

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

CHAPTER 5: HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT

Summary of Representation.
Change sought.

City Council's Response to Representation
Change Proposed

Issue 5.1
Historic Environment Chapter
(General)

City Council's Response to Representation

The support is welcomed.

Representation:

Respondent 212 has submitted separate objections dealing with the instances where it is claimed that omissions have been made. These are dealt with below in relation to the individual Proposals concerned.

Sparsholt College (353/15)

Support the Historic Environment Chapter (Proposals H.1 to H.17 and paragraphs 5.1 to 5.64).

Change sought - none.

Change Proposed – none.

English Heritage (250/3)

Support the proposals, which appear comprehensive. Support the inclusion of proposals for shopfronts, blinds and signs and Proposal HE.17.

Change sought - none.

Bishops Waltham Society (212/7)

Strongly support the Proposals in this Chapter, but major policies seem to have been omitted and intended improvements not made.

Change sought - none specified.

Issue 5.2
Paragraphs 5.7 - 5.9

City Council's Response to Representation

The reference to 'historic urban areas' in paragraph 5.7 relates to the "Extensive Urban Surveys" undertaken for Wickham, New Alresford and Bishops Waltham. These did define various zones but were not produced for planning policy purposes and the extent of the archaeological areas that they define represents only the situation as known at the time. Further survey work or finds may change perceptions of which area is most important for archaeology in each settlement. Also the surveys only cover 3 settlements and there will be other settlements which are undoubtedly also of archaeological importance (e.g. Winchester).

Representation:

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

Object to paragraph 5.7 as the Local Plan fails to identify historic urban areas on the Proposals Map, preventing proper consideration of the impact of development proposals on such areas.

Change sought - identify boundaries of historic urban areas on the Proposals Map.

Given this situation, and the fact that the Extensive Urban Surveys are publicly available documents, it is not considered necessary or appropriate to attempt to identify 'historic urban areas' on the Local Plan's Proposals Map.

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

Object to the reliance on planning obligations to secure archaeological investigation and recording, as these could be secured by planning conditions too.

Change sought - amend paragraph 5.9 to reflect that fact that planning conditions can be used.

It is agreed that archaeological investigation and recording can be secured by planning condition as well as through planning obligations. Paragraph 5.9 should therefore be amended to reflect this.

Change Proposed – paragraph 5.9:

Where archaeological investigation and recording provides the most appropriate means of taking account of less important archaeological sites, provision for this may need to be secured using planning obligations and/or conditions....

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

CHAPTER 5: HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT

Summary of Representation.
Change sought.

City Council's Response to Representation
Change Proposed

Issue 5.3 Proposal HE.1

Representation:

P A Warner (1249/8)

Support Proposal HE.1 and paragraphs 5.4 to 5.7. Important archaeological sites need this protection.

Change sought - none.

J Hayter (138/25)

Proposal HE.1 should be changed to ensure recording of all features, not just archaeological ones.

Change sought - modify 2nd paragraph of HE.1, to state "...only where satisfactory provisions have been made to record all the above features before, or during, development..."

Grainger Trust PLC (214/8)

Object to Proposal HE.1, the wording does not reflect Government guidance (PPG16) accurately.

Change sought - detailed alternative wording suggested to reflect PPG16 more closely.

Cala Homes (South) Ltd. (468/21)

Object to the detailed wording of Proposal HE.1. The Local Plan refers to important archaeological sites contained within the Sites and Monuments Record, this information should be shown on the Proposals Map.

Change sought - modify 1st sentence of Proposal HE.1 to refer to "nationally important" sites. Add an explanation within the supporting text to explain how the wording "where such presentation is not possible or desirable" will be applied.

City Council's Response to Representation

The support is welcomed.

Proposal HE.1 already refers specifically to archaeological sites, monuments, historic buildings, landscape features and their settings, as recorded in the Sites and Monuments record. Respondent 138's proposed change would generalise the wording and result in repetition with other Historic Environment Proposals (HE.5 development in Conservation Areas, HE.14 alterations to historic buildings, HE.17 re-use and conversion of rural and industrial buildings) and with other sections of HE.1. It is therefore considered unnecessary.

The wording of HE.1 is considered to be consistent with PPG16. Whilst the PPG does refer to the presumption in favour of "nationally important" remains, it also recognises that other remains are important. This part of HE.1 is worded the same as the equivalent Proposal in the current (1998) Local Plan and the Local Plan Inspector, taking account of PPG16 advice, supported this wording.

