

**East Hampshire District Council
(1437/6)**

Consideration should be given to developer's contributions towards the possible extension of the South Hampshire light rail transit route up to Waterlooville.

Change sought – not specified.

Highways Agency (2276/1)

Object to new paragraphs RD12.36 and RD12.40 since they fail to take account of the possible need for trunk road improvements. It is disappointing that the Masterplan has been agreed without consultation with the Agency. Some improvement may be required to the trunk road network as a result of the proposed development, for example junction 3 of the A3(M).

Change sought-none specified.

**Hampshire County Council
Environment Department (1433/9)**

The supporting text should be revised to ensure provision of appropriate infrastructure.

Change sought – include within the Transport section: 'a planning application for development would need to be supported by a full Transport Assessment of the proposals. Solutions to stimulate walking, cycling and bus usage will be required, and these facilities together with access routes to the development would need to be provided, secured and paid for by the developer (s) of the west of Waterlooville MDA.'

Havant Borough Council (2117/2)

No mention of the need to protect sensitive roads within the Borough from providing vehicular access to the MDA.

Change sought - add at the end of the first sentence of RD12.40: 'Purbrook Heath Road, Forest End and Windrush Gardens.'

to be important in highlighting the need for a Transport Assessment and appropriate provision/contributions by developers. Additional wording is therefore recommended, as shown below.

It is agreed that it is important that residential streets within Havant Borough are protected from extra traffic generated by the MDA. Although a short part of the eastern part of Purbrook Heath Road could form part of the Southern Access Road, there will not be access into the MDA from elsewhere on that road. To ensure the protection of the residential nature of surrounding streets, an addition similar to that suggested by Havant Borough Council should be included.

Change Proposed – Paragraph RD12.40:

~~No~~ Vehicular access to the MDA will only be permitted from the locations referred to above, and not from Closewood Road, or Newlands Lane, Forest End, Windrush Gardens or Purbrook Heath Road. Careful consideration will be given to the appropriate routing of construction traffic before planning permission is granted for any development.

Change Proposed – New paragraph after RD12.40:

Any planning application for development should be supported by a full Transport Assessment. Measures to stimulate walking, cycling and bus usage will be required and these facilities, together with access routes to the development and possibly improvements to the trunk road network, will need to be provided, secured and paid for by the developers of the MDA.

Issue: 12.7 (Deposit 12.16)
RD12.13 and RD12.36-RD12.40
Proposal NC.2 (v) (a) Southern
Access Road

City Council's response to representation:

The support is welcomed.

The Masterplan Framework is indicative and further work is required

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

Representations:

Support/Resolved/Withdrawn:

East Hampshire District Council (1437/8)

The identification of a direct spine road through the MDA is welcomed. The recognition of the need to minimise its impact on important nature conservation and landscape features to the west of Purbrook and to preserve the tranquil setting of the Rowans Hospice is particularly welcomed.

Change sought - none.

The Rowans Hospice (2311/3)

Support the proposed alignment of the Southern Distributor Road, which ensures that any impact upon the Hospice is minimised. It supports the proposal that provision of access to any proposed uses to the north of its land should be provided from the Southern Distributor Road.

Change sought - none.

Objections:

The Rowans Hospice (2311/5)

Support the proposed alignment of the Southern Distributor Road, which ensures that any impact upon the Hospice is minimised (RD Map 41a and para RD12.37). However, the Plan should cross-reference the proposed changes to the text.

Change Sought - *Cross-reference change to the text i.e. detailed examination of the relationship between the Southern Distributor Road and Purbrook Heath Road.*

Mr and Mrs Hill (362/1)

It is not essential that the Southern Access Route links to Purbrook Heath Road. Any link that is proposed should attempt to limit the level of traffic movement into Purbrook Heath Road. There are other alternative access points to the countryside from the MDA. It could become a 'rat run' between Purbrook and Denmead.

Change Sought - *not specified*

The Rowans Hospice (2311/1)

The Plan should make it clear that there will be a separate or possibly no link into Purbrook Heath Road from the Southern Access Road and that the treatment of any proposed changes to Purbrook Heath Road will be the subject of detailed investigation and public discussion. Modifications should be linked back to the relevant paragraphs in the Plan (i.e RD12.36, RDM41a)

Change Sought - *not specified.*

on the precise alignment of the Southern Access Road. The final alignment will be determined following detailed assessment of the environmental impact of the different routes. This will take account of the need to minimise impact on the Hospice, the importance of which is fully recognised. It is not intended that the Southern Access Road will use Purbrook Heath Road, other than for possibly a very short section at its eastern end. It is also intended that the design of the link with Purbrook Heath Road will discourage unnecessary traffic.

The Local Plan allows flexibility in the detailed routing by saying that the link with the Purbrook Heath Road should be 'in the vicinity of the Ladybridge roundabout'. It is therefore recognised that there is a lack of clarity about exactly where the route should go, but this reflects the fact that determining the best final position of the route is a continuing process. It is considered appropriate to maintain this flexibility at the present time, although the Masterplan work may well add more detail. The need to avoid increasing traffic along the length of the Purbrook Heath Road is noted and this aim will be incorporated into work to design the detail of the Southern Access Road and its junction with Purbrook Heath Road, in due course.

One of the functions of the Southern Access Road is to ease congestion in Purbrook Village. It should feed south-bound traffic originating from within the MDA onto the A3 south of Purbrook. Transport studies that have been carried out showed that this road will be necessary to prevent traffic congestion becoming unacceptable. The Southern Access Study concluded that the road should be provided before 1500 dwellings are completed at the very latest. It is, however, desirable that the Southern Access Road is provided at an earlier stage and the Local Plan encourages the earliest possible provision. This may be influenced by the financial appraisal, which is ongoing, and no change should therefore be made to the Plan at this stage.

In deciding the general route for the road in the Masterplan Framework, full account has been taken of the need to retain the Hospice's tranquil setting. The possibility of a western route was tested but it was rejected as ineffective, unviable and environmentally damaging.

The Plan seeks the earliest possible construction of the Southern Access Road for a number of reasons. From a practical perspective it makes sense to construct the road at the same time as utilities are being put in. Indeed, there is likely to be a need to provide infrastructure along the same route as the Southern Access Road, making it more efficient to carry out all the works together. These utilities are likely to be needed at the beginning of the development. The road will also provide a route for construction traffic so that it can avoid having to use the A3 corridor and also so that construction can be started in more than one location across the development, helping to meet the target of building 2000 homes by 2011. Also the road could provide an early public transport route, helping to encourage early use of public transport and ensure minimum impact from the MDA on the existing road network.

The support by respondent 1437 for early provision of the Southern Access Road is welcomed. In response to their comments on the lack of a new northern access road, there are two northern links proposed, one at the Asda roundabout, which leads directly to good routes to the A3(M) and also at Hambledon Road. It is considered that these will provide satisfactory access.

Change Proposed – None.

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

Kris Mitra Associates (289/1, 289/2, 289/3)

Support the proposed southern access to the MDA but are concerned that its description in the Plan does not reflect the arrangements agreed for the Preferred Composite Option or Policy MDA3 of the Havant Borough District Wide Local Plan. The Plan is also contradictory as Proposal NC.2 talks of 'linking to Purbrook Heath Road in the vicinity of the Ladybridge Roundabout' but RD12.36 describes the MDA's southern access as '...from the A3 at or in the vicinity of the Ladybridge Roundabout...'. Neither reflects the Masterplan.

Change sought - amend Part (v)(a) of NC.2 to read: *'the completion of appropriate access routes from the development to the adjacent transport network for public, commercial and private transport, cycling and walking. These routes will include a southern access route from the Ladybridge Roundabout, which should also link to Purbrook Heath Road.'*

Amend RD12.36 to read: *'careful consideration has been given to how access to the new community can best contribute to transport objectives. The proposed vehicular access points are shown on Inset Map 41. They include an access from the A3 at Ladybridge Roundabout to provide a southern access road for the new community.'*

The third sentence of RD12.37 be changed to read: *'construction of the southern access road will therefore be required as part of the MDA's first phase of development...'*

G Blackett (82/3), W Blackett (83/3), S C McIntosh (116/1), A Cooper (156/2), P Cooper (157/3), C Crascall (167/1), S Harvey (684/2), J Harvey (685/2), J Morgan (731/2), D L Morgan (755/2), M Norris (1077/3), A R B Norris (1079/3), F Harrison (2081/3), J Harrison (2082/3), D Wright (2090/3), P Wright (2091/2), R Platt (2094/2), C Tarrant (2101/2), N J Tarrant (2102/2), R P Dodson (2103/2), H V Dodson (2104/2), J Thrush (2120/1), D W Lock (2262/3), M W Scarth (2084/1), B Scarth (2085/1)

Object to the Southern Access Road because the tranquillity of the hospice will be destroyed, further developments will be encouraged in the future and traffic onto the Ladybridge roundabout will cause congestion in Purbrook village and may interfere with the operation of the A3 bus route.

Change sought – *provide a Western Route for vehicles and restrict the Southern Access Road for cycles and pedestrians only.*

Mr and Mrs Hill (362/5)

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

The Plan should make clear that there will be a separate or possibly no link into Purbrook Heath Road. This modification to the Plan should link back to the relevant paragraphs in the Plan.

Change Sought – *not specified.*

Mr and Mrs Hill (362/3, 362/4), The Rowans Hospice (2311/2)

There should be clarification to indicate that the access to Purbrook Heath Road will be given detailed consideration to respect the sensitivity of the Hospice access road. Paragraph RD12.36 should make clear that the southern access road need not link directly to Purbrook Heath Road. Any link should limit the level of traffic into Purbrook Heath Road. Purbrook Heath Road should have traffic movements restricted and also provides access to the countryside and there are few alternative access points to the countryside from the MDA.

Change sought – *not specified.*

Laing Homes Ltd. (236/10)

Object to the presumption that the southern access road should be provided in the early stages of development. Technical work suggests that traffic generation from the MDA means it would not be required until near completion of the 2000 dwellings. The timing suggests that the Council is seeking to resolve existing deficiencies through unreasonable impositions on the MDA. Also, building a southern access road early in the development seems to show a lack of commitment either to careful design or to completing the MDA by 2011. The further reference and different wording in RD12.48 is confusing.

Change sought - *delete sentences 1-3 of RD12.37 and substitute with 'A southern access road is desirable to reduce the volume of traffic originating from the MDA which would, otherwise, use the A3 through Purbrook. It would also facilitate the provision of a good quality public transport link through the MDA. Provision will be required prior to the completion of 2000 dwellings. If practicable, it would be advantageous to make it available early in the development in order to establish travel patterns from the MDA.*

East Hampshire District Council (1437/7)

The provision of a Southern Access Route to the MDA at an early stage is welcomed. However, no new northern access road to the MDA is proposed and Ladybridge Road/Stakes Road does not provide a northern link to the A3(M). Commuter traffic to the north will therefore run through Horndean when heading for the A3(M).

Change sought - *not specified.*

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

Issue: 12.8 (Deposit 12.16)
RD12.32 and RD12.36-RD12.40
Proposal NC.2 (v) (a) Effect on
Brambles Business Park

Representations:

Objections:

Brambles Traffic Group (2306/2)

A great deal of work, at some expense, has been undertaken to ensure current estate traffic flows at an optimum level to ensure staff retention and business development has been maintained and in some cases increased. Doubling the potential traffic on existing roads would have a negative effect on local businesses.

Change sought – not specified.

M Synnett (2296/1)

The proposed new road layout will severely disrupt the already heavy traffic flow on the Brambles Estate at peak hours.

Change sought - not specified.

City Council's response to representation:

The proposed access routes into the Brambles Estate are intended to help integrate the existing and new employment areas. They are proposed partly as a result of consultation, in response to concern over the potential for unacceptable levels of HGV traffic in the MDA, amongst other issues. In the light of the comments made, two links to the Brambles Estate are proposed, with the potential that one of them could be used for HGV traffic only. Whilst this could allow HGVs from the new employment areas to pass through the existing industrial area, it could also provide another means of access to/from the existing estate, helping to relieve any congestion that may occur there. It is accepted that there may need to be traffic signing, routing and management measures put in place to encourage HGVs to use the most appropriate route, but this is too detailed a matter for specific mention in the Local Plan.

The road changes around the Brambles Estate will open up the road network to existing traffic. Those who already work there may begin to take a new route to work through the MDA, depending on where they live. It is likely that a redistribution of traffic will occur. A Traffic Assessment is a requirement at the planning application stage and the effects on the Brambles Estate will be examined then, and any necessary measures put forward, as appropriate.

Change Proposed – None.

Issue: 12.9 (Deposit 12.21)
RD12.13
Proposal NC.2 (b) Flood Risk

Representations:

Support/Withdrawn/Resolved:

Environment Agency (253/20)

Support the changes to NC.2 v (b).

Change Sought - none.

City Council's response to representation:

The support is welcomed.

Change Proposed – None.

Issue: 12.10
RD12.13 RD12.38
Proposal NC.2 (vi) Integration
with Waterlooville Town
centre/Maurepas Way

Representations:

Objections:

Havant Borough Council (2117/2)

Object to the Masterplan Framework as it fails to show traffic calming for the southern section of Maurepas Way to facilitate the integration of Waterlooville Town Centre with the MDA.

Change Sought - amend Masterplan Framework to show traffic calming along the southern section of Maurepas Way.

City Council's response to representation:

The Maurepas Way Study is currently underway and will look at various options for achieving better integration between the MDA and Waterlooville town centre. The options range from improved pedestrian/cycle crossing facilities to the decking over of Maurepas Way. The possibility of a relief road through the MDA is also being considered and the West of Waterlooville Forum has asked for options with and without a relief road to be tested through the Masterplanning process. The Maurepas Way Study is not sufficiently advanced to include any recommendations within Pre-Inquiry Changes at this stage. However, the results will feed into the Masterplan process and the public consultation thereon, and may result in further changes being proposed.

Change Proposed – None.

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

Havant Borough Council (2117/3)

Object to Inset Map 41 as it fails to address the importance of a relief road for the southern section of Maurepas Way as this will help facilitate the integrating of Waterlooville Town Centre with the MDA.

Change Sought - amend Inset Map 41 to show a suggested alignment for a relief road to Maurepas Way (southern section).

Havant Borough Council (2117/6)

Object to 12.38 as it ignores any possible highway solution to achieving integration of the MDA with Waterlooville Town Centre.

