

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

Issue: 13.1 (Deposit 13.3)

RD13.01

Proposal S.1: General principles

City Council's response to representation to Representation

Support is welcomed.

Change recommended- none

Representations:

Support/resolved/withdrawn:

Environment Agency (253/23)

Support the changes made and withdraw objection made on the Deposit Plan (253/26/DEPOS).

Change Sought: None

Issue: 13.2 (Deposit 13.4)

RD13.02

Proposal S.2 (Bishops Waltham – Malt Lane)

City Council's response to representation

The respondent objects to the amendment made to Proposal S.2 which saw 'shopping' deleted and replaced with 'small-scale retail development'. The change was made to ensure that any development on this particular site was small in scale. This is consistent with PPG6, which states that small or historic towns may not have sites suitable for large-scale developments and that development should be of a scale appropriate to the size of the centre.

Representations:

Objections:

WM Morrison Supermarkets PLC (2277/3)

If retail development is identified, then it would be appropriate for this site to accommodate retail development on a scale that will meet the need.

Change Sought:

Criterion (i) to read:

'Achieve a mix of complementary uses, which may include housing, retail development, service uses and car parking, and provide for the relocation of existing uses on the site where necessary'.

Further, the site in question is a small site and although no retail study has been completed there is no evidence that there is a demand for retail development other than small-scale development in Bishops Waltham or that this small site could accommodate it.

Change Proposed- none.

Issue: 13.3 (Deposit 13.7)

RD13.07

Paragraph 13.10

City Council's response to representation to Representation

Despite the decision made by the Inspector, who suggests that the site is 'eminently suitable for mixed use development' it is not recommended that any changes be made. The site was reassessed as advised by PPG3 and it was concluded that it should remain an employment-only allocation, due to its advantages for employment use. It is accepted that an Inspector has allowed an application for developing the site for mixed-use. This decision was taken as an exception to Proposal S.4, based on the particular merits of that application and circumstances at the time. This does not mean that Proposal S.4 should be amended to allow a generally permissive approach to residential development on this site.

Representations:

Objections:

James Duke & Sons (866/1)

Changes to text are required post the decision made by the Inspector on the 25th February 2003. Refer to detailed Representation.

Change Sought: Paragraph 13.10 should be amended to refer to 'significant redevelopment for mixed-use incorporating business and residential development, which will be encouraged to improve the environment and economic prosperity of the area.'

Although no changes are recommended at this stage, it should be remembered that PPG3 is being reviewed. The intention of the change is that Local Authorities allow land currently allocated for industrial or commercial use, and redundant commercial buildings, to be used for housing or mixed-use development unless a convincing case for their retention is made. Until the Government has finalised these changes, it is not advised that changes be made to the Local Plan in regard to land that may be effected by this change.

Change Proposed- None

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

Issue: 13.4 (Deposit 13.17)

RD10.01
Map 10 Durley

Representations:

Support/resolved/withdrawn:

Durley Parish Council (2281/1)
Support the changes made on the Deposit Plan in regard to RD10.01.
Change Sought: None

City Council's response to representation to Representation

Support is welcomed.

Change Proposed- none.

Issue: 13.5 (Deposit 13.7)

RD13.08
Proposal S.4

Representations:

Support/resolved/withdrawn:

Environment Agency (253/24)
Support the changes made and withdraw objection made on the Deposit Plan (253/28/DEPOS).
Change Sought: None

Objections:

James Duke & Sons (866/2)
Changes to text are required post the decision made by the Inspector on the 25th February 2003. Refer to detailed Representation.
Changes Sought:
Amend S.4 to 'suitable for a mixed-use of business (B1 and B2 Uses) and residential development' and delete criteria (i).
Amend supporting text in paragraph 13.11, 13.12 and 13.13.

City Council's response to representation to Representation

Support is welcomed.

866 – see comments at Issue 13.3 above.

Change Recommended- none

Issue: 13.6 (Deposit 13.)

RD13.11
Proposal S.7

Representations:

Objections:

Cavendish & Gloucester (2309/2)
The suggested wording does not adequately recognise the significant site constraints nor the limited opportunities for business development of the site.
Change Sought:
Amend the 2nd sentence of Proposal S.7 criterion (i) to read;
'Alternatively and subject to the achievement of community benefits

City Council's Response to Representation

The respondent believes that redevelopment of the site offers an opportunity to create a development that has fewer negative impacts on Cheriton particularly in terms of HGV traffic. They see early redevelopment as desirable as community developments could be secured, such as the playground. The changes to the proposal were designed to allow flexibility for developers as it is recognised that there are constraints on employment uses and thus a mixed-use development may be appropriate. The Proposals allow for a substantial element of residential use, where this is necessary (especially HGVs) or to achieve the Plan's other requirements (e.g. the playground). This could include live-work units.

Change Proposed- None

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

including the playground enlargement (see criteria (iv) below) and the site access improvements, the housing floorspace will constitute the majority of the floorspace on the site. The employment provision may include live work units'.

Issue: 13.7 (Deposit 13.19)

RD13.15 - RD13.22

Sutton Scotney

Representations:

Objections:

Wonston Parish Council (1428/1)

The former Station Yard and Taylors Yard should be treated as different entities in the Plan.

Change sought – separate the former Station Yard from the Coach Works for planning purposes.