The PPG highlights the importance of all important archaeological sites, not just nationally important remains. Archaeological assessments will appraise remains on levels of local, regional, national and international importance. Proposal HE.1 provides for situations where it is not possible or desirable to preserve remains in situ, which PPG16 recognises may be the situation in some cases. The judgement about whether preservation in situ is "possible or desirable" will depend on the circumstances of each case, taking account of the importance of the remains (in local, national, etc terms), the results of an archaeological assessment and the development proposed. It is not considered that the Plan could provide any more detailed advice on this judgement given the unique circumstances likely to be involved in each case.

One of the changes sought by respondent 214 is considered appropriate and could be covered in the second paragraph of HE.1 by adding a reference to excavation. This option is considered more suitable as it combines with policy information regarding planning applications in the second paragraph of HE.1.

Only general reference is made in the Local Plan to important archaeological sites contained within the Sites and Monuments Record. The Sites and Monuments Record contains a very large number of scheduled and unscheduled sites and it is considered that it would not be practical to show these legibly or accurately on the Proposals Map. The Sites and Monuments Record is a publicly available document which can be consulted by applicants and others. It is therefore proposed that sites should not be shown within the Local Plan itself.

Change Proposed – Proposal HE.1:

....only where satisfactory provision has been made for a programme of archaeological investigation, excavation and recording before, or during, development and for the subsequent publication of any findings, where appropriate.

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

CHAPTER 5: HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT

Summary of Representation.
Change sought.

City Council's Response to Representation
Change Proposed

Issue 5.4 Paragraph 5.4, Proposal HE.1

Representation:

I White (349/2)

Object to Local Plan including reference to an MDA at Winchester City (North). The area has archaeological significance with amateur archaeologists who enjoy 'panning' the area. The 2000 dwellings could be appropriately absorbed within the Southampton City Council and Portsmouth City Council areas.

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

City Council's Response to Representation

The reference to the MDA at Winchester City North within the Local Plan Review 2001 is necessary in order to meet the requirements of the Hampshire County Structure Plan 1996-2011. Initial archaeological assessments were carried out for the locality to define the 'area of search'. Further detailed assessment has now been carried out as part of the process of identifying a preferred development area. The Winchester Museum Service Archaeology Section produced the brief for this detailed archaeological evaluation, the results of which have been taken into account in planning for the MDA.

However, this work has produced no evidence to suggest that the preferred development area is so sensitive in archaeological terms as to prevent the development of the MDA. A more detailed response to objections on the MDA is given in the section dealing with New Communities.

Change Proposed – none.

Issue 5.5 Proposal HE.2

Representation:

P A Warner (1249/9)

Support Proposal HE.2 and paragraph 5.10. Unidentified archaeological sites need this protection.

Change sought - none.

T Jones (347/2)

A good proposal but it assumes that important sites are listed in the Sites and Monuments Record.

Change sought - add: "or when there is reason to believe that a site capable of listing in the Sites and Monuments Record may exist".

City Council's Response to Representation

The support is welcomed.

It is agreed that Proposal HE.2 should relate to sites that may in the future be recognised as having archaeological importance, rather than referring only to those currently on the Sites and Monuments Record. However, the wording of the Proposal is already rather complex and the inclusion of the respondent's suggested wording would make it very difficult to follow. It is therefore proposed instead that the reference to the Sites and Monuments Record be deleted, which would simplify the Proposal and make it clear that it does not only apply to sites on the Record.

Change Proposed – Proposal HE.2:

Where there is evidence that archaeological sites, monuments (whether above or below ground), historic buildings and landscape features, and their settings (as identified and recorded in the Sites & Monuments Record) may be present on a site, but their extent and importance is unknown, the Local Planning Authority will refuse applications which are not supported by adequate archaeological assessment...

Issue 5.6 Proposal HE.2

Representation:

Grainger Trust PLC (214/9)

Object to Proposal HE.2, with reference to a prospective developer being required to arrange for an archaeology field assessment. It should follow the wording

City Council's Response to Representation

Respondent 214 acknowledges that Proposal HE.2 reflects the guidance of PPG16, but wishes its wording to reflect the PPG's more closely. It is considered entirely appropriate that the planning authority should be able to word its local plan in its own way, without having to repeat PPGs. The wording used has been developed from the equivalent Proposal in the current (1998) Local Plan and the Local Plan Inspector, taking account of the same PPG16 advice, supported this Proposal. No change to the proposal and associated text are considered necessary.

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

CHAPTER 5: HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT

Summary of Representation.
Change sought.

City Council's Response to Representation
Change Proposed

of PPG16 more closely.