Change sought - amend paragraph RD12.38 to refer to the possibility of providing a relief road so as to take through traffic presently on the B2150 Hambledon Road, A3 London Road and A3 Maurepas Way (Southern section), in order to secure the integration of Waterlooville Town Centre with the MDA.

Issue: 12.11 (Deposit 12.22)

RD12.13

Proposal NC.2 (ix)

Impact on the Environment

Representations:

Objection:

English Heritage (250/2)

Criterion (ix) refers to the need for any important nature conservation interests to be protected but there is no equivalent reference to the need to protect heritage interests in this area.

Change Sought - that the Plan be modified to remedy this.

City Council's response to representation

Particular emphasis is placed on nature conservation interests, as these are an important factor, especially in the southern part of the MDA area. However, it is agreed that there are some heritage interests in the area and it is important that these are protected. Waterlooville contains the St. John conservation area and some of the buildings in the Plant Farm complex that falls within the allocated MDA area have recently been listed. It is therefore appropriate to amend the policy to reflect this and ensure that these interests are protected.

Change Proposed – NC.2 criterion (ix):

The main nature conservation and heritage interests are protected in accordance with Proposals C.9, ~~and~~ C.10, HE.1 – HE.4, and HE.13 – HE.16.....

Issue: 12.12 (Deposit 12.8)

RD12.20 and RD 12.21

New paragraphs: Development Options

Representations:

Objections:

Laing Homes Ltd (236/6)

RD12.20 generates fundamental uncertainty as to whether outline planning permission would be granted at the outset for the whole of the MDA or for only some unknown part. If the former, phasing would prevent full development by 2011. There is no explanation of how, in such circumstances, the additional reserve provision would be affected. Phasing is inappropriate and would not meet what is envisaged in the Structure Plan.

City Council's response to representation:

It is agreed that the reference to 'up to' 2000 dwellings is potentially misleading, when this refers to the baseline requirement. It is therefore proposed that the changes suggested by Havant Borough Council be generally incorporated. This would also partly address Laing Homes' objection. However, to go further as suggested by Laing Homes and identify where development should commence would be excessively detailed for the Local plan. This may, however, be a matter that is appropriately considered within the Masterplanning process. To include the Laing Homes wording would also partly dictate the phasing of development when this objector already objects to the Plan's references to phasing.

East Hampshire District Council's comment regarding the urban park area is noted. However, this is outside the Winchester Local Plan area and not something the Local Plan can address. However, the intention is to create an urban extension that is integrated with the existing built-up area of Waterlooville, not separated from it by a gap. It is not, therefore, accepted that the 'gap' should be bigger or that it should create a 'sense of separation'.

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

Change Sought - insert redrafted paragraph on the following lines: 'The extent of the land shown on Inset map 41 and the Masterplan Framework (Inset 'x'), required for at least 2000 dwellings, mixed use, community facilities and other associated buildings and infrastructure, is the outcome of a comprehensive analysis of a range of factors. These included the character of the existing urban areas, household composition, dwelling needs and demand characteristics, achieving a comprehensive range of dwelling types, topography, existing natural features and proximity to the town and local centres, existing facilities and public transport routes. It was concluded that an average net residential density of about 40 dpha would be most appropriate and the identified area would allow at least 2000 dwellings to be accommodated within it at this density.'

Insert a further paragraph as follows: 'As indicated in the amplification of the Masterplan Framework and, inter alia, at RD 12.48, implementation of the MDA, within this area, should commence with the development of the priority areas, such as to the south west of the Hambledon Road Local Centre'.

Havant Borough Council (2117/5)

The Masterplan Framework for the MDA proposes land at Plant Farm in Havant District for housing development. This land is for a cemetery in the Havant Borough District-Wide Local Plan.

Change Sought - in the 1st sentence the words 'up to' should be deleted. After '2000' dwellings' the words: 'and the reserve provision of up to 1000 dwellings' should be inserted. The last sentence should be reworded to read: 'A phased release of land for a total of up to 3000 dwellings..'

East Hampshire District Council (1437/12)

The principle of the maintenance of the Purbrook/Waterlooville Local Gap as an urban park is welcomed, but the area of gap shown is insignificant and unlikely to create a sense of separation.

Change sought – not specified.

Change Proposed – paragraph RD12.20:

Inset Map 41 identifies the maximum extent of land required for ~~up to~~ 2000 dwellings (and the reserve provision of up to 1000 dwellings), mixed-use, community facilities and other associated buildings and infrastructure.... A phased release of land for a possible total of up to 23000 dwellings is therefore proposed to enable the land take to be reduced if higher densities than presently envisaged are achieved in the early phases.

Issue: 12.13 (Deposit 12.8)

RD12.23

New paragraph: Impact on Hospice

Representations:

Support/Withdrawn/Resolved:

City Council's response to representation:

The support is welcomed.

The Southern Access Road will be designed so as not to use Purbrook Heath Road, nor to encourage unnecessary traffic onto it. The Plan requires improved access to be provided to the countryside by enhancing footpath, bridleway and cycleway access (Proposal NC.2 (vii) and also proposes adequate recreational provision within the MDA and through the improvement of the Purbrook Heath

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

The Rowans Hospice (373/11)
Support the new paragraph 12.23.
Change Sought – none.

recreation ground. Vehicular access to the countryside will not be encouraged and road layouts and traffic management measures used to discourage rat-running through rural roads.

Objections:

Change Proposed – None.

Mr and Mrs Hill (362/2)
Support the new paragraph RD12.23 in respect of location but reference should be made to the need to protect Purbrook Heath Road, which now serves the Hospice and the Recreation Ground. Purbrook Road is the only link into the countryside and is in danger of becoming a 'rat run'. Greater consideration should be given in the Plan to Purbrook Heath Road.
Change Sought - not specified.

Issue: 12.14 (Deposit 12.11)
RD12.29 and RD12.28
Paragraph 12.50 and 12.51
Housing

City Council's response to representation:

Representations:

The support is welcomed.

Support/withdrawn/ resolved:

More detailed work on densities within the MDA is to be carried out through the Masterplanning process. It would not be appropriate to specify densities for different parts of the MDA through the Local Plan process. There is no need to provide greater detail on net density in the Local Plan as the Masterplan will be adopted as supplementary planning guidance and form the basis of planning applications. The Local Plan goes as far as it should in giving guidance in housing densities, by referring to an overall net residential density of about 40 dph (paragraph RD12.20). RD12.21 refers to the need to have variations in density to reflect all the parameters and controlling factors that are set out.

East Hampshire District Council (1437/4)

The recognition that the MDA should meet a wider sub-regional housing need and should therefore contribute to the affordable housing needs of a number of adjacent local authorities is welcomed.
Change Sought - not specified.

Most of the affordable housing to be provided within the MDA is expected to meet the housing needs of the South East Hampshire area, including the adjoining districts of Havant Borough, Portsmouth and East Hampshire. A separate housing needs survey for the Waterlooville area was therefore undertaken jointly by the relevant authorities. The additional survey has looked at the sub-regional area in more detail to establish affordable housing needs and how much of affordable housing should be provided within the MDA. The survey also concluded that a suitable dwelling mix would be 50% one or two bedroom, although this may need to be refined further through the Masterplan. The starting point is the District wide policy in the Local Plan (H.7) that requires 50% of dwellings to be one or two bedrooms, but the local survey has confirmed this is also an appropriate requirement for the MDA. There will still be a range of different sized dwellings, including those large enough for families with children.

Objections:

Laing Homes Ltd (236/7)
More detail guidance on net housing densities within the MDA should be provided by the Local Plan. The Council has sought to be highly prescriptive on other matters (see RD2.28 and RD12.29) where more flexibility is essential but then, through RD12.21, has failed to set out any parameters on this critical issue. If the paragraph is retained it should refer to explanatory text related to the Masterplan framework (as inset 'x') providing broad density requirements within the MDA.
Change Sought - delete new paragraph 12.21 and substitute an alternative which refers to explanatory text for the Masterplan Framework setting out density requirements for detailed application through the masterplan. It could then refer to the parameters that have determined density (proximity, topography).

The area is generally under-supplied with one and two bedroom dwellings and there is no reason to expect that demand for housing in the MDA will be any different to the national trend of decreasing household sizes. Therefore the need for 50% of dwellings to be one or two bedroom is designed to meet the under-supply of one and two bedroom dwellings and is not an arbitrary figure.

Laing Homes Ltd (236/8)

The updated housing needs survey fails to distinguish adequately between need and demand. Developers must be satisfied that there is an effective demand for the

The MDA is unusual in that it will meet sub-regional rather than merely local housing need. It is designated as an MDA in the Structure Plan to meet a wider regional need. What is set out in the Local Plan is the results of an additional survey that concluded that the MDA should provide an affordable housing proportion of 50%. The effect of affordable housing provision on the viability of the development will be assessed as part of the financial appraisal that is currently being undertaken. However, the suggested split between rented and shared equity, which results in a relatively low

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

dwelling mix sought by a local planning authority. There is no scope for adaptation to accommodate a household with children. No opportunity to share or subsidise the initial purchase costs through non co-habiting households occupying the unit. Less 2 bedroom spacious houses for mature adults will be available thus family units will not be released into the market. H.7 and RD12.28 would allow the dwelling mix requirement to be met without the provision of any 1 bdrm types, though this would hardly be consistent with the conclusions of the 2002 survey. The figure of 50% is arbitrary. RD12.28 has significant, adverse implications for ensuring that the unit mix in the MDA is that which most effectively meets the needs ,n both the private and affordable sectors, of those most likely to seek dwellings within it.

Change Sought - *reinstate text deleted by RD12.28. The Plan would be significantly improved by alternative explanatory text to the effect that the Council will seek a significant proportion of all units – possibly up to 50% with no more than 2 bedrooms – within the MDA and will continuously monitor the applicability of this approach as development is undertaken.*

Laing Homes Ltd (236/9)

The revised content added by RD12.29 is misconceived and unjustified. The proposition that the MDA will meet a wider sub-regional need is unproven. In the justification for 50% affordable housing in the MDA, the Council has failed to show that it has taken proper account of other community related costs. Also the split between rented and shared equity tenure will have a direct bearing upon viability.

Change Sought - *delete from 'however, the MDA..' to '....affordable homes within the MDA'.*

Substitute: 'Proposal H5 will be applied to residential development within the MDA'. Amend RD06.14 to achieve consistency with the above.

The Executors of E S Edwards (2285/3)

The objective to seek a 50% proportion of affordable housing will stifle development and further exacerbate the implausibility of the Local Plan Review's Housing Supply strategy.

Change Sought - *delete the changes to Paragraph 6.44 and 12.51.*

requirement for rented units, is likely to ensure that the costs of affordable housing provision do not impact unduly on the viability of development.

Change Proposed – None.

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

Issue: 12.15 (Deposit 12.12)

RD12.42

New paragraph: Position of Cemetery

Objection:

The Rowans Hospice (2311/4)

No objection to the principle of locating the cemetery to the north of the Hospice, provided that direct overlooking and linkage is limited. The Hospice would have very strong objections to any proposal to provide access from Purbrook Heath Road to serve the cemetery, even as a temporary arrangement. It would be unacceptable to have mourners and hearses passing along this road and gaining access past the entrance to the Hospice.

Change sought - make it clear in paragraph 12.42 that there will not be access to the cemetery past the Hospice.

J Allen (145/1), S N Allen (139/1), G Blackett (82/4), W Blackett (83/4), D Barber (726/1), L Bolton (2125/1), D M Bolton (2126/1), D Campbell-Lendrum (2122/1), J Cleife (24/1), V W Cleife (25/1), D Cleife (61/1), A Cobb (141/1), A Cooper (156/3), P Cooper (157/4), C Crascall (167/3), J Crascall (168/2), R C Dodson (2103/3), H V Dodson (2104/3), F Fuller (646/1), C Pool (659/1), S Pool (660/1), F Harrison (2081/4), J Harrison (2082/4), V Hawkes (2097/1), M H Hawkes (2098/1), M Harvey (669/1), S Harvey (684/3), J Harvey (685/3), F Harvey (688/1), N Harvey (2092/1), M Hobbs (2096/1), S F Hunt (676/1), G J Hunt (678/1), K Jennings (1063/1), D Jones (151/1), D S Jones (152/1), T Lewis (2123/1), M Lewis (2124/1), N J Lincoln (735/1), J Morgan (731/3), D L Morgan (755/3), M J Neil (143/1), P T Neil (144/1), M Norris (1077/4), A R B Norris (1079/4), Y Osachuk (158/1), R B Osachuk (160/1), E Priddy (125/1), R Platt (2094/3), D Riddell (661/1), M A Riddell (663/1), L Steggles (2121/1), C Tarrant (2101/3), N J Tarrant (2102/3), J Watts (164/1), S Watts (165/1), C J Wearn (147/1), D J Wearn (148/1), G M Wearn (2112/1), H Wearn (2113/1), A J Webb (2093/1), P M Wright (2091/3), S A Barber (2127/1), B Kidd (2128/1), P M Kidd (2129/1), E Langford (2130/1), E B M Heyburn (2131/1), A Chambers (2134/1), Mrs Martin (2135/1), Mr Martin (2136/1), D P D Weston (2137/1), M Gilson (2138/1), E P Gilson (2139/1), R Garner (2140/1), M Garner (2141/1), R Hardy (2142/1), P Hardy (2143/1), C J Coupland (2144/1), B Coupland (2145/1), T G McInally (2146/1), W M McInally (2147/1), G S Barnes (2148/1), M G A Barnes (2149/1), V P Barnes

City Council's response to representation:

It is noted that, despite the considerable objection to the location of the cemetery close to the Rowans Hospice, the Hospice itself does not object in principle to such a use. The Hospice has provided a full statement of its concerns and aspirations, which indicates that cemetery use is one of a number of tranquil uses, including low-density housing, that it would consider appropriate. Indeed the Hospice recognises that a cemetery may be a suitable area for families to spread ashes or bury their loved ones.

The main concern for the Hospice is that its tranquil setting is maintained. The Hospice wishes to see the existing belt of woodland to the north of its site retained, as it provides a useful buffer. It welcomes the proposed location of the Southern Access Road as far to the east of the area as possible. It is strongly opposed to any access to the cemetery being taken from Purbrook Heath Road, even on a temporary basis, as this would require mourners, hearses, etc to pass the Hospice. The Hospice would prefer to see the existing footpath that passes along its western boundary diverted to avoid future disturbance problems.