Redrow Southern Ltd (2279/1) (2279/2) (2279/3) (2279/4) 2279/5)

The former Station Yard and the adjoining Coach Works are under different land ownerships with different aspirations for the development of their sites. Policies to protect this site for employment are superseded by PPG 3. The former Station Yard is more suitable for residential use than employment. Support the preparation of a Brief, but it is only appropriate for the former Station Yard site.

Change sought - the two sites should not be linked. The Plan should acknowledge the different ownerships and allow for development on each part to come forward independently at different times.

Associated Properties UK Ltd (2282/1) (2282/2) (2282/3) (2282/4) (2282/5) (2282/6) (2282/7) (2282/8)

Proposal S.16 continues to pre-suppose that the site will be mostly developed for employment uses, thus conflicting with PPG 3 advice.

Changes sought – specific wording changes in response to objection.

Maxim Taylor (2006/1)

The Coach Works and former Station Yard should be treated as two different sites as they are under different ownerships and therefore have different aspirations.

Changes sought – amend Proposal to treat the former Station Yard and the Coach Works as separate entities.

City Council's Response to Representation

As a result of a review of all employment sites in the District, and representations made on the Deposit Local Plan, it was concluded that the former Station Yard should be a mixed use allocation, and that it should be extended to include the adjacent Coach Works site. It is considered that comprehensive consideration of both sites would result in a better overall development solution, given their central location and the significant size of any potential development in relation to the village as a whole. The development of both sites comprehensively could also result in significant environmental improvements within the village, particularly as a significant part lies within the village's Conservation Area.

A number of the representations on the Revised Proposal S.16 consider that the Local Plan should recognise that the land is in different ownerships, with different aspirations, and that the Plan should be modified to allow the sites to be considered separately and at different times. It is also asserted that the Proposal conflicts with PPG 3 advice in requiring the majority of the site to be developed for employment use. One objector considers that the former Station Yard is more suitable for residential use, and that a Development Brief should be prepared only for that site.

The changes made in the Revised Deposit Plan require the preparation of a Design and Development Brief covering both sites. It is still considered that, whether or not one site is developed independently, it should be developed in a way that is consistent with comprehensive development principles relating to both sites, given the key location and potential size of the development within the village.

A Brief is currently being prepared by the agents for the owners of the former Station Yard, but covering both sites. This is being prepared in consultation with the City Council, and a number of detailed studies are being undertaken in advance of determining development principles for the area.

The Proposal is consistent with PPG 3 advice, in that its allocation for mixed use followed a review of all employment sites in the District. It is still considered important to retain some employment use within the area, and this was supported by the Parish Council in their comments on the Deposit Plan.

The need for employment in the village is the subject of further detailed study, which should determine the appropriate proportion, but the best location for that employment use will need to take account of other factors that need to be considered in establishing comprehensive development principles for the two sites.

The Parish Council and the local community would also need to be involved in the preparation of the Brief, and in the discussion of development principles to guide future development of both sites. In advance of the completion of the initial detailed studies, and further progress on the Brief, it would be premature to recommend further changes to the Proposal or the related text at the present time.

Recommended Change - none.

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

Issue: 13.8 (Deposit 13.22)

RD13.23

Proposal S.18

Whiteley Farm

City Council's response to representation

Support is welcomed.

Change Proposed- none.

Representations:

Support/resolved/withdrawn:

Environment Agency (253/25)

Support the changes made and withdraw objection made on the Deposit Plan

(253/34/DEPOS)

Change Sought: None

Hampshire County Council (Chief

Executive Dept.) (1432/3)

Support the changes made and withdraw objection made on the Deposit Plan

(1432/1/DEPOS).

Change Sought: None

Issue: 13.9 (Deposit 13.25)

RD13.25 and RD13.26

Proposal S.21 and Paragraph

13.79

City Council's response to representation

Criterion iii) was added to draw attention to the ecological importance of parts of the site. The Environment Agency and Hampshire County Council support its inclusion.

Representations:

Support/resolved/withdrawn:

Environment Agency (253/26)

Support the changes made to RD13.25.

Change Sought: None

County Planning Officer, Hampshire

County Council (1433/3)

Support the changes made to RD13.25.

Change Sought: None

Respondent 2272 objects to the wording within the Revised Deposit Plan as they consider that it is inconsistent with the Development Brief and Planning Permission. The Development Brief recognises the conservation value within this area and specifies the need to protect and enhance the woodlands and the meadows. The changes to the plan mean that is consistent with the designation as a SINC and with the planning brief.

Change Proposed- None.

Objections:

J.Sainsbury Developments Ltd (2272/1)

Criterion (iii) is misleading and inconsistent with the existing planning permission, reserved matters, and development brief.

Changes Sought: Amend criterion (iii) to read 'Provides an extensive landscape framework by maintaining or enhancing, where possible, existing woodland, major hedgerows and watercourses...'

J.Sainsbury Developments Ltd (2272/2)

The paragraph is ambiguous and could be interpreted in a way that is inconsistent with the planning permission (W12503/03 of October 2001), approved reserved matters and the development brief.

Change Sought: Amend paragraph 13.79 to read: 'In providing for these

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

requirements, schemes should seek to ~~reflect~~ ~~conserve~~ the nature conservation interests of the site (part of which is unimproved grassland, designated as a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation), ~~and retain these features within any proposal.~~

Issue: 13.10 (Deposit 13.26)
RD13.27
Proposal S.22

Representations:

Support/resolved/withdrawn:

Fareham Borough Council (1423/3)
Support the changes made to RD13.27.
Change Sought: None

City Council's response to representation

Support is welcomed.

Change Proposed- none.