Change sought - *change wording to reflect PPG16 more closely.*

Bewley Homes (386/10)

Object to Proposal HE.2, which is too restrictive.

Change sought - *revise to require that the design statements to be submitted with planning applications include archaeological investigation work.*

Proposal HE.2 requires applications to be supported by adequate archaeological assessment, which is not considered to be unduly restrictive. Such an assessment may well form part of a design statement, as suggested by respondent 386, and HE.2 does not prevent this. The important thing is that the assessment is of appropriate detail and quality.

The level of assessment relative to site specific issues requires detailed analysis based on individual development proposals. These investigations should be undertaken before planning applications are submitted, as required by HE.2, and this is in accordance with PPG16 guidance.

Change Proposed – none.

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

CHAPTER 5: HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT

Summary of Representation.
Change sought.

City Council's Response to Representation
Change Proposed

Issue 5.7
Paragraph 5.11

Representation:

Cala Homes (South) Ltd (468/23)
Object to use of "by intrusion into wider views", which is ambiguous and contrary to guidance contained within PPG12.
Change sought - not specified.

City Council's Response to Representation

The importance of historic parks, gardens and battlefields is noted in PPG15. The PPG also acknowledges the need to "take account of the historical dimension of the landscape as a whole rather than concentrate on selected areas". It is therefore considered that the Local Plan is right to seek to avoid "intrusion into wider views" rather than just to concentrate its protection only within the defined boundaries of designated areas. PPG16 also states that "detailed development plans (local plans and unitary development plans) should include policies for the protection, enhancement and preservation of sites of archaeological interest and of their setting."

Change Proposed – none.

Issue 5.8
Proposal HE.4

Representation:

**Itchen Valley PC (286/2),
P A Warner (1249/10)**
Support Proposal HE.4 and paragraph 5.17. It is important that the setting of conservation areas is protected.
Change sought - none.

City Council's Response to Representation

The support is welcomed.

Paragraph 5.19 of the Plan requires new plots to be of a form best suited to the area, not that they "reflect those of the surrounding area". To require this may conflict with the Plan's density requirements and would not in itself ensure that development is sympathetic. In any event, it is considered that specific advice on plot sizes, etc is too detailed for inclusion in Proposal HE.4, which is a general proposal that concentrates particularly on views into and out of conservation areas.

**Culver & St Michael's Roads
Residents Assoc. (1377/2)**
Strongly support Proposal HE.4 and paragraph 5.19, but the requirements of 5.19 should be included in the Proposal itself.
Change sought - add text to Proposal HE.4: "In forming house plots, the plan form should reflect those of the surrounding area".

It is accepted that historic layout should be taken into account when considering development proposals. Paragraph 5.19 is in fact part of the introductory text to Proposal HE.5, which does include reference to matters such as plot sizes and widths, building heights, massing, etc. It is felt that Proposal HE.5 covers these points adequately.

Change Proposed – none.

Issue 5.9
Proposal HE.4

Representation:

GOSE (261/29)
Support the objectives of the policy but it should take account of townscape considerations not just be restricted to landscape issues.
Change sought - widen the scope of the policy in accordance with advice in PPG15.

City Council's Response to Representation

The support for the policy objectives is welcomed. This Proposal is intended to be concerned with the impact of development on the landscape setting of conservation areas and is a deliberate attempt to highlight the importance of this by separating it from other proposals dealing with townscape issues. Townscape issues are not, therefore omitted but are dealt with in other Proposals, particularly HE.5. The section of PPG15 quoted refers to the fact that development outside of, but affecting the setting of, a conservation area is a material consideration and does not specifically mention townscape issues.

A reference to distant/higher vantage points is considered appropriate, given that the Local Plan covers a broad area where views from distant/higher vantage points can be very important.

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

CHAPTER 5: HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT

Summary of Representation.
Change sought.

City Council's Response to Representation
Change Proposed

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

Object to references to distant/higher vantage points when assessing proposals. The proposal fails to take into account PPG12 and PPG15.

Change sought - the Plan should encourage development that is consistent with maintaining the overall character of conservation areas, better reflecting PPG15.

Bishops Waltham Society (212/8)

Object to the omission of the current Local Plan's Proposal HG.5, as intended by Officers.

Change sought - add Proposal HG.5 dealing with the designation of new conservation areas, prior to HE.4.

PPG12 (paragraph 4.4) refers to the impact of development on landscape quality, the need for better urban design, including the appearance of proposed development and its relationship to the surroundings, and inclusion of policies which help preserve the built and archaeological heritage. It is considered that the wording of the Local Plan does satisfy the requirements of Government advice and does not need changing.