The southern part of the MDA is one where there is substantial ecological interest, as well as the constraints posed by the Hospice itself, and some existing housing. The aim has, therefore, been to minimise the amount of built development in this area, especially as building work is likely to be more disruptive both to the Hospice and wildlife. It is considered that a housing development would harm the tranquil setting of the area and the Hospice has stated its wish to see any pavilions and areas of movement associated with playing fields located well away. Whatever the use of the land to the north of the Hospice, it is accepted that the mature tree belt should be retained and would limit visual links between the two sites.

Not allocating the land north of the cemetery for any MDA use and retaining it in its 'natural' state would require the proposed uses to be located elsewhere within the MDA. This is likely to result in the MDA boundary being extended further into greenfield land, beyond the clear boundaries currently being used to contain the development. The proposal to put a cemetery on land to the north of the Hospice is a result of weighing up a wide range of issues. In this case the potential types of development to be allocated to this land are housing, playing fields or the cemetery. The land south of Milk Lane, adjacent to the A3, is considered best suited for housing and the cemetery is the most suitable use for the land north of the Hospice.

As well as the cemetery being considered the most suitable use, the other potential uses are considered better suited to other locations. Housing capacity on the site north of the Hospice is lower than the smaller site south of Milk Lane because of the proximity of the Hospice and the routing of high-pressure gas mains. Housing immediately north of the Hospice would also be poorly related to the other areas of housing in the MDA and the proposed school, as would playing fields.

Change Proposed – None.

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

(2150/1), D P Barnes (2151/1), A Harris (2152/1), H Harris (2153/1), F Miceli-Hyde (2154/1), P E Benford (2156/1), C A Benford (2157/1), P (2158/1), S Moth (2159/1), C. Moth (2160) K Woodley (2161/1), E Woodley (2162/1), C Read (2164/1), A Cocker (2166/1), K A Cocker (2167/1), A H Hall (2168/1), C Hall (2169/1), C D Herbert (2170/1), A J Herbert (2171/1), J Fraser (2172/1), M Fraser (2173/1), P D James (2175/1), L Cole (2176/1), A Cole (2177/1), S Jay (2178/1), M Jay (2179/1), G Mitchell (2180/1), J Mitchell (2181/1) T Purkis (2182/1) K Purkis (2183/1), A De Fano (1040/1), K Clark (2186/1), D Clark (2187/1), P Conner (2188/1), R Conner (2189/1), Deborah Hart (2190/1), Deanne Hart (2191/1), J Hart (2192/1), N Steward (2193/1), M Steward (2194/1), L Cobb (2195/1), L J Brown (2197/1), R Brown (2097/1), B Ford (2198/1), K Ford (2199/1), P Barrett (2200/1), A Barrett (2201/1), A Fullard (2202/1), C Fullard (2203/1), A Fullard (2204/1), K Townsend (2205/1), M Townsend (2206/1), R Townsend (2208/1), K Bolton (2209/1), H Bolton (2210/1), J Bolton (2211/1), A J Bolton (2212/1), M Manns (2213/1), B Manns (2214/1), J Smith (2215/1), M Watt (2216/1), Mrs Tomlin (2217/1), V Davey (2218/1), C Hobbs (2219/1), S Aicken (2220/1), M Wiseman (2221/1), T Irish (2222/1), A Thorpe (2223/1), T Bartram (2224/1), M K Hodge (2225/1), J Chivers (2226/1), P Chivers (2227/1), D W Hughes (2228/1), D Hughes (2229/1), B J Whale (2230/1), P Q Jervis (2231/1), Y Munro (2232/1), B Van Steen (2233/1), C McIntyre (2234/1), I Johnson (2235/1), A Pennell (2236/1), P J Brumhill (2237/1), S E Gridley (2238/1), Ludford (2239/1), Mr and Mrs Murphy (2240/1), P Ludford (2241/1), G Doggett (2242/1), J Powell (2243/1), J A Watt (2244/1), R Huntley (2253/1), A Huntley (2254/1), B Hall (2256/1), R T Crook (2257/1), A L Crook (2258/1), E Toghill (2259/1), D Streten (2260/1), D W Lock (2262/4), A Ozouf (2267/1)

Object to the position of the cemetery because: it is in a totally insensitive position next to a Hospice; a cemetery north of the Hospice would destroy the tranquility and necessitate a new road with extra traffic noise; a cemetery is already included in the Havant Borough Local Plan alongside the A3 bus route (MDA1); should another cemetery be required for the Winchester District there are areas of land between Purbrook and Wickham that could be used.

Change sought - *the land surrounding the Rowans Hospice should be maintained in its natural state. The section RD12.41/42 should be deleted from the Plan.*

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

H Muir (2019/1)

The Rowans is a place where people come to end their final days in peace and tranquillity, not a place where they might be buried.

Change sought - not specified.

East Hampshire District Council (1437/11)

The extension of the Hospice towards the cemetery is inappropriate. The extension would be much more appropriately located in the area proposed for new woodland. Consideration should also be given to the allocation of a site for a crematorium.

Change sought - not specified.

Havant Borough Council (2117/7)

Object to the proposal for a cemetery on land to the north of the Hospice. The site south of Milk Lane proposed as a cemetery in the Havant Borough District-Wide Local Plan is a preferable location. There is a pressing need for a new cemetery but the site north of the Hospice is unlikely to come forward at an early date as it depends on provision of the Southern Access Road, the timing of which remains uncertain. The site north of the Hospice is less accessible as it is further from the main public transport corridor of London Road and from the existing urban population, and may be perceived as unsafe. Land at Plant Farm to the south of Milk Lane is unlikely to remain open as a Local Gap if it does not have the cemetery on it. This will put at risk the protection of the identity of Purbrook.

Issue: 12.16 (Deposit 12.9)

RD12.48

Paragraph 12.81: Phasing

Laing Homes Ltd (236/11)

In RD12.38 the proposals for the access points from Hambledon Road are clearly laid out, but this does not follow through into RD12.48. This contains the qualification that development is likely to commence adjoining the specified access points. This may be no more than a recognition by the Council that, for reasons outwith its control, the MDA may not, in the first instance, be commenced at all of these access points. Such a possibility is recognised but the paragraph could be improved.

Change sought - reword the beginning of RD12.38 as follows: 'The masterplan will be evolved from the premise that development will commence adjoining one or more of the access points, as shown on the Masterplan Framework, from Hambledon Road, Maurepas Way and

City Council's response to representation:

Paragraph RD 12.48 already recognises that development is likely to commence next to the main access points, including those on Hambledon Road. Paragraph RD12.38 makes specific mention of this access point. The respondent's suggested re-wording of paragraph RD12.38 does not add anything that is not already stated in the Plan. It is not, therefore, proposed to include the suggested wording.

Change Proposed – None.

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

London Road.’

Issue: 12.17
Winchester City North: General

Representations:

Objections:

RD12.50

New Communities

Save Barton Farm Group (175/23)

We are concerned that the detailed surveys referred to have not involved independent reviewers such as English Nature, the RSPB, English Heritage etc.

Change sought - involve English nature, The Wildlife Trust and the RSPB in rigorous study of the wildlife and habitats of the area.

Mr and Mrs J P English (1401/4)

Strategic requirements for Hampshire County Council, Southampton City Council and Portsmouth City Council are based on projected housing numbers that undermine planning objectives for the countryside, transport and Winchester. RPG9 identified Winchester as a Historic Town that should be afforded special protection. The development would cause environmental and heritage stress. There would be too much traffic generated. There is no recourse to the ‘Future of Winchester Study’ or ‘Winchester and its Setting’.

Change sought – Delete Proposal NC.3 and related RDs.

Cala Homes (South) Ltd. (468/1) and (468/2)

Although strongly supporting the identification of land at Barton Farm as a potential MDA, the boundary of the site as drawn on Inset Map 45 seems to preclude the possibility of additional recreational provision being provided on land within Cala’s control, east of the railway line. NC.3 also seeks to unnecessarily cross refer to other policies and proposals within the Local Plan, does not justify the need for a ‘Sustainability Statement’ considering a detailed Environmental Statement will be submitted, and fails to identify the appropriate level of employment development to be provided despite a requirement to do so as set out in Policy MDA1 of the Structure Plan. There is no justification for a resource centre for recycling within the Local Plan or elsewhere. The developer’s role in making provision for facilities is not specified. The policy should clarify that whilst the Masterplan should allocate land for services, other parties will be involved in their provision. There are no targets or

City Council’s response to representation:

Survey Work

It is standard practice for developers to carry out ecological surveys to demonstrate development impact and for local authorities to scrutinise and audit the results. The Consultants used by the development interests are reputable companies and a ‘Phase One Habitat Survey’ has been carried out in line with best practice advice. It is usual practice for the City Council to seek independent advice from the County Ecologist at Hampshire County Council on the robustness of the survey work that has been carried out. The County Ecologist and a representative from English Nature have participated in the Winchester City North Stakeholder Group seminars and have therefore been fully involved in the technical work. The City Council has received no representations from English Nature, the RSBP or Wildlife Trust suggesting that the results of the survey work are inadequate or unreliable. There are no international, national or local designations present on the site. Ecological interests are limited. Further protected species surveys will need to be carried out as part of the Masterplan process in due course to ensure that any habitats present on the site are protected and/or enhanced.

Strategic development requirements

The issues raised by respondent number 1401/4 have been dealt in response to issues 12.27 and 12.29 of the Analysis of Representations and Recommended Responses to the Winchester District Local Plan Review Deposit 2001.

Respondent 468 raises a number of separate points. Dealing first with the matter of recreational provision. Land to the east of the railway, which is considered suitable for playing pitch provision, has been already allocated under Proposal RT.4 to meet an existing open space deficiency within the District. This land cannot therefore also be used to meet open space requirements arising from the MDA. The Inset Map 45 and accompanying Local Plan proposals purposefully exclude the provision of additional formal recreational facilities on other land east of the railway line, although it does provide for informal recreation. There are a number of reasons for this, which are set out below:

- the topography of the land means that new playing fields outside the area already allocated are likely to require intrusive cut and fill;
- the land is designated as a local gap between Winchester, Kingsworthy/Headbourne Worthy. The provision of further areas of playing fields may require built facilities, such as changing rooms, sports pavilion and other ancillary facilities, including floodlighting, which would be inappropriate;
- an appropriate access to serve an enlarged formal recreation area, including car parking provision, may need to be constructed. This would be intrusive in the local gap and countryside. Access to the area under the existing railway line underpass is unlikely to be satisfactory;
- the allocation of land to accommodate the reserve MDA as shown in the Local Plan is sufficient to accommodate the playing fields requirements and this principle was tested through the technical work carried out;
- playing field provision should be located within or as close to existing residential areas as possible with satisfactory pedestrian and cycle links. Accommodating playing field requirements as an integral part of the MDA, rather than as an ‘add on’ is therefore preferable.

Proposal NC.3 and the cross-references it contains help to clarify the development requirements and have been used sparingly and where appropriate after due consideration. Cross-references have been

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

benchmarks for 'greater' use of public transport. In some cases it may be appropriate to deviate from adopted parking standards. The proposal for 'adequate' improvements to the sewerage and water supply system do not apply a bench-mark or recognise that developer obligations should be fairly and reasonably related to the proposed development. The proposal refers to indicative ground water hazard area and requires the area shown on Inset Map45 to be kept free of any development. The proposal should recognise the role of the Masterplan and Environmental Statement in identifying the correct area to be protected. Although arrangements must be made to enhance informal public access to the countryside, land east of the railway line is not included in the MDA. The local plan provides no justification for links to the surrounding countryside beyond Cala's control. The Proposal fails to recognise the role of the Masterplan in identifying those features worthy of longer term management and maintenance. It is inappropriate to require that advanced strategic landscaping is implemented prior to development commencing. The policy should be amended to recognise that it is the role of the strategic authorities rather than the City Council to identify where there is 'compelling justification' for development to commence at Winchester City (North) MDA, and also that this related to the County's need.

Change sought – not specified.

B D Porter (64/1)

Criterion ii) The proposal (ii) to build '...a high quality of design...' is too vague.
Criterion iii) It is not possible to mitigate against a minimum of 2000 houses on a greenfield site.
Criterion iv) It is unlikely that the people buying houses, other than the affordable element will obtain jobs in Winchester. Traffic will be generated.
Criterion v) It would be naïve to believe that the building of 2000 additional homes at Barton Farm will not have a major impact on existing traffic levels to the detriment of existing residential areas within the vicinity of the development.

Change sought - removal of Winchester City (North) as the reserve MDA in the Hampshire Structure Plan.

used throughout the Plan and are present in other Proposals. Cross-references are helpful to avoid unnecessary repetition and should remain in this Proposal in line with the approach taken in the rest of the Plan.

A sustainability statement will provide a holistic overview of how sustainability principles across a broad spectrum of environmental, social and economic considerations have been incorporated into the location, design, use and construction of the development. Sustainable development principles must underpin the Masterplan for the development and developers will be expected to submit a statement to demonstrate how sustainability principles have been incorporated in the detailed plans, in line with the Local Plan policies. As such a Sustainability Statement is different to and more broadly based than an Environmental Assessment. The latter is limited to assessing and mitigating impact rather than providing a justification for the proposed development layout, design, mix of uses and transport arrangements to demonstrate that proposals represent the most optimal 'sustainable solution'.

Policy MDA1 of the Hampshire County Structure Plan indicates that the MDA should provide for the co-ordinated and integrated development of a range of land uses including employment. Two of the baseline MDA's in the Structure Plan have specific strategic employment allocations. The remaining two have no strategic employment allocation and the guidance is that local economic studies should advise on the need for and extent to which new employment provision may be needed as part of the MDA. There is no strategic guidance set out for the reserve site at Winchester City North other than that in Policy MDA1. The amount of new employment land to be provided is, therefore, a matter for local determination and there is no strategic need for a large allocation. Although the Proposal itself does not set out a guideline figure, the supporting text at paragraph RD12.62 indicates that the need for new employment land within the MDA is likely to be limited and should not exceed 6ha. This could be in the form of a traditional business park allocation or alternatively be provided for through mixed-used development. There is, therefore, a clear indication of the maximum likely extent of the requirement. This figure has been determined in the light of the best and most update economic information available at the present time. However, the site's reserve status means that economic circumstances may well be different at the time the site is released than can be envisaged now. Accordingly, an updated economic appraisal will be required in due course, taking account of the results of the 2001 Census and other economic information. The advice set out in the Proposal therefore provides a general indication of the present requirements. The City Council will need to review and update the advice as appropriate, depending on whether and when the site is released. In order to maintain flexibility within the Plan at this stage, it is not appropriate to include a specific employment allocation within the text of the Proposal itself.