Officers did recommend carrying forward Proposal HG.5 of the current Local Plan (report PTP126, 2.4.2001), with the addition of references to proposals to preserve and enhance conservation areas (conservation area appraisals, etc). In drafting the Plan, however, it was felt that Proposal HG.5 was not worded in 'land-use' terms (i.e. it did not indicate how planning applications would be determined) and should not, therefore, be carried forward. This was explained when the Review Plan was considered by Members (report PTP140) and was agreed. Nevertheless, the wording of Proposal HG.5 was in fact carried forward and included in the explanatory text of the Local Plan Review (paragraph 5.15), along with additional text setting out the criteria that would be used to designate new/extended conservation areas and references to conservation area appraisals (paragraph 5.16).

The intentions set out in report PTP126 have, therefore, been incorporated, albeit not exactly as originally envisaged. There has been no omission, deliberate or otherwise, and judging by the Government Office's (GOSE) comments, the inclusion of the current Plan's Proposal HG.5 would have been objected to on the basis that it is not a 'land-use' policy.

Change Proposed – none.

Issue 5.10
Proposals HE.5 - HE.8

City Council's Response to Representation

The support is welcomed (see Issue 5.11 below regarding density issues).

Representation:

Change Proposed – none.

Culver & St Michael's Roads

Residents Assoc. (1377/3)

Strongly support Proposals HE.5-HE.8 (together with corresponding Design & Development proposals in Chapter 3), but regret the loss of the St. Cross Special Policy Area and WDLP Proposal EN.1

Change sought - none.

Issue 5.11
Proposal HE.5

City Council's Response to Representation

The support is welcomed.

Representation:

Proposal HE.5 does not actually mention density and does not require a particular density to be achieved. Its emphasis is very much on achieving a design-led approach, but setting out requirements for

P A Warner (1249/11)

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

CHAPTER 5: HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT

Summary of Representation. ***Change sought.***

City Council's Response to Representation ***Change Proposed***

Support proposal HE.5 and paragraphs 5.24-5.25, which are well-constructed proposals.

Change sought - none.

**A Rich (254/3), H Mycock (313/2),
T Stephenson (343/2), P H Radcliffe (+
29 other signatories) (1245/3),
W G Pollock (1251/3), J G Hurcom
(1376/2)**

Support HE.5 but it needs added weight in the context of relative densities. Other proposals have some flexibility on the question of densities.

Change sought - add "a design-led approach takes priority over density" at the beginning of HE.5.

M Meadows (350/1)

St Giles Hill conservation area has a special character which would be damaged by additional housing and increased on-street parking. There should be a special policy for the area, which should not allow for infilling.

Change sought - include a special policy for St Giles Hill area with additional requirements relating to design, traffic, parking and density, excluding PPG3 densities from the area.

development to be in sympathy with the historic settlement pattern, plot sizes and widths, height, massing, materials, etc, etc. Whilst the explanatory text refers to PPG3's emphasis on higher densities, it also points out that it is essential that new development responds sympathetically to the existing settlement pattern and that plot sizes must be suitable to the area (paragraphs 5.19 and 5.20).

It is therefore considered that the Proposal and its explanatory text already anticipate that PPG3's density requirements may sometimes have to be moderated to conserve the character of a conservation area. Nevertheless, PPG3 does specifically state that its policies should be applied immediately and does not specify any exceptions to its density requirements. It must, therefore, be taken into account and it is not considered appropriate to adopt the wording suggested by the various respondents. These alternative forms of wording would suggest that PPG3 need not be applied or that it is of secondary importance. As the Plan's density and parking requirements are set out in other Chapters, this is where any changes should be concentrated, if they are considered appropriate (see responses to objections to these Chapters).

Change Proposed – none.

Issue 5.12 **Proposal HE.5**

Representation:

GOSE (261/30)

Support HE.5 (a) but there is no need for extensions to be referred to as "secondary in nature" as they would be required to be of an appropriate character scale and form not to dominate the principal elevation.

Change sought - not specified.

Hawthorne Kamm Ltd. (374/2)

HE.5 is too restrictive and doesn't recognise that there are modern buildings in conservation areas on which "windows, doors or conservatories made of aluminium, uPVC or other non-traditional materials" are more appropriate. PPG1 requires plan policies to avoid excessive detail.

City Council's Response to Representation

The support is welcomed.

It is accepted that the requirement for extensions to be secondary in nature is not always appropriate or necessary given the other requirements of HE.5. However, the requirement to avoid extensions dominating principal elevations may not be enough in itself to avoid harmful and domineering new development. Accordingly it is proposed that Proposal HE.5 be amended to refer to extensions needing to be 'subordinate' rather than 'secondary'.

It is also accepted that there are modern buildings in conservation areas and that there is a place for good design using modern materials. The City Council has a tradition of encouraging such design and the Local Plan does not seek to stop this. The references to avoiding non-traditional materials relate to the section on alterations to buildings that require planning permission. It is generally aimed at changes to older buildings, although this is not explicit. To make it clearer, this section of the Proposal should be changed so as to resist 'unsympathetic' use of non-traditional materials, rather than to avoid their use completely.

Change Proposed – Proposal HE.5:

...(a) the character, scale and plan form of the original building are

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

CHAPTER 5: HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT

Summary of Representation.
Change sought.

City Council's Response to Representation
Change Proposed

Change sought - change HE.5 to avoid being overly prescriptive and recognise the existence of modern buildings.

respected and the extension is ~~secondary in nature subordinate to it~~ and does not dominate principal elevations;....

....Permission will not be granted for schemes, which involve the erosion of character, such as the unsympathetic use of windows, doors or conservatories made of aluminium, uPVC or other non-traditional materials or the replacement of traditional roofing materials with inappropriate ones.

Issue 5.13
Proposal HE.5

Representation:

Bishops Waltham Society (212/9)

Object to the omission of HG.7 (iii) of the current Local Plan.

Change sought - add to HE.5 (v): "do not generate excessive traffic, car parking, noise or cause other detriment to the environment. Existing uses of this nature will not be allowed to expand or intensify".

Add to explanatory text: "where existing uses are affected, the City Council will encourage their relocation".

City Council's Response to Representation

Proposal HE.5 has been expanded over the equivalent Proposal in the current Local Plan (HG.7) so as to provide more useful design-orientated guidance, related to new buildings, extensions and alterations. With its increased emphasis on design it is not considered appropriate to include the matters suggested by the respondent. Proposal DP.14 covers such matters and resists development that would create, consolidate or expand uses that generate excessive traffic or cause noise or other environmental problems. This Proposal applies to conservation areas as well as the rest of the District. It is, therefore, not considered necessary to include the additional requirements suggested by the respondent.

Change Proposed – none.

Issue 5.14
Paragraph 5.25

Representation:

H Watson (345/4)

The Plan omits mention of landscape or environmental features where they make an important contribution to the character of the area.

Change sought - Paragraph 5.25 add new text after "and plan form of adjoining building":

"and existing trees and other landscape features and artefacts to be retained, together with lines of proposed protective fencing and proposed new tree planting to allow the impact to be tested".

City Council's Response to Representation

The wording of HE.5(i) does require that new buildings are sympathetic to trees and landscape features. Conservation Area Technical Assessment reports also provide supplementary guidance for historic areas and individual sites, to be taken into account when assessing either the effect of development on existing vegetation or related landscape planting. The Plan includes a specific Proposal (DP.5) seeking to maintain the District's landscape qualities and this Proposal, along with its explanatory text, covers the matters raised by the respondent. It is, therefore, not considered necessary to include the additional requirements suggested by the respondent in paragraph 5.25. However, see also Issue 5.15 below.

Change Proposed – none.

Issue 5.15
Proposal HE.6

Representation:

City Council's Response to Representation

The support is welcomed.

Proposal HE.6 requires details to be submitted of various matters, including "existing trees and proposed landscape treatment". In

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

CHAPTER 5: HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT

Summary of Representation.
Change sought.

City Council's Response to Representation
Change Proposed

P A Warner (1249/12)

Support Proposal HE.6, an excellent proposal.

Change sought - none.

H Watson (345/5)

Not enough emphasis is placed on natural features of historic sites and sites within conservation areas.

Change sought - add at the end of HE.6:

"Natural features of the site, such as trees, hedges, walls, and other important features should be shown together within the area to be fenced off for their protection during development and for continuing protection, if necessary, after development"

addition, Proposal DP.5 seeks to maintain the District's landscape qualities and this Proposal, along with its explanatory text, covers many of the matters raised by the respondent. However, it is accepted that the submission of adequate information about site characteristics is especially important in conservation areas and therefore some changes are proposed to summarise the additional requirements suggested by the respondent.

Change Proposed – Proposal HE.6:

....Detailed plans and elevations showing the existing and proposed development, together with details of adjoining properties, particulars of materials, existing important local features, hedges and trees and proposed landscape treatment, (including measures to protect existing landscape and built features) will be required....