Chapter 14 of the Local Plan adequately deals with the matter of implementation. It explains the role of public sector and the private sector in financing development proposals and emphasises the importance of co-ordinating the efforts of both to deliver successful developments. It also acknowledges that requirements from developers must be directly related to the development itself. It is not therefore considered necessary to amend the Proposal NC.3

With regard to "greater use" public transport, the Hampshire Local Transport Plan (LTP), sets out clear targets for reducing car usage and increasing public transport for the Winchester Movement and Access Plan area. New development at Winchester City North must show how it will contribute towards achieving the overall aims and objectives set out in the LTP. It is inappropriate for Proposal NC.3 to repeat the detail set out in the LTP.

Winchester District Local Plan Review

Analysis of Representations on the Revised Deposit Plan

Advice on car parking provision and the applications of standards is set out in Proposal T.4. This clearly indicates that the parking standards represent the maximum amount that will be acceptable. The standards aim to minimise the amount of car parking provided in new development, particularly where the site is fully accessible by a range of transport modes. The proposal further indicates that sympathetic consideration will be given to development proposals with reduced levels of parking provision and/or shared provision between different land use types. Accordingly the application of current parking standards does allow for the flexibility sought. Improvements to the sewerage and water supply system will need to be carried out to the satisfaction of Southern Water and the Environment Agency and must meet their requirements.

With regards to the ground water hazard area, Inset Map45 describes the hazard area as 'indicative only'. The Plan at paragraph RD12.67 therefore already acknowledges that the precise extent of the area will need to be refined to inform planning application decisions. The Plan also requires a detailed flood risk assessment to be carried out as part of any planning application or environmental statement. The concerns expressed by the respondent are therefore already adequately dealt with and the City Council would expect the Masterplan, supporting any planning application, to clearly show the precise extent of ground water hazard area.

The boundary of the MDA shown on the Proposals Map does not include land to the east of the railway line, although the Map annotation clearly indicates that the area is reserved for informal recreation purposes to meet needs arising from the MDA. Enhancing and managing informal public access to the countryside surrounding the MDA will help to control pressures on the urban fringe and reduce conflict with land owners and problems with trespass onto farmland. The public does not recognise landownership patterns and will seek access to countryside on land outside the control of Cala Homes to the north and east of the site. The pressure for access to the countryside can be managed to some extent and the allocation of an area to the east of the railway line for informal recreation will help to focus public activities. However, at the same time off-site improvements to footpath networks to the north of the site may also be required. It is reasonable for the City Council to seek contributions towards improvements on land outside the control of Cala's interests where the development has a direct effect on wider land management issues. The extent of the informal network of footpaths and cycleways to the east of the railway equally should not be constrained by landownership patterns and the definition of a hard boundary for this area would serve no logical purpose. Appropriate improvements should be identified through the Masterplan process and be agreed via a process of negotiation between the City Council and local landowners.

The landscape character of the area and the visual impact of the MDA is a sensitive and important local issue. The landscape scheme and new strategic planting requirements necessary to provide a well defined framework for the development need careful consideration, implementation and appropriate long term management to ensure that the MDA is accommodated in a way which respects the landscape character of the area. It will be necessary to agree the strategic landscape framework and planting for the whole site through the Masterplan process. The City Council will then seek to negotiate with the developer with a view to enabling appropriate strategic planting to take place advance of any development on the site. Where this cannot be agreed with the developer, strategic landscaping planting for the whole site may be required to be provided at the outset of the development as a first phase via a S106 agreement negotiated as part of the outline planning application.

With regards to the release of the site, the Proposal does recognise that it is the role of the Strategic Authorities to identify a compelling

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

justification to release reserve sites within Winchester District. However as part of the monitoring process the City Council will be consulted by the strategic authorities if a need to release reserve sites is identified. It will therefore reach its own view on the robustness of the monitoring process and on how the results of the exercise should be properly interpreted. Accordingly where the City Council is satisfied that the strategic authorities have properly identified a compelling justification for the release of sites within Winchester District as opposed to elsewhere in the County to meet Hampshire's needs, planning permission will be granted for development. The Proposal states the City Council's formal position on this matter and no further amendment is proposed.

In response to respondent 64/1, the Proposal provides cross references to Proposals DP.1 and DP.3 which set out more detailed advice on the design and development principles for all new development against which the MDA proposals will be tested. These Proposals provide an indication of how the Planning Authority will judge whether or not development proposals represent a "high quality of design".

A development of the scale proposed will of course have a huge impact since 'green fields' will be built upon, irrevocably changing the character of the area. However, the principle of development and the recognition that large-scale impact will occur has already been considered at the strategic level and a decision made that the need for development to meet housing needs may outweigh the need to protect countryside at this location. The Proposal seeks to ensure that in implementing development, interests of acknowledged importance at a local level, such as woodland belts and hedgerows present on the site, are protected and enhanced as far as possible through sensitive layout and design of the development. In this way, the impact of the development can to some extent be mitigated. Accordingly an environmental and sustainability statement will be required to demonstrate that, where possible, steps have been taken to protect, retain and/or enhance local features present on the site and/or in the immediate vicinity and where there is adverse impact, appropriate mitigation measures are proposed.

With regard to employment provision, there is only proposed to be a limited amount of new employment provided and therefore an acknowledgement that most of the people will work elsewhere. However, it should be noted that there is considerable imbalance between the number of working residents in Winchester and the jobs provided, with much higher number of jobs than residents. Additional housing provision will therefore help to readdress this balance. The objective is to provide people with a better opportunity of being able to live and work locally. It is only through increasing choice and providing better opportunities that current live/work patterns are likely to be changed in the longer term.

Traffic management measures are likely to be required to dissuade traffic from using the existing residential road network as alternative 'rat-runs' to Andover Road. These measures have proved effective at minimising traffic impact on the surrounding road network in other locations. Matters relating to traffic impact generally arising from the MDA have already been dealt with in response to Issue 12.31 in the Analysis of Representations and Recommended Responses to the Winchester District Local Plan Review Deposit 2001

Change Proposed- none.

Issue: 12.18 (Deposit 12.27)
RD12.51
Proposal NC.3: number of new dwellings

City Council's response to representation:

The precise number of dwellings that can be accommodated on the proposed reserve site can only be tested through the detailed preparation of a Masterplan. The Proposal indicates that the land

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

Representations:

Objections:

City of Winchester Trust (223/4), Save Barton Farm Group (175/24)

The policy refers to approximately 2000 dwellings. Evidence suggests that a minimum of 2000 dwellings is needed to create a new community. Certainty is needed in the number proposed so it will be possible to know how much land and infrastructure are necessary. If more are intended the number should be specified. Also, there should be more than one compelling justification to trigger development.

Change sought- Respondent 175: remove 'approximately' and specify numbers. Remove 'a' from 'that a compelling justification...' so that it is clear there should be more than one.

Respondent 223: in para 12.51 delete 'approximately and insert 'at least' so as to conform with all other specific MDA policies in the Structure Plan.

M J Maidens (1184/2)

Approximately 2000 houses would have a serious effect on the unique status of Winchester as outlined in the future of Winchester Study endorsed by the Council.

Change sought-not specified.

allocated is sufficient to accommodate 'approximately 2000 dwellings'. The actual number may be a little over or under 2000 depending upon the final mix of dwellings and range of densities promoted through Masterplan, and the physical and social infrastructure requirements for the site. These will need to be updated and confirmed if and when the site is eventually released for development. The land allocation already envisages a compact form of development and it is therefore highly unlikely that the site could accommodate a significantly higher number of dwellings than 2000 at a density that would be acceptable. Accordingly it is appropriate for the policy to refer to 'approximately' to provide sufficient flexibility through the Masterplanning work to test alternative design solutions for the site, whilst providing a clear indication of the general scale of development that is required to be accommodated.

It is correct that 2000 dwellings is generally viewed by the County Council to represent the minimum number of dwellings necessary to create a new community which has an element of self containment. The City Council is not proposing that the reserve site should accommodate significantly less than 2000 dwellings and therefore the reserve site will deliver a new community of the scale generally considered appropriate for an MDA.

The term 'compelling justification' for the release of a reserve site is consistent with the terminology referred to in Policy H4 of the Hampshire County Structure Plan and the SPG on 'Implementing Policy H4'. The SPG sets out the monitoring arrangements and explains how the decision to release a reserve site will be made. This document makes it clear that there are a combination of factors and influences which will be taken into account in determining whether there is a need to release a reserve site or not. As a result of examining a range of factors the strategic authorities will need to decide whether or not the accumulation of evidence gathered suggested that there is a 'compelling justification' to release a reserve site. Accordingly the wording of the Policy does not require amending since the 'compelling justification' to release a site will be based upon the analysis of a range of factors.

The issues raised by respondent number 1184/2 have been dealt with in response to issue 12.29 of the Analysis of Representations and Recommended Responses to the Winchester District Local Plan Review Deposit 2001.

Change Proposed- none.

Issue: 12.19 (Deposit 12.27)
RD12.51 and RD12.56
Proposal NC.3:density/design

Representations:

Objections:

I Berry (2270/1), Save Barton Farm Group (175/44)

The statement 'a high quality of design' is vague and further qualification is required, which should clearly state the standards the development must achieve in order to go ahead. Even well designed development would irreparably damage the historic setting of Winchester.

Change sought - there should be minimum screening standards, for example noise levels. There should also be a statement of maximum accountable

City Council's response to representation:

In regard to the 'high quality of design' statement, the Proposal provides cross references to Proposals DP.1 and DP.3. These proposals set out more detailed advice on the design and development principles for all new development which the MDA proposals will be tested against. These Proposals provide an indication of how the authority will judge whether or not development proposals represent a "high quality of design".

With respect to the controlling of noise pollution and other such pollution or damage that may be caused as a result of development, the Council has produced a 'Scoping Opinion', which details the issues which developer will have to address when producing an Environmental Statement. This will ensure that all aspects of the environment are managed in a sustainable manner. There are also minimum standards (e.g. noise standards) that are applied by appropriate legislation, regulations or best practice.

With regard to 'Green wedges' the Local Plan proposes a Local Gap between Winchester and Kingsworthy/Headbourne Worthy to protect the countryside between these settlements and retain its open

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

environmental damage, for example to wildlife, light pollution and noise pollution. It should be made explicit that the quality of design is secondary to the potential damage to Winchester of any major development on its green wedges.

J Balfour (1294/1)

The addition of 2000 homes at Barton Farm would be out of balance. Clause 12.56 proposes to exceed PPG3. Densities of 40 per hectare will create slums. The development will not help the housing needs of Southampton and Portsmouth as the cost of transport means it is too expensive for low paid workers to travel that distance. There will be too much pressure on Winchester Hospital and other facilities.

Change sought - *remove proposals for Winchester City (North) MDA and replace with an area nearer employment. Reduce to 30 dwellings per hectare, as per PPG3. The developer should be required to contribute to expanding hospital and city movement facilities.*

Bovis Homes Ltd. (205/4), Heron Land Developments Ltd (204/4)

Support the approach seeking high net densities of not less than 30 dwellings per hectare and testing higher densities through the masterplan process. However, the site boundary as defined suggests that a decision to pursue an average density of at least 47.5 dwellings per hectare has already been decided.

Change sought - *Change Inset Map45 (new plan suggestion shown on original representation). Replace 'a compact new community' with 'compact development forms'.*

J Balfour (2249/1)

PPG3 is under review. Over-density and too much affordable housing will lead to a sink estate. The proposals are out of context for this Roman City.

Change sought - *30 houses per hectare should be the maximum. Delete proposals to develop Barton Farm.*

character. In implementing development, interests of acknowledged importance at a local level, such as woodland belts and hedgerows present on the site, are to be protected and enhanced as far as possible through sensitive layout and design of the development.

In regard to the additional homes and the density of development, the densities currently proposed for the MDA are in-line with PPG3 guidance of 30–50 dwellings per hectare. The precise number of dwellings that can be accommodated on the proposed reserve site will be tested through the detailed preparation of a Masterplan. The Proposal indicates that the land allocated is sufficient to accommodate 'approximately 2000 dwellings'.

An overall average density has not been decided upon for Winchester City North MDA and will only be decided if and when the MDA is triggered for development and as a result of the Masterplanning process. Although the Plan at the moment gives a general idea of the expected densities and indicates that a compact form of development should prevail, circumstances could change as the infrastructure and other land use requirements are firmed up at the time the site is released. For example, the area of employment land may alter when the economic appraisal work is updated, which could result in a reduction in land allocated for employment. This would in turn free up more land for residential development and would alter the density of development.

Taking account of the landscape and physical constraints of the area, such as the railway and the characteristics of land to the north of the site, the area shown on the amended plans represents the maximum extent of the land that the City Council considers suitable for development to meet MDA requirements. The site allocation is therefore not likely to change, however the density of development that can appropriately be accommodated on the site will need to be tested further. The Plan indicates that 'approximately' 2000 dwellings can be accommodated.

The proposed densities are within PPG3 guidelines and there is no reason why higher density development cannot be attractive. Much of historic Winchester is built at higher densities than 30 dwellings per hectare, and properties within central residential areas of the City are highly sought after.

With respect to the issue of commuting, currently there are more people that commute into Winchester than commute out. Ideally, this MDA will help to achieve a better balance between housing and employment, thus reducing commuting overall.

Respondent 1294 is also concerned the Royal Hampshire County Hospital will not be able to cope with the increase in demand expected with the development of the MDA. Proposal NC.3 (iv) expresses the need to provide adequate facilities and services to serve the new community, including health. This may, therefore, require financial or other contributions to be made towards improving capacity at the Hospital.

Change Proposed – None

Issue: 12.20 (Deposit 12.27) **RD12.50 and RD12.51 RDMAP45** **Proposal NC.3: Method/timing** **of specifying a site**

Representations:

Support/resolved/withdrawn:

City Council's response to representation:

The support is welcomed.

The identification of the Reserve MDA at Winchester City North is in-line with the requirements of the Hampshire County Structure Plan. Further Supplementary Planning Guidance issued by the strategic authorities on 'Implementing Policy H4' indicates how reserve sites should be dealt with in Local Plans. The allocation of a reserve site is consistent with this advice.

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

RD12.51

Hampshire County Council (1433/10)

The changes made to the plan to identify the boundary of the reserve major development area at Winchester City (north) are welcomed.

Change sought - none

Objections:

M Lucas (2110/1), E Loverseed (2114/1)

The selection of Barton Farm as reserve MDA in place of the wide 'area of search' in the previous draft is premature.

Change sought - amend text to allow for the site to be re-evaluated if and when it is demonstrated that the reserve site must be called up. These investigations can then take account of prevailing conditions at the time. They should require up to date site surveys.

Kier Land (2273/3), (2273/4)

The Council's proposed trigger mechanism for the MDA is contrary to the trigger set out in the Structure Plan. The release of reserve sites should be triggered as a consequence of housing completion performance at County level, with the strategic authorities determining the most appropriate reserves sites to release and in which order. Therefore, it is inappropriate for Winchester to seek to determine when to trigger the MDA based upon need in Winchester District alone. The process adopted by the Council in identifying a site is flawed for the following reasons:

Technical inaccuracy

- Archaeological assessment scored Barton Farm more highly than it should have as it said there is no known archaeological constraint. There are the remains of a field system, settlements (possibly one of schedulable quality) and burial mounds. The council found this after doing the original assessment but did not re-do the assessment. Littleton has a scheduled monument but less evidence of prehistoric and Roman occupation.
- Agricultural land. Littleton got no score as there was insufficient information. It should have had a positive score as much is either the barracks or Littleton Stud and therefore the potential to revert to agricultural use is unlikely.
- Weighting. The council failed to openly or objectively weight criteria. However, 4 separate criteria related to transport/accessibility so there was implicit weighting in favour of transportation issues. Not weighting landscape meant that there was a failure to acknowledge the relative importance of the protection of

See the Analysis of Representations on the Deposit Plan; Chapter 12; New Communities for responses on the following issues:

- the trigger mechanism - Issue 12.27;
- brownfield land/Sir John Moore Barracks – Issue 12.28. The Ministry of Defence has not currently indicated that the Barracks have been, or will be, declared surplus to defence requirements;
- landscape and agricultural land - Issue 12.32 and 12.35. See also Issue 12.25 below;
- weighting of selection criteria – Issue 12.36. Consideration was given to the effect of applying various weightings but this was not considered to have any significant effect on the outcome of the assessment. The selection of the reserve MDA site was not just based on the scoring of the various criteria, but also the extent to which any issues that scored badly could be resolved;
- archaeology – Issue 12.38. Although further technical work showed archaeological remains, it was advised that these are not a constraint to development. There are the remains of an 18C Hessian Camp on the site, however the presence of the remains could be mitigated, if they are deemed to be important, by leaving that particular area as open space and ensuring that no development occurs on it. The reserve MDA at Winchester can still accommodate development on the site whilst being sensitive to cultural interests.

With regard to the release of the site, the Proposal does recognise that it is the role of the Strategic Authorities to identify a compelling justification to release reserve sites within Winchester District. However as part of the monitoring process the City Council will be consulted by the strategic authorities on an annual basis on the need to release sites within Hampshire and in which district reserve sites should be released. The City Council will therefore reach its own view on the robustness of the monitoring process and on how the results of the exercise should be properly interpreted. Accordingly where the City Council is satisfied that the strategic authorities have properly identified a compelling justification for the release of sites within Winchester District, as opposed to elsewhere in the County to meet Hampshire's needs, planning permission will be granted for development. The Proposal states the City Council's formal position on this matter and no further amendment is proposed.

In respect of respondents who either object to the identification of a defined site, believe that existing brownfield sites will meet the need for housing or suggest alternative sites for the MDA, the Winchester City North MDA was considered the most appropriate location for a reserve MDA by the Strategic Planning Authorities. See the Analysis of Representations on the Deposit Plan; Chapter 12; New Communities; Issue 12.32 & Issue 12.27 for further comments on the identification of the site at Winchester City (North).

Transport and traffic issues were considered when assessing the merits of each of the potential 'areas of search'. Proposal NC.3 also states that development will only be permitted if appropriate transport networks are established that encourage public transport, walking, cycling; provide good access on-site and off-site; minimise the impact of traffic on sensitive roads and residential areas; and provide parking in accordance with the Hampshire parking standards. The Proposal also requires that any important nature conservation interests are protected and where possible enhanced and further requires an appropriate assessment of the River Itchen.

The Winchester City (North) MDA arose from the report of the Structure Plan Examination in Public Panel. The strategic planning authorities rejected several other options, including Micheldever Station and Whiteley, and decided that Winchester City (North) should be a reserve MDA. The Local Plan is not, therefore, able to change the general location of the reserve area, or replace it, even if this were felt to be appropriate.

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

Winchester.

The site selection process did not comply with PPG3 guidance (para 28-34)

- The PPG3 process, if followed, would have weakened the case for Barton Farm
- Representation goes through the process suggested by PPG3 for both sites and finds that Littleton scores more highly.

Change sought - amend trigger mechanism to accord with the Structure Plan and make reference to the fact that it will be triggered when strategic authorities determine that there is a need.

Delete allocation of reserve MDA at Barton Farm and allocate land instead at Sir John Moore Barracks/Littleton Stud as identified in representation.

Kier Land (2273/5)

Object to the allocation of land at Barton Farm as a reserve MDA north of Winchester, as shown on RDMAP45.

Change Sought - Delete the MDA at Barton Farm and allocate instead land at Sir John Moore Barracks/Littleton Stud as illustrated in representation.

Bryan Jezeph Consultancy (373/13)

The area of land shown in RDMAP45 is inadequate for the MDA and the possibility of extensions to the urban settlement of Littleton and Harestock should be considered.

Change Sought - Consider Littleton and Harestock for future development.

D W R Clarke (135/1)

The Plan fails to consider the alternative sites provided on Worthy Down and Sir John Moore's Barracks.

Change sought - Move reserve area to Sir John Moore's Barracks and Worthy Down. The Defence Land Agency has offered to co-operate.

Defence Estates (2280/3)

PPG3 says that greenfield sites should not be built on unless there are no other reasonable alternatives. If the Barracks were evaluated separately it is thought that it would score better than Barton Farm.

Change sought - Sir John Moore Barracks to be allocated.

M J Maidens (1184/1)

An area of development has been identified after detailed studies. However, these did not include fundamental assessments such as traffic assessments and the Itchen Sustainability Study.

Change sought - none specified.

J Porter (2263/3) (Councillor)

Whilst there is in principle acceptance of the HCC strategic plan, the trigger is not

As the Local Plan states in paragraph 12.84 in regard to the release of the MDA, 'the land will, however, only be released for development if a compelling justification for additional housing has been identified by the strategic planning authorities (Hampshire County Council, Southampton City Council and Portsmouth City Council)'. The reserve MDA is a strategic allocation for development for the County. There are 4 MDA allocations in Hampshire, which are expected to meet the needs in the various districts. The MDA at Winchester City (North) is a reserve MDA and will only be activated if the need is apparent, and if the urban capacity sites are not forthcoming. (For further comments on this issue, see the Analysis of Representations on the Deposit Plan; Chapter 12; New Communities; Issue12.27).

The County Structure Plan requires a 'reserve' housing allocation to be made in the Local Plan for an MDA. The Sir John Moore Barracks was evaluated along with other potential 'areas of search', but the proposed site was concluded to be the most suitable to accommodate major development. This matter is discussed in the Analysis of Representations on the Deposit Plan Issue no. 12.36.

Change Proposed - None

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

sensitive to the needs of Winchester and does not take account of possible windfall sites which may be put forward north of Winchester.

Change sought - delete paragraph 12.50.

J Weeks (2087/1)

Object to the amendments made to the effect that the case for houses on Barton Farm must be decided on Winchester's needs alone.

Change sought - not specified.

P McManus (2305/1)

The selection of a specific area for an MDA shows an undue urgency to provide a major site for an ill-defined need, with maximum impact on irreplaceable countryside. If it is unavoidable to identify an MDA in north Winchester, it would be prudent to await the decision of the Army on Sir John Moore Barracks site.

Change Sought - not specified

Eagle Star Estates Ltd. (352/3), R V Marsh (2302/1), S M Marsh(2303/1)

Object to the change from an area of search to specifying Barton Farm. WCC Urban Capacity Study identified sufficient brownfield sites to meet housing needs in this Plan period.

Change sought - any additional site becoming available, such as Flowerdown or Worthy Down would be better able to meet housing needs after the plan period. -delete the proposed allocation and consider other choices, particularly a proper evaluation of Micheldever Station Market Town.

K Learney (975/1) (Councillor)

There is already excessive pollution in Winchester, which significant urban growth would only exacerbate. The trigger for the reserve MDA may not be within the Plan period. Brownfield sites may come forward in this time.

Change sought – Delete RD12.50-12.93, as not necessary at this stage.

Issue: 12.21 (Deposit 12.27)
RD12.50 and RDMAP45
Proposal NC.3: Boundary

Representations:

Support/resolved/withdrawn:

Hampshire County Council (Director of

City Council's response to representation:

The support is welcomed.

It is anticipated that the land identified on the Proposal Map will adequately provide for the facilities and services of the MDA. Development of the land to the north of Well House Lane would have a considerable impact on the landscape. The recommended location of the reserve MDA to the south of Well House Lane would minimise the landscape impact of the development whilst ensuring that it does

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

Environment) (1433/12)

Welcome the changes to the MDA boundary on RDMAP45.

Change sought - none.

Trevor Saville (1171/1), Mr and Mrs Blaxland (1378/1), Amanda Lee (1173/1)

Support the amendment RDMAP 45.05.

Change sought - none.

Objections:

Heron Land Development Ltd. (204/3), Bovis Homes Ltd. (205/3)

Although supporting the identification of a site for the MDA on Inset Map 45, a larger area of land should be allocated for the MDA, to include land north of Well House Lane, in order that infrastructure requirements can be met (see original representation for detail of reasons for seeking a revised boundary).

Change sought - *Change sought to Inset Map 45 (see plan attached to the original representation).*

RD12.50

Bryan Jezeph Consultancy (373/12)

The area of land is inadequate to provide for the proposed MDA. Also the possibility of extensions to the urban settlement of Littleton and Harestock should be reconsidered.

Change sought - *not specified.*

G R E Pope (995/1)

Concentration of the reserve MDA to the area bordering Park Road removes any chance of greenbelt remaining on the north side of Winchester. It also increases the potential for traffic congestion in the adjacent road systems serving the northern approaches to Winchester.

Change sought - *situate the new development at least 5 miles away to preserve green belt. Link this with a new road system to lighten the traffic load on the present northern approach road. Possibly relocate major institutions to rural locations so that brownfield sites can be developed for residential purposes.*

not impact on the Conservation Area or other important historic areas or their settings.

It is anticipated that site identified on the Proposal Map will be adequate for the MDA. However, the reserve has not yet been triggered, therefore densities and the amount of land anticipated to be occupied by specific services and facilities may have altered if and when the MDA is activated. If it is activated, the Masterplan will determine the specific details of the site. The land at Littleton and Harestock was evaluated as a potential site for the reserve MDA however the Barton Farm area emerged as the most suitable location.

One respondent requests that the MDA be situated 5 miles away to preserve the green belt. There is no defined green belt in the Winchester area. The MDA is not intended to be a free-standing settlement, but a sustainable extension to the existing town. If the MDA was situated 5 miles from the existing town, it would not be sustainable and such a location would not follow the 'sequential approach' promoted in Government policy. A local gap designation has already been applied between Winchester and Kings Worthy. With regard to traffic congestion the policy acknowledges the need to minimise traffic in the residential areas, see NC.3 (v) (a) for further details. Locating the development as proposed supports the provision of integrated walking and cycling routes and viable bus services with employment and other facilities within relatively short distances. The allocation of a site remote from an existing large settlement is more likely to lead to traffic problems than to solve them.

Change Proposed - None

Issue: 12.22 (Deposit 12.27)

RD12.51 (iii)

Proposal NC.3: Mitigation

Representations:

Objections:

Save Barton Farm Group (175/25), I G Embrey (2250/2), J Cullen (1413/3)

Building 2000 houses on a site visible from two main routes into Winchester cannot be mitigated. Also there should be no concept of 'overriding justification.'

City Council's response to representation:

The justification and need for development is discussed in the Analysis of Representations on the Deposit Plan; Chapter 12; New Communities; Issue 12.27. With respect to mitigation of the impact of the development, it is clear that the landscape character of the area and the visual impact of the MDA is a sensitive and important local issue. It has never been suggested that a development of this scale can (or should) be hidden. However, landscape impact was one of the considerations that was taken into account in the process of selecting the 'area of search' and refining this to the Barton Farm area.

The landscape scheme and new strategic planting requirements necessary to provide a well defined framework for the development needs careful consideration, implementation and appropriate long-

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

Change required - retain the open panoramic views of the northern approach. Delete references to 'overriding justification'.

I G Embrey (2250/1)

However good the design of the development, building a new estate on Barton Farm will damage the historic setting of Winchester and encourage inward migration to a community whose amenities are already stretched. It is not possible to mitigate against these effects.

Change sought - delete proposals for Winchester City (North) MDA at Barton Farm.

Save Barton Farm Group (175/28)

We are not convinced that it is possible to avoid the risk of flooding both on and off site.

Change sought - not specified.

term management to ensure that the MDA is accommodated in a way which respects the landscape character of the area so far as possible. It will be necessary to agree the strategic landscape framework and planting for the whole site through the Masterplan process. The City Council will then negotiate with the developer with a view to enabling appropriate strategic planting to take place advance of any development on the site. If advance planting cannot be agreed with the developer, strategic landscaping planting will be required to be provided at the outset of the development as a first phase via a S106 agreement attached to the outline planning application.

In regard to the 'overriding justification', it is necessary to recognise that a situation may arise where an interest of acknowledged importance may have to be compromised. However, this should only be the case if the need for such a compromise outweighs the need to protect or enhance that feature, hence the reference to 'overriding justification'.