Issue 5.16

Proposal HE.7

Representation:

GOSE (261/31)

Object to Proposal HE.7(iii) which appears to oppose the demolition of all unlisted buildings. PPG15 only seeks the retention of buildings that make a 'positive' contribution to the character of the conservation area.

Change sought - not specified.

J Beveridge (Councillor) (351/1)

Object to the requirement of Proposal HE.7 for planning permission for redevelopment in conjunction with consent to demolish a building. This causes long delays in coming to a decision as to whether to grant demolition approval.

Change sought - amend HE.7 so that the principle of demolition can be considered before a subsequent redevelopment.

City Council's Response to Representation

The advice of PPG15 was taken into account in drafting Proposal HE.7, which conforms to that advice. HE.7(ii) resists demolition unless a building makes no positive contribution to the conservation area. This is equivalent to the PPG's requirement to retain buildings that make a positive contribution. This has since been accepted by GOSE in discussing this objection.

Proposal HE.7 accords with the objectives of PPG15, which states: "consent for demolition should not be given unless there are acceptable and detailed plans for any redevelopment". The advice goes on to say that the merits of any redevelopment can be considered in determining whether consent should be granted for demolition. Proposal HE.7 refers to consent "normally" being subject to permission for redevelopment and does, therefore, allow for some flexibility. However, in the light of the clear Government advice in PPG15, it is not considered appropriate to amend the Proposal in the way suggested by the respondent.

Change Proposed – none.

Issue 5.17

Proposal HE.8

Representation:

P A Warner (1249/13)

Support Proposal HE.8, the retention of

City Council's Response to Representation

The support is welcomed.

The work on urban capacity took account of various potential 'constraints' to sites being brought forward but concluded that the fact a site was in a conservation area did not make it less likely to come forward or to meet density guidance. In many cases higher density

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

CHAPTER 5: HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT

Summary of Representation.
Change sought.

City Council's Response to Representation
Change Proposed

features of a conservation area is essential.

Change sought - none.

**Bewley Homes (386/21),
Bryant Homes (397/5)**

Support Proposal HE.8 but the Urban Capacity Study identifies many 'good' sites in conservation areas which would be contrary to HE.8 and are therefore unlikely to come forward.

Change sought - additional housing sites should be allocated because the Urban Capacity Study is unlikely to deliver sufficient housing land.

development may better reflect the character of a conservation area, as borne out by recent experience.

The issue of whether adequate housing land is made available is dealt with in response to objections to the Housing Chapter (Issue 6).

Change Proposed – none.

Issue 5.18
Proposal HE.8

Representation:

**A Rich (254/2), H Mycock (313/1),
T Stephenson (343/3), P H Radcliffe
(+30 other signatories) (1245/4),
W G Pollock (1251/4), J G Hurcom
(1376/3)**

Generally support Proposal HE.8 but space should be provided within development for renewal and replacement of trees, etc and this should not be counted in density calculations.

***Change sought - add to Proposal HE.8:
"Adequate space must be provided within any such development for the renewal and replacement of natural features, trees and hedges. Such space should be netted-off the development area for the calculation of densities."***

H Watson (345/6)

Object to Proposal HE.8, which should allow important features to be deducted from total plot sizes before development densities are calculated.

Also space is needed for new planting and this should be subtracted from the gross area in density calculations.

Change sought - add at end of Proposal H.8:

"and space for the protection of features such as trees, hedges, artefacts to be retained and proposed new planting where it is considered necessary to provide for the longer term amenity and

City Council's Response to Representation

The general support is welcomed.

PPG3 (Annex C) suggests that private garden space, incidental open space and landscaping should be included within net density calculations, but significant landscape buffers and open spaces serving a wider area should be excluded from the calculations. It is therefore considered appropriate that where trees or other important features serve a wider or 'strategic' function they should be excluded from the relevant net density calculations. The same may apply where new landscaping would serve such a function, although in most cases its benefit will be much more local.

It is likely that features serving such a wider function will have been identified in Conservation Area Technical Assessments, Village Design Statements and other supplementary planning guidance, where it exists. However, the importance of individual features would also need to be assessed at the planning application stage.

While the suggestions made by the respondents are generally accepted, it is not considered that Proposal HE.8 is the right place to address them. Features that are of more than local importance may occur throughout the District, not just in conservation areas. The relevant changes are, therefore, proposed in response to objections to the Design & Development Principles Chapter (see Issue 3.14 above).

Change Proposed – none.

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

CHAPTER 5: HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT

Summary of Representation.
Change sought.

City Council's Response to Representation
Change Proposed

character of the area”.

Issue 5.19
Proposal HE.9

City Council's Response to Representation

The support is welcomed.

Representation:

The proposed change of wording would maintain the intent and function of Proposal HE.9 and it is agreed that it would be less complicated. The Plan should, therefore, be revised as suggested by the respondent.

Southern Tourist Board (87/5)

Support HE.9, it is important to recognise the essential qualities/ characteristics that make towns and villages distinctive and to maintain them.

Change sought - none.

Change Proposed – Proposal HE.9:

Proposals to remove or alter shopfronts which are appropriate to their location, of historical or architectural value, or which contribute to the character of the building or area, will only be permitted if they maintain or enhance the character of the area, or involve the restoration of original features that have been lost.

Hawthorne Kamm Ltd. (374/3)

Object to Proposal HE.9 which is too complicated and should be reworded.

Change sought - redraft HE.9 to state:
“Proposals to remove or alter shopfronts which are appropriate to their location, of historical or architectural value, or which contribute to the character of the building or area, will only be permitted if they maintain or enhance the character of the area, or involve the restoration of original features that have been lost.”

~~*In order to achieve the retention and restoration of shopfronts which are appropriate to their location, of historic or architectural value, or which contribute to the character of the building or area, proposals to remove or alter such features will only be permitted if they maintain or enhance the character of the area, or involve the restoration of original features which have been lost.*~~

Issue 5.20
Proposal HE.10 - HE.11

City Council's Response to Representation

Representation:

The approach adopted in the Local Plan is to refer to relevant supplementary planning guidance where it has been produced, within the relevant Proposal. The Plan's proposals require that development should accord with the relevant guidance. GOSE have not objected to this approach in relation to site-specific proposals that refer to development briefs, for example S.12-S.14 and its approach therefore seems somewhat inconsistent.

GOSE (261/32)

In the context of PPG12's guidance on supplementary planning guidance it is not appropriate to include reference to the English Historic Forum's publication in HE.10.

Change sought - not specified.

PPG12 is clear that SPG can supplement policies in a local plan and should be clearly cross-referenced to them. It is considered entirely appropriate for the Local Plan to highlight in its proposals the fact that relevant SPG exists and that development proposals should accord with it.

GOSE (261/33)

In the context of PPG12's guidance on supplementary planning guidance it is not appropriate to include reference to the English Historic Forum's publication in HE.11.

Change sought - not specified.

Nevertheless, the English Historic Towns Forum guidance that is referred to has now largely been superseded by the City Council's own 'Design Guidance for the Control of Shopfronts and Signs' and it is, therefore, proposed that reference to the EHTF guidelines be deleted.

Change Proposed – Proposal HE.10:

~~*....New shopfronts should normally incorporate traditional elements and materials and accord with the guidelines of the English Historic Towns Forum – “Shopfronts and Advertisements in Historic Towns 1991” and Winchester City Council's “Design*~~

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

CHAPTER 5: HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT

Summary of Representation.
Change sought.

City Council's Response to Representation
Change Proposed

Guidance for the Control of Shopfronts and Signs" (1998).

Change Proposed – paragraph 5.32:

The City Council has produced "Design Guidance for the Control of Shopfronts and Signs" English Historic Towns Forum's guidelines referred to above have been produced in response to trends towards standardised shop design and the imposition of corporate identities, regardless of the building involved. This has been developed from guidelines produced by the English Historic Towns Forum, with the principles related specifically to the character of the District. The City Council has produced its own "Design Guidance for the Control of Shopfronts and Signs" to supplement this at the local level. This is principally aimed at new shopfronts in Conservation Areas, where the Planning Authority has greatest control, but is also applicable to shopfront design generally in the District.

Change Proposed – Proposal HE.11:

....Proposals will be expected to have regard to the guidelines of the English Historic Towns Forum - "Shopfronts and Advertisements in Historic Towns 1991" and Winchester City Council's "Design Guidance for the Control of Shopfronts and Signs" (1998).

Issue 5.21
Proposal HE.12

Representation:

Hawthorne Kamm Ltd. (374/4)

Object to Proposal HE.12, which requires further clarification with regard to what is appropriate and the level of advertising permitted.

Change sought - expand text to refer to what is appropriate or SPG.