(2250/1) See the Analysis of Representations on the Deposit Plan; Chapter 12; New Communities; Issue 12.29 (Character of Winchester) & 12.30 (Impact on Social Infrastructure).

With regards to the ground water hazard area, the Plan acknowledges that the precise extent of the area will need to be refined to inform planning application decisions. The Plan also requires a detailed flood risk assessment to be carried out as part of any planning application or Environmental Statement. The City Council would expect the Masterplan, supporting any planning application, to clearly show the precise extent of ground water hazard area.

Change Proposed - None

Issue: 12.23 (Deposit 12.27)
RD12.51 (iv and v)
Proposal NC.3: infrastructure

Representations:

Support/resolved/withdrawn:

Environment Agency (253/21), (253/22)
Support RD12.51, Proposal NC.3 c) and NC.3 ix)

Change sought - none.

Objections:

E Loverseed (2114/2)

The bullet points listed are contradictory. Good access to local schools, town centre and railway station implies impact of traffic on sensitive roads and residential areas. Parking is to be provided and it is not likely that cars parked within the development will never leave it.

Change sought - remove Barton Farm as identified reserve site.

M Squire (2269/1)

Although the proposal requires that physical infrastructure has been appropriately secured, including access to link the development to the transport network this is not strong enough and is

City Council's response to representation:

The support is welcomed.

The bullet points are not contradictory. The provision of good access to local schools does not mean that the impact of traffic on sensitive roads and residential areas will be high. The location of the primary school will be on-site with the secondary school located adjacent to the MDA. This will enable access to these facilities by walking, cycling or public transport, helping to reduce the need for travel by private car to and from the schools and other local facilities.

The land for physical infrastructure will be appropriately secured via Section 106 agreements and the wording is strong enough in criterion NC.3(v) to achieve this. With regard to 'good access', it is not possible to define this in every case. However, other statutory documents such as Planning Policy Guidance and the Local Transport Plan are likely to provide relevant guidance.

The need to plan for a reserve MDA is not optional, as it has already been decided by the Strategic Authorities that there must be a reserve MDA at Winchester City (North). With respect to alternative transport options, the Council will support alternatives to car journeys that are available and attractive to users. Southern Water and the Environment Agency have been consulted on the Plan and it is felt that the policy adequately deals with the issues relating to flooding. It will be noted that the Environment Agency has supported the changes to the Plan regarding flooding and an 'appropriate assessment' of the River Itchen.

Several respondents object to the MDA for a number of reasons including; traffic implications, infrastructure, loss of the countryside, the idea of high quality design as a mitigating factor; and congestion.

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

subject to interpretation. Also, the provision of good access is subject to various interpretations of 'good' (for whom?).

Change sought - *provision of necessary infrastructure should be obligatory. The requirements of 'good access' should be defined in measures.*

Mr and Mrs R J Smith (1122/1)

Traffic and thus air pollution would be worsened - we do not believe new residents would use alternative modes of transport. Winchester's infrastructure would be overloaded and surface water feeding the Itchen would be increased and may lead to flooding problems downstream. The area chosen for the reserve MDA is a vital green wedge and contains good quality agricultural land (Inspector's Report, 1997).

Change sought - *not specified.*

C A Berry (2271/1)

A high quality design cannot overcome the problems of placing 2000 new dwellings on a greenfield site and imposing an intolerable extra burden on already overloaded roads and facilities. Congestion in the city will be exacerbated. Some of the city's most accessible countryside will be lost. The main landscape features will not be maintained.

Change sought - *remove fatuous references to improvements to countryside. To make the new development less obtrusive there should be noise and visual screening and distance between existing settlements. It should be acknowledged that traffic problems will also be worsened.*

A G Campbell (71/1), Save Barton Farm Group (175/27)

There is no evidence that the new infrastructure to sustain 2000 new dwellings will work. Traffic congestion in sensitive areas will be worsened - its impact cannot be removed.

Change sought - *remove proposals for Winchester City (North) MDA.*

Hampshire County Council (1434/9)

Although welcoming the identification of the need for adequate provision of services and facilities, including some that are the responsibility of the County Council, the full range of County Council services are not specified within the policy and there is a danger that they may be excluded from the consideration of future planning obligations.

Change sought - *discuss with the County Council the full range of facilities that will need to be included within the new community so that these can be acknowledged within NC.3.*

These points of objection have all been dealt with at the deposit Plan stage and above. Further, the location of a reserve MDA at Winchester City (North) is a Structure Plan requirement and is not, therefore, optional.

The City Council has been in discussion and consultation with relevant County Council Departments about the provision of services and facilities. Whilst it is not for the Local Plan to set out the full range of services required for the MDA, specific requirements are set out in Proposal NC.3 for key items of infrastructure, especially where land or financial contributions will be required. Other requirements will be identified as part of the Masterplan process. The MDA at Winchester City (North) is a reserve MDA, therefore it would not be appropriate to be too prescriptive at this stage, as requirements may change by the time the site is triggered. The manner in which the MDA has been approached in the Plan allows for flexibility.

Change Proposed – *none.*

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

Issue: 12.24 (Deposit 12.27)

RD12.51 (vi)

Proposal NC.3: Integration with Winchester

Representations:

Objections:

J A Denny (2268/1)

Barton Farm is good quality agricultural farmland. Development would be an eyesore and would not integrate with the city.

Change sought-Withdrawal of proposals for Winchester City (North) MDA at Barton Farm.

Save Barton Farm Group (175/29)

The statement 'the new development is properly integrated with the existing built-up area of Winchester' is not explicit enough.

Change sought- convey how such a large development will be integrated

City Council's response to representation:

A detailed landscape and visual impact assessment will be undertaken following the Landscape Institute/Institute of Environmental Assessment Guidelines for landscape and Visual Impact Assessment. In respect of the respondent's concerns about the development being an eyesore, effective, appropriate and feasible mitigation measures will be put forward, which relate to the existing landscape character.

The 'Future of Winchester' study discusses that development should be 'stitched' into the existing built up area by making it contiguous, providing transport and access to the existing town and by allowing those new areas developed to utilise the facilities in the existing town and vice versa. It is not felt that additional text is required to detail this.

Change Proposed - None

Issue: 12.25 (Deposit 12.27)

RD12.51 (viii)

Proposal NC.3: Landscape

Representations:

Support/resolved/withdrawn:

**Hampshire County Council;
Environment Department (1433/5)**

Withdrawn objection to 12.51
(1433/10/WDLPR/DEPOS)

Change Sought – none.

Objections:

**Save Barton Farm Group (175/30), E
Loverseed (2114/3), I G Embrey
(2250/3), R Secker (2275/2)**

The main landscape feature here is open space put to arable farming. How can this be retained when there is major development?

Change sought - remove Barton Farm as identified reserve site. Search for alternative site not encroaching on green land.

Save Barton Farm Group (175/1)

We are concerned by the conflict between acknowledging the importance of the landscape north of Winchester in RDAPP2.08 and putting this to one side when justifying siting the reserve MDA at Barton Farm. Also, many studies mentioned in the second Draft Deposit have yet to be undertaken or are only partially completed.

Change sought - not specified.

City Council's response to representation:

The support is welcomed.

It is obviously not the intention of the Council to retain farming on the area reserved for the MDA. Proposal NC.3 (viii) states that the MDA will be approved if the main landscape features of the site are retained and incorporated into the development proposals. Farming is not a landscape feature, but a use of the site. The use of the land, the cultural attributes i.e. the Hessian Camp and the social importance of the land would all be considered when assessing the level of importance the landscape holds for the community, however these issues (social, cultural and use) are not in themselves, landscape features. Therefore NC.3 (viii) does not apply.

The landscape to the north of the reserve MDA is recognised as having landscape features worthy of protection, hence no development will be undertaken on this land. In order to maintain and/or enhance this landscape through the development of the MDA, a landscape scheme and strategic planting requirements will be decided after careful consideration. The aim is to have an MDA that is sensitive to its surrounding environment. Clearly the development of an MDA will mean change, however this does not mean that it cannot be undertaken in a manner that is sensitive and respectful to its surrounding environment.

Before the site selection was made by the Strategic Planning Authorities, various studies had been undertaken covering the main constraints of the sites. These studies provided the authorities with a level of understanding needed to enable an informed decision to be made. The on-going nature of the MDA process means that more detailed studies will be required to determine the detailed layout and design. It is inevitable that not all of the required studies can be completed at the outset and that the need for additional studies will arise during the complex process of planning for the reserve MDA. However, much work has already been undertaken and the Plan highlights other key areas where further studies are needed.

NC.3(ii) will only permit development if 'it accords with Proposals DP.1...'. DP.1(v) specifically ensures that applications must have a

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

English Heritage (250/3)

Criterion (ix) refers to the need for any important nature conservation interests to be protected and cross-reference is made to proposals elsewhere in the Plan. However, there is no equivalent specific reference to the need to protect heritage interests in this area, although these may be significant.

Change sought - *modify the Plan to remedy this.*

Winchester Landscape Conservation Alliance (333/1)

The development of Barton Farm would swallow a vital green wedge on a major approach to our historic city. The proposal is in conflict with section 11 of the WDLP which states that the plan seeks to ensure development in an around Winchester protects its heritage.

Change sought - *use brownfield sites elsewhere in the County.*

design statement that includes a full site analysis identifying any known elements of historic importance which may be affected by the development including archaeological remains, ancient monuments, historic buildings, important historic parks and gardens or other historic landscape features. An additional criterion in NC.3 is not, therefore, necessary as the Plan already addresses the need to protect heritage interests.

See the Analysis of Representations on the Deposit Plan; Chapter 12; New Communities; Issue 12.28 (Brownfield Land) & Issue 12.29 (Character of Winchester). In summary, not all the green wedges and corridors which are characteristic of the City are sacrosanct. However in selecting a reserve site for the MDA careful consideration has been given to providing access to the countryside and to protecting the remaining 'green gap' to the north of City through the designation of an area for informal recreation and retention of the local gap designation between Kings Worthy and Winchester, to the east of the railway line.

Change Proposed - *None*

Issue: 12.26 (Deposit 12.30)

RD12.52

Paragraph 12.86

Support/Resolved/withdrawn:

B Rathbone (2252/1)

Support paragraph 12.86.

Change sought - *none.*

Objection:

M J Maidens (1184/3)

I am concerned that the particular strategic planning authority has not been identified so that representations can be made to this authority to remove this reserve site from any development plans.

Change sought - *none specified.*

City Council's response to representation:

The support is welcomed.

The strategic planning authorities have been identified in paragraph 12.84.

Change Proposed - *None*

Issue: 12.27 (Deposit 12.30)

RD12.60

New paragraph Housing

Representations:

Objection:

Save Barton Farm Group (175/31)

Although 35% affordable housing is proposed, this will only be affordable until it is sold on. It is not specified whether it should be rental only.

Change sought - *promote the Rural Housing Enabler (RHE) scheme.*

**Heron Land Developments Ltd. (204/5),
Bovis Homes Ltd. (205/5)**

City Council's response to representation:

The precise tenure split will be decided after an up-to-date assessment is undertaken if and when the reserve MDA is triggered. However, any affordable housing will be required to meet local needs and to be retained for future needs. It will not, therefore, be sold on the open market, but is instead likely to be a mix of rented and shared equity accommodation.

Winchester City (North) is a reserve MDA, and therefore it is reasonable for the Local Plan to state that, should the site be triggered, the starting point for assessing what proportion of affordable housing should be sought would be the proportion that applies generally in the District. Given the uncertainty about when the site may be triggered, the Local Plan should not go further than this at this stage, as any proportion should be based on an up-to-date assessment if and when the site was triggered. The Council has recently undertaken an updated District-wide survey which has identified a considerable increase in the need for affordable housing.

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

Object to the increase to 35% affordable housing, and the indication that this may be further increased. This is said to be necessary to achieve the target of 900 affordable homes in the area. However, with 600 affordable homes at Winchester City (North) MDA with a 30% policy on sites of 5 or more homes, this figure would be achieved.

Change sought - *maintain the current requirement of 30% affordable housing.*

Cala Homes (south) Ltd. (468/15)

Requirements for a range of housing types such as smaller dwellings and affordable housing are ill defined and lacking in justification. The policy refers to H.7 which is subject to objection, and to H.5. The requirement for 35% affordable housing is not justified in the Local Plan and the policy refers to the need for an updated Housing Needs Survey. The policy seems to assume that this will give rise to a higher requirement on the reserve MDA, but it could also be lower.

Change sought - *not specified.*

R Roves (2287/2), Save Barton Farm Group (175/26)

Those who will be able to buy the 'affordable housing' will be those who already have jobs in other parts of the city. Those that work in Winchester or take the new employment provided by convenience stores and so on of the MDA will not be able to afford open market houses at Barton Farm. It will become a commuter suburb that generates considerable additional road users.

Change sought - *remove Barton Farm as a site for development.*

There is, therefore, no likelihood of the provision within the reserve MDA exceeding the need for affordable housing, whatever percentage is required.

Proposals H.5 & H.7 (as proposed to be amended) will detail the District-wide figures for affordable housing. These are a reasonable starting point for the reserve MDA, but if the site was triggered, the proportion of affordable housing would need updating to take account of an up-to-date needs assessment. An additional viability appraisal may also need to be undertaken as background to the preparation of the Masterplan.

It is not for the Local Plan to specify who will have affordable housing or where they will work. However, the provision of the maximum appropriate amount of affordable housing may well help to reduce commuting, and this will be sought.

Change Proposed - *None*

Issue: 12.28 (Deposit 12.30)

RD12.62

New paragraph: Employment

Representations:

Objections:

Save Barton Farm Group (175/32)

Winchester is not short of employment, it is short of employees. The provision of employment land at Winchester City (North) is an attempt at disguising the fact that new development here would be a dormitory suburb.

Change sought - *delete reference to employment land.*

M J Maidens (1184/5)

The provision of a resource centre will not provide many jobs - most will commute to London on the train. The development would not help life in Winchester.

Change sought - *remove reference to*

City Council's response to representation:

Policy MDA1 of the Hampshire County Structure Plan indicates that the MDA should provide for the co-ordinated and integrated development of a range of land uses including employment. Two of the baseline MDA's in the Structure Plan have a specific strategic employment allocation. The remaining two have no strategic employment allocation and the guidance is that local economic studies should advise on the need for and extent to which new employment provision may be needed as part of the MDA. There is no strategic guidance set out for the reserve site at Winchester City North, other than that in Policy MDA1. The amount of new employment land to be provided is therefore a matter for local determination and there is no strategic need for a large allocation. The City Council will need to review and update the advice as appropriate, depending on when/whether the site is released.

The assumption that the resource centre will not provide many jobs may not be well-founded. The extent of employment land is not determined yet and will only be determined when the Council has received up to date information on the needs of the community if and when the MDA is released.

The tenure split will be decided after an up-to-date housing needs assessment is undertaken, if and when the reserve MDA is triggered.

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

Amenity site.

Cala Homes (south) Ltd. (468/16)

Cala homes support the statement that there is only a limited need for employment provision. However the failure to identify the scale of employment land appropriate to Winchester City (North) MDA is objected to. Although 6 hectares is estimated, there is no indication as to whether this is a target provision and this figure is not justified. Neither is there any justification either for limiting potential employment generating uses to those falling within Use Classes B1 and B2 or for a recycling centre.

Change sought - *not specified.*

J Cullen (1413/4)

The proposed development would be most beneficial to newcomer commuters, putting the road and railway system under more pressure. Affordable housing occupiers may be key workers from public services, so employment opportunities are limited.

Change sought - *delete references to Winchester City (North) MDA.*

Winchester City (North) is a reserve MDA, and therefore should the site be triggered, the starting point for assessing what proportion of affordable housing should be sought would be the proportion that applies generally in the District. As Winchester has a large proportion of people that commute to work here, the MDA at Winchester City (north) would provide opportunities for those people to live in Winchester too, reducing the need to commute. Further, it is not for the Local Plan to specify who affordable housing will be allocated to.

Change Proposed - *None*

Issue: 12.29 (Deposit 12.31)

RD12.64 and 12.65

New paragraph: Transport

Representations:

Objections:

M Campbell (71/2) R Secker (2275/3)

Winchester City (North) MDA would create severe traffic congestion in Andover Road and feeder roads such as Park Road. This may lead to noise pollution and traffic accidents.

Change sought –

71- cancellation of proposals for Winchester City (North) MDA.

2275- plan should define how increased traffic on existing network will be avoided.

D Hurrell (2247/1)

Winchester cannot cope with an increased volume in traffic because any increase will damage Winchester as a tourist centre.

Change sought - *cancellation of proposals for Winchester City (North) MDA.*

A Trimmer (1115/2)

It is suggested that using Well House Lane and Worthy Road would minimise the volume of traffic using Andover Road (N)/A34 for destinations within Winchester. Even if that were possible, the traffic so diverted would finish up at the North Walls/City Road Junction, which is already over-congested. The real

City Council's response to representation:

The plan specifically states that measures will be needed to be considered to reduce traffic speeds on Well House Lane, Down Farm Lane and to minimise the volume of traffic using the Andover Road (north)/A34(T) trunk road route. No further changes are therefore needed.

Traffic measures are proposed for Andover Road as it is here that the most traffic is expected to be generated. The Masterplan and Transport Assessment will need to detail the traffic issues and measures that will be undertaken to minimise the effect.

Paragraph RD12.65 already refers to the need to minimise traffic using the A34 for local destinations, but it is accepted that this could be supplemented by additional wording along the lines suggested by the Highways Agency.

The Masterplan and the Transport Assessment will consider detailed access and traffic measures for the MDA and the effect of these on the trees on Andover Road and other detailed design issues. However, the Plan already suggests that there should be a bus route through the development.

The need to avoid unnecessary use of Well House Lane and Bedfield Lane is accepted. The Masterplan and Transport Assessment will need to assess and determine how this is best achieved. However, the Plan already refers to the need to reduce traffic speeds on Well House Lane, Down Farm Lane and Bedfield Lane.

The Council is able to seek developers contributions where they are reasonably related to the development. In regard to the Park and Ride, it is recognised that there is a potential for a Park and Ride however, this will be looked at in the Masterplan and will be subject to more detailed assessment of demand and viability. Specific mention is made of the need for improved foot and cycle bridge provision at the Andover Road railway bridge because this is a known constraint. It is accepted that improvements will be needed elsewhere in

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

problem, which is not addressed in para12.15, is the ever-increasing volume of traffic diverting from the A34 junction on Three Maids Hill through the City.

Change sought-none specified.

Save Barton Farm group (175/34) C Embrey (2251/1)

There is a reference to minimising traffic on Andover Road, but not Worthy Road. Achieving this with 2000 extra houses will be difficult.

Change sought –

175- a more detailed study of transport implications before the site is specified. 2251-deletion of Winchester City (North) proposals.

Highways Agency (2276/2)

We support the recognition in RD12.65 that the volume of traffic using the Andover Road/A34 route for destinations in Winchester should be minimised.

However, there is no consideration of the potential needs for improvements to the A34/Andover Road junction and the trunk road network in general.

Change sought - *add a bullet point to RD12.65 to say 'safeguard the operation of the trunk road network in accordance with the criteria established by DTLR Circular 04/2001.'*

K Larkin (204/8), Bovis Homes Ltd. (205/8)

Using two points on Andover Road for vehicular access to the MDA would create gaps in the line of trees on the east side. Sharing the use of Andover Road for cars and buses accessing the site doesn't allow any bus priority.

Change sought - *access for public transport, walking and cycling to be from Andover Road and for cars and service vehicles from Well House Lane.*

Headbourne Worthy Parish Council (2318/1)

The Council object to the paragraph stating that a 'secondary access' to the MDA is likely to be needed onto Well House Lane. This will encourage use of Well House Lane and Bedfield Lane to access the A33. This would worsen the existing problems of fast traffic and accidents in Headbourne Worthy.

Change sought - *there should be a 'no right turn' from the MDA onto Well House Lane.*

Save Barton Farm Group (175/33)

The high cost of works involving both railway and highway that would be needed for a new foot and cycle bridge is unlikely to be absorbed by developers. Where will the cycle traffic go when it has crossed the railway line? How much green field will be taken for development of park

Andover Road too and these are alluded to in the remainder of this sentence.

A number of the objections relate to details that the Masterplan and Transport assessment will need to resolve. With regard to traffic generation, the presence of cycle ways, footpaths and high quality public transport will give people the option of alternative transport to car use. The Local Plan provides opportunities for car journeys to be minimised but transport issues are a matter for the Local Transport Plan. The Transport Assessment will look at the detail of the traffic issues and appropriate management measures will need to be incorporated in the Masterplan.

It is recognised that there is some potential for a Park and Ride facility. This is likely to serve this radial route, not just the MDA. The most appropriate location for such a facility needs to be considered in producing the Masterplan, as it will be partly dependent on the more detailed disposition of uses within and adjoining the MDA, which needs to be subject to more detailed consideration. The potential for a P&R facility will be looked at in detail in the Masterplan. The local plan already deals with the potential for bus services for the MDA, see new paragraph RD12.64.

Whilst it is accepted that a full Transport Assessment is needed, it is considered appropriate for the Local Plan to draw attention to the key transport issues that have already been identified. Transport is clearly one of the major areas of concern for local people and the Local Plan should set out certain principles relating to it.

The Local Plan just covers the key issues in relation to the MDA. Initial transport studies were undertaken in order to determine the viability of the site as a MDA however, a detailed Transport Assessment will be undertaken along with the Masterplan.

Parking Standards are applied on a consistent basis throughout Hampshire.

Consideration of comprehensive measures to reduce the impact of traffic has been made in the context of the wider transport strategy for Winchester.

Change Proposed – RD12.65:

- minimise the volume of traffic using the Andover Road (north) /A34 Trunk Road route for destinations within Winchester and safeguard the operation of the A34 as a trunk road.

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

and ride.

Change sought - *a more detailed and in-depth study of transport implications and a projection of the domino effect of development at Winchester City (North) MDA.*

A Trimmer (1115/1)

Once cycle traffic has crossed the footbridge, where will it go? Improvements that would cater for better cycle or pedestrian movements on the Andover Road are not possible.

Change sought - *abandon Winchester City (North) MDA.*

V E Bruty (1259/1)

There is a failure to address the problem of traffic generation. The emphasis is on promoting cycling and walking to address this problem. However, most of the site is not within easy walking/cycling distance. A new footbridge by the rail bridge is impractical as the road over the railway is narrow and there is no footpath on one side.

Change sought - *publicly available plans should show exactly what is envisaged and how it would be possible to build a foot and cycle bridge adjoining the Andover Road Rail Bridge.*

**Heron Land Developments Ltd. (204/7),
Bovis Homes Ltd. (205/7)**

Support the various measures that are set out to encourage walking cycling and bus use and for park and ride. However, a firm proposal should be made for a park and ride car park off Andover Road and the site proposed for Winchester City (North) MDA should be large in enough to fit this facility.

Change sought - *include a firm proposal for a site for a park and ride facility within the MDA.*

**Heron Land Developments Ltd. (204/6)
Bovis Homes Ltd. (205/6)**

Support the provision of park and ride as a key element of the Winchester Movement and Access Strategy. However, a proposed site for a park and ride car park to the north of Winchester is omitted, even though paragraph 11.33 reports that it will be needed within the next ten years.

Change sought - *amend the last point of RD12.64 to read 'the provision of a park and ride site within the development'.*

E Loverseed (2114/4)

Those living in the proposed MDA would be better served by a conventional bus service. For those travelling into Winchester park and ride doesn't offer the benefits of taking public transport the whole way, or the convenience of parking at a final destination.

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

Change sought - exclude park and ride from the plan.

Cala Homes (South) Ltd. (468/17), (468/18)

The criteria listed are unnecessary and should not be covered in the Local Plan as the scope for a Transport Assessment for proposals has already been agreed with the Local Highways Authority.

Change sought - not specified.

M J Maidens (1184/6)

It is wrong that a reserve site was selected before any transport assessment has been made.

Change sought - make and approve a transport assessment before any further work is done.

M J Maidens (1184/4)

This test should also include the viability for car parking. Present guidelines are inadequate, particularly as there is no cheap, reliable public transport system.

Change sought -: not specified.

V and R Sutcliffe (2313/1)

The methods of minimising traffic and definitions of sensitive roads are unclear in: 'Minimise the impact of traffic from the development on sensitive roads and residential areas...'

Change Sought: not specified.

Issue: 12.30 (Deposit 12.34)

RD12.67

New paragraph: Drainage and flooding

Representations:

Support/resolved/withdrawn:

Environment Agency (253/25), (253/24)

Support RD12.51, Proposal NC.3 c) and NC.3 ix)

Change sought - none.

Objections:

Heron Land Developments Ltd. (204/9)

The proposal for a joint study of flooding issues is welcomed but the land drainage issue may go beyond the site boundary.

The extent that the Barton Farm site drains the valley north of Well House Lane is still not known and thus neither is the extent that measures may be needed to mitigate flooding downstream of the MDA.

Change sought - the valley north of Well House Lane should be included within the boundary of the MDA so that any necessary mitigation measures can be incorporated into the masterplan.

City Council's response to representation:

The support is welcomed.

It is accepted that land drainage issues may go beyond the site boundary, hence the need for the joint study by the Environment Agency, referred to in the Plan. However, it is not necessary to include additional land within the defined MDA development for it to be subject to study, and the study is likely to cover areas well beyond the MDA boundary, which it would be impractical to include anyway.

The proposed study is aimed at assessing the degree to which the development may lead to off-site down stream flooding, if any. It is therefore related to the development and it is reasonable that the developer would be expected to contribute to studies. If there are a number of areas that require a similar study to be undertaken on flooding issues, it is sensible to include all of these areas into one study. In this instance, the developers would only be required to contribute a proportionate amount to the study, related to the likely impact of the development.

The suggestion that flood mitigation measures failed elsewhere does not give reason to choose another site for the MDA. The flooding/drainage issues are taken very seriously and work has been done in conjunction with the Environment Agency. Further detailed studies are to be completed in regard to these issues and the outcomes will be incorporated into the Masterplan.

The detailed studies proposed are precisely to determine whether areas further downstream, especially central Winchester, will be affected by the MDA. Although it is considered unlikely that Southampton would be directly affected, this is capable of being

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

Cala Homes (South) Ltd. (468/19)

This policy is unduly onerous. The developers should only be asked to contribute to studies of flooding issues where they fairly and reasonably relate to the development being proposed. Indeed it is understood that there is no longer any requirement to contribute to a joint study of flooding issues in Winchester given the limited anticipated impact arising from the proposed development.

Change sought - none specified.

assessed as it is 'downstream' of the proposed MDA.

Change Proposed - None

A Trimmer (1115/3)

The area in the south of the site that is specified on the map as 'sometimes flooding' in fact floods two to three times per year. Soakaways are proposed as a mitigation measure, however soakaways constructed at the junction of Andover Road and Stoney Lane were a complete failure.

Change sought - abandon the concept of Barton Farm as an MDA.

M J Maidens (1184/7)

I think it is important to include downstream areas and Southampton in the joint study as these can flood when the Itchen is swollen and would be affected by increased surface water run-off.

Change sought - include these areas.

Save Barton Farm (175/35)

Just by having buildings not on low ground will not be enough.

Change Sought - not specified.

Issue: 12.31 (Deposit 12.30)

RD12.71-12.74

New paragraphs: Education provision

Representations:

Objections:

Cala Homes (South) Ltd. (468/20)

This new paragraph is overly prescriptive and the precise timing of development and related education facilities is something that should be determined through the Masterplanning/Development Brief process.

Change sought - not specified.

Save Barton Farm Group (175/36)

There may in fact be a need for a secondary school as those likely to be buying open market houses on this site are unlikely to be first time buyers so will probably have older aged school children.

Change sought - specific study required of the likely impact on the provision of secondary school education.

City Council's response to representation:

The Education Authority has advised the Council that a primary school will be required within the MDA. This is a very important facility, the need for which will be generated by the proposed development. It is therefore entirely reasonable that the Local Plan should highlight the need and responsibility for providing it. It is accepted that the precise timing of development is not known, but the Local Plan does not seek to prescribe this.

The Education Authority has advised the Council that a secondary school will not be required within the MDA. There is a secondary school located within walking and cycling distance of the MDA that will have the capacity to take those additional students resident in the MDA. The location of the development in relation to the school will not require car journeys to the school. Whilst secondary school provision is expected to be made off the MDA site at Henry Beaufort School, it may be that associated playing fields need to be within the MDA area. To provide flexibility it is proposed that the Plan's explanatory text be amended to be less prescriptive about the location of secondary education provision by deleting the words 'off-site'.

There is a requirement for the developer to contribute to education facilities. The precise form of this requirement, and the level of facilities required, will need to be subject to further study and negotiation. It may be that pre-school provision is provided commercially, in which case the contribution required may be less

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

**D Hurrell (2247/2), I G Embrey (2250/4),
Save Barton Farm Group (175/37)**

The proposal for off-site secondary education will aggravate traffic in other parts of the city.

Change sought - remove proposals for the MDAs around Winchester.

-Cala Homes (South) Ltd. (468/4)

Whilst there will be a role for the masterplan to identify sufficient land to accommodate all educational facilities, these do not necessarily need to be provided by the developer in their entirety. There is a need for the Local Plan policy framework to clearly distinguish between the role of the developer and other interested parties such as the Education Authority.

Change sought - not specified.

Cala Homes (South) Ltd. (468/5)

The requirement to provide pre-school education and care facilities is unjustified and bears no relation to the scale of need arising from the proposed development.

Change sought - not specified.

than for a facility to be used as a community education facility. The Local Plan is not prescriptive about the scale or form of provision and this will be the subject of further study through the masterplanning process. Nevertheless, provision for pre-school education facilities is a legitimate requirement, as the need for it is generated by the MDA development.

Change Proposed – RD12.73

Government and local authority funding for new schools is insufficient to cover the full cost of provision. As the need for education provision is generated by the development, developers will be expected to provide all education facilities needed on-site and contribute to improved provision off-site for secondary education.

Issue: 12.32 (Deposit 12.30)

RD12.69 and RD12.76

New paragraphs: Health Provision

Representations:

Objection:

Denmead Village Association (2293/3)

There has been no reaction to the many comments on inadequate hospital provision. The previous objection has not been met.

Change sought-none specified.

Save Barton Farm Group (175/38), C Embrey (2251/2)

As health care services should be provided on-site, are GPs and dentists to be persuaded to move to Winchester, or will existing ones be working longer hours.

Change sought - detailed study into the provision of GPs, dentists and other health service providers on the proposed site and the effect on Winchester generally.

Cala Homes (South) Limited (468/21)

Object to RD12.76 as it fails to distinguish between the role of the developer and other parties. The Masterplan may be required to make provision for land to meet the needs of the new community, although there is no suggestion as to how such additional services could be provided by the developer in isolation. The

City Council's response to representation:

The Plan does not detail what will make up the 'health provision', as this will be determined by the Masterplan if and when the reserve MDA is activated. It is impossible for the Local Plan to go into more detail than stated as further investigation will be needed of the best way to provide for additional health needs. These needs may change by the time the MDA is triggered. (Given the area of interest of respondent 2293, it is assumed that this representation is meant to relate to the West of Waterlooville MDA).

The Plan provides for Health Services within the MDA to meet the expected demand. It is not for the Local Plan to detail where the practitioners will come from. Common sense suggests that with the additional demand more medical practitioners, dentists, etc will be required. The Local Plan highlights that the development is being planned for and enables the local Primary Care Trust to consider the best way to provide for improved health facilities and how they should be staffed.

The relevant paragraph states that appropriate primary health care facilities (the precise needs for which will be determined through the Masterplan process) should be provided on-site and that developers will be expected to contribute to such provision. It is accepted that developers will not be required to provide such facilities in isolation and that they will need to be planned jointly with the relevant primary health care providers. However, the need for such facilities is generated by the proposed development and it is therefore entirely reasonable that the developer should contribute towards health provision. The precise nature of the facilities required and the contribution necessary will be the subject of detailed negotiation if and when the MDA is triggered.

Change Proposed – None.

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

contributions arising from the developer should be clearly defined as those which fairly and reasonably relate to the proposed development.

Change sought – not specified.

Issue: 12.33 (Deposit 12.30)

RD12.78

New paragraphs: Local centre

Representations:

Objections:

Cala Homes (South) Ltd. (468/22)

Object to the absence of a clear statement that a new local centre will be formed as part of the proposals at Winchester City (North).

Change sought - not specified.

Wm Morrison Supermarkets Plc. (2277/2)

Policy 12.78 limits the scale of foodstore development to small/medium scale. It would be appropriate to allow for a foodstore that would be of a size able to meet the identified needs of the northern suburbs of Winchester.

Change sought - amend the third sentence of RD12.78 to read 'a foodstore of a scale to meet the needs of the Northern suburbs of Winchester will be appropriate, provided potential transport issues can be resolved.'

City Council's response to representation:

Respondent 468 objects to the absence of a clear statement that a new local centre will be formed as part of the proposals for the MDA. RD12.78 specifically states that 'a new Local Centre, acting as a focal point for the new neighbourhood, will be required'. It is not necessary to include further detail in respect of the local centre at this stage and further work will be undertaken as part of the masterplanning process.

The Local Plan already states that a small/medium sized store may be appropriate and could possibly serve North Winchester, as well as the MDA. The previous response also notes that more detailed consideration will be given to this issue as part of the masterplanning process. This means that the needs of the community can be assessed and provided for at the time of development. However, it is not the intention that the MDA local centre should be based around a car-orientated foodstore, but that any foodstore provision is of a modest scale that will form an integral part of the local centre.

Change Proposed - None

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

Issue: 12.34 (Deposit 12.33)

RD12.80 RD12.82

New paragraphs: Recreation open space and Access to countryside

Representations:

Objections:

Heron Land Developments Ltd. (204/10), Bovis Homes Ltd. (205/10)

RD12.80 could lead to the unnecessary development of playing fields within the Winchester-Kingsworth/Headbourne Worthy strategic gap. More intensive forms of recreation such as pitches with floodlighting and club houses could diminish the qualities of this gap.

Change sought - delete the proposals for sports facilities on land north and west of Courtenay Road, Winchester and make provision for the shortfall of playing facilities within the site for Winchester City (North) MDA and not in the strategic gap.

Cala Homes (South) Ltd. (468/23)

The land east of the railway line should be included within the area of the defined MDA. It should be identified to meet the recreational needs of the new MDA or even the wider city.

Change sought-not specified.

Save Barton Farm Group (175/39)

I G Embrey (2250/5)

The important informal recreational resource of Barton Farm will be largely eliminated - access routes to the countryside would be of a suburban character.

Change sought - not specified.

Deletion of the Winchester City (North) MDA proposal.

City Council's response to representation:

Inset Map 45 and the accompanying Local Plan allocate an area of land to the east of the railway line for formal recreation use (RT.4), to meet Winchester's existing needs for additional recreation provision. This allocation is not, therefore, intended directly to serve the MDA. Elsewhere, the Plan excludes the provision of additional formal recreational facilities on land east of the railway line, although it does provide for informal recreation provision. There are a number of reasons for this:

- the topography of the land means that new playing fields may require unsightly cut-and fill which would detrimentally change the character of the landscape in this location;
- land is designated as a local gap between Winchester, Kingsworthy/Headbourne Worthy. Further playing field provision may require built facilities, such as changing rooms, sports pavilion and other ancillary facilities, including floodlighting, which would be inappropriate;
- an appropriate access to serve the recreation area, including car parking provision may need to be constructed. This could intrude into the local gap and countryside. Access to the area under the existing railway line underpass is unlikely to be satisfactory;
- the allocation of land to accommodate the reserve MDA as shown in the Local Plan is sufficient to accommodate the playing fields requirements and this principle was tested through the technical work carried out;
- playing field provision should be located as close to existing residential areas as possible with satisfactory pedestrian and cycle links. Accommodating playing field requirements as an integral part of the MDA, rather than as an 'add on' is therefore preferable.

Change Proposed - None

Issue: 12.35 (Deposit 12.32)

RD12.85-RD12.87

New paragraphs: Landscape and nature conservation

Representations:

Objections:

RD12.85

Save Barton Farm Group (175/40)

Mass tree planting may screen buildings but it will radically alter the very nature of the northern approach to the City, to its detriment. Trees will not conceal the encroachment of bricks and mortar into the precious green wedges of Winchester's setting.

City Council's response to representation:

The landscape character of the area and the visual impact of the MDA is a sensitive and important local issue. It is not suggested that the development can or should be hidden by mass tree-planting and any landscape strategy will need to take account of the landscape character of this area of countryside. The landscape scheme and new strategic planting requirements necessary to provide a well defined framework for the development will need careful consideration, implementation and appropriate long-term management to ensure that the MDA is accommodated in a way which respects the landscape character of the area. It will be necessary to agree the strategic landscape framework and planting for the whole site through the Masterplanning process. The City Council will then negotiate with the developer with a view to enabling appropriate strategic planting to take place in advance of any development on the site. If this cannot be agreed, strategic landscaping planting for the whole site will be required to be provided at the outset of the development as a first phase via a S106 agreement attached to the outline planning application.

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

Change sought - include a statement that Barton Farm is not suitable for development.

Save Barton Farm Group (175/41), I Loverseed (1307/1)

It is rash to state that the development is unlikely to have any direct impact on the river's ecology, especially before the conclusions of the Itchen Sustainability Study are published.

Change sought - there should be a commitment to reopen the search for a suitable reserve site if the Itchen Sustainability Study suggests an impact on river ecology.

M J Maidens (1184/8)

The proposed development would have a profound effect on the river's ecology.

Change sought - none specified.

Heron Land Developments Ltd. (204/11), Bovis Homes Ltd. (205/11)

The protection of the features in RD12.85 is supported. However, the avenue of trees adjoining the east side of Andover Road North has been omitted.

Change sought - add to line 2: 'the avenue of trees east of Andover Road North.'

Cala Homes (South) Ltd. (468/24)

Cala Homes objects to the apparent additional requirements introduced within this paragraph as a Scoping Opinion has already been agreed with the Local Authority in consultation with the Environment Agency setting out the extent of works.

Change sought - not specified.

The statement that 'the development is unlikely to have any direct impact on the river's ecology' is based on the current advice of the relevant statutory organisations. The effect on the River Itchen would be minimal, as the intent is to take water from the river for the MDA and to return it to the river after it has been treated. Regardless of where the site for the MDA is located in the area to the north of Winchester, the effect on the river ecology will be similar. The main issues that the Itchen Sustainability Study will address is whether the river is in 'favourable condition' for its ecological importance and what measures are needed to achieve/maintain such a condition. The main influence of the MDA is likely to be where the water will be extracted and the quality of the water post-treatment when it is returned to the river. It is expected that it will be possible to ensure that these points are chosen so as to ensure that important ecology is not damaged, but should this not be possible the Environmental Statement will have to consider whether the effects can be mitigated or whether the development should be modified.

Paragraph RD12.85 refers to the importance of protecting and utilising the most important landscape features. The Barton Farm ridgeline is highlighted but this is not to suggest that it is the only feature to be protected. It is agreed that the avenue of trees on the east side of Andover Road is important locally, but it is not the purpose of the Local Plan to identify every important feature of the site. This should be done as part of the Masterplanning process.

The Scoping Opinion clearly discuss the issues that need to be assessed in detail with regard to the likely significant effects of the development on the environment. One specific to this representation is the need to consider 'changes to hydrology of watercourses and aquifers' and 'abstraction or transfers of water'. Paragraph RD12.87 refers to the 'appropriate assessment' that is required to assess the effect of development on the ecology of the River Itchen. Ecological issues also form part of the scoping opinion and the effect of development on the ecology of the Itchen is, therefore, something that will be required in any event. The Plan does not, therefore, introduce unreasonable new requirements.

Change Proposed - None

Issue: 12.36 (Deposit 12.37)

RD12.89

New paragraph: Local Gap

Representations:

Objections:

Save Barton Farm Group (175/42)

So many services are to be fitted in it calls in to question what will happen to the local gaps.

Change sought - give unambiguous support to the preservation of Local Gaps.

M J Maidens (1184/9)

The local gap should be extended to include Barton Farm.

Change Sought - as above.

City Council's response to representation:

In selecting the reserve site for the MDA, careful consideration has been given to the effect on the settlement pattern in the area and gaps between settlements. The Barton Farm area is not part of any designated Local Gap and only open recreational uses are proposed within the defined Gap. Barton farm was chosen as the site for the reserve MDA after various sites in the area were assessed for their potential. As such, it would not be appropriate for the Local Plan to identify Barton Farm as a local gap.

Change Proposed - None

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

Issue: 12. 37 (Deposit 12.38)

RD12.93

New paragraph: Developer contributions

Representations:

Objections:

Hampshire County Council (1434/10)

Welcome the reference in RD12.92 and 12.93 to the County Council's intended supplementary planning guidance on developer contributions in relation to the new MDA communities. However, all new development places increasing pressure upon County Council services. The Local Plan must widen its approach and have policies on developer contributions across the whole Local Plan area and all new developments and go into further detail.

Change sought-

- *The reference to developer contributions is too vague and should be amended to have due regard to the emerging County Planning Authority's Supplementary Planning Guidance- 'Statement on Developer Contributions, Infrastructure Provision, Service Requirements and Negotiating Protocol' and also:*
- *include specific reference to the full range of County Council services that will require financial contributions from new development, including libraries and emergency services.*
- *Indicate that all new residential development will be required to contribute to education and other service infrastructure on all dwellings, regardless of the scale of development.*
- *Identify areas and projects that contributions will be sought for.*

City Council's response to representation:

The County Council's proposed developer contributions protocol has not been adopted as supplementary planning guidance and, therefore, is not yet in operation. It is likely to be subject to significant changes, due in part to concern amongst the Hampshire Districts about the legitimacy of some of its requirements. It would not, therefore, be appropriate to refer to it further within the Local Plan.

The County Council's main concern in this objection seems to relate to developments of a smaller scale than MDAs and the objection is not, therefore, relevant to RD12.92 and 12.93. It is also not likely to be appropriate to seek developer contributions to the full range of County Council services, due to the requirements of Government advice on developer contributions (Circular 1/97). If the County Council has particular projects to which developer contributions can justifiably be sought, this needs to be fed into the Masterplanning process at an early stage so that appropriate provision can be sought. The Local Plan includes adequate requirements for developer contributions, where justified, both for MDAs (Proposals NC.2 and NC.3) and generally (Proposal DP.12).

Change Proposed – None.