City Council's Response to Representation

Proposal HE.12 aims to provide a clear and consistent framework with regard to blinds and canopies. The Proposal is, therefore, intended to enable development control decisions regarding possible levels of advertising, blind and shutter use, which achieve the retention of a conservation area's character. There is some flexibility within national regulations to enable shop fronts and signs to be installed and changed without express consent in certain circumstances.

As a result of the varying design, function and individual site issues it is not considered realistic or appropriate to provide detailed criteria in a broad policy document such as the Local Plan Review. HE.12 combines Proposals HG.15 and HG.16 of the current Local Plan and uses their wording. It would, however, be worthwhile adding a reference to the City Council's shopfronts supplementary planning guidance, as in Proposals HE.10 and HE.11, as this does include relevant advice on blinds and shutters.

Change Proposed – Proposal HE.12:

....Solid external shutters, which obscure the shopfront, will not be permitted. Proposals will be expected to accord with Winchester City Council's "Design Guidance for the Control of Shopfronts and Signs" (1998).

Issue 5.22
Proposal HE.13

Representation:

Hawthorne Kamm Ltd. (374/5)

City Council's Response to Representation

Proposal HE.13 aims to provide a framework for dealing with proposals in a way that contributes to retaining a building's essential features. Whether the conversion of a cellar to another use is appropriate will be strongly based on the merits of individual sites. This is just one aspect of the Proposal, which is intended to enable

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

CHAPTER 5: HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT

Summary of Representation.
Change sought.

City Council's Response to Representation
Change Proposed

Object to Proposal HE.13, which does not specify what it considers to be "inappropriate use of cellars, compared to their traditional use". Also, the policy's failure to recognise value of cellars as potential source of housing capacity.
Change sought - revise HE.13 to encourage use of cellars for housing and not require former uses unless relevant.

Bishops Waltham Society (212/10)
The current Local Plan's Proposal HG.18 should be added before HE.13, as intended in report PTP126.
Change sought - add current HG.18.

appropriate use of cellars. It is considered entirely appropriate to seek to avoid underuse and to promote appropriate uses. In many cases this is likely to involve traditional uses and the scope for achieving new dwellings through the use of cellars (as opposed to basements which were purpose designed as living accommodation) is likely to be very limited.

Nevertheless, this may not always be the case and the phrase "compared to their traditional use" is considered superfluous. It is therefore proposed that this phrase be deleted.

Officers did recommend carrying forward Proposal HG.18 of the current Local Plan (report PTP126, 2.4.2001). In drafting the Plan, however, it was felt that Proposal HG.18 was a rather general proposal that was more an objective than a useful development control policy. When the Review Plan was considered by Members (report PTP140) it was recommended that the Proposal be deleted as its aims could be included in the explanatory text and its requirements were covered by other policies. The wording of Proposal HG.18 was therefore included in the explanatory text of the Local Plan Review (paragraph 5.38).

The intentions set out in report PTP126 have, therefore, been incorporated, albeit not exactly as originally envisaged. There has been no omission, deliberate or otherwise.

Change Proposed – Proposal HE.13:
....(ii) Proposals which would result in the under-use of upper floors of historic buildings or inappropriate use of cellars, ~~compared to their traditional use,~~ will not be permitted;....

Issue 5.23
Proposal HE.14

Representation:

P A Warner (1249/14)
Support Proposal HE.14, our historic and listed buildings need this protection.
Change sought - none.

City Council's Response to Representation

The support is welcomed.

Change Proposed – none.

Issue 5.24
Proposal HE.15

Representation:

Bishops Waltham Society (212/11)
The changes intended in report PTP126 have not been made, in line with guidance in PPG15.
Change sought - add to HE.15:
"A prior offer of the building on the open market at a realistic price reflecting the building's condition must be made".

City Council's Response to Representation

Officers did recommend the inclusion of the text referred to by the respondent (report PTP126, 2.4.2001). This text was in fact added at paragraph 5.28 of the Plan, which refers to demolition in conservation areas. In addition, paragraph 5.48, which precedes Proposal HE.15, refers to the considerations listed in PPG15 regarding the demolition of listed buildings and confirms that these will be taken into account. As PPG15 contains several criteria relating to the demolition of listed buildings, and as such demolition would only be acceptable in very exceptional circumstances, it is not considered appropriate to refer just to the issue of the marketing of the building.

It is concluded that adequate reference to this issue is included in

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

CHAPTER 5: HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT

Summary of Representation.
Change sought.

City Council's Response to Representation
Change Proposed

paragraph 5.28 and that the explanatory text to Proposal HE.15 refers to the requirements of PPG15, which are quite comprehensive and do not need to be repeated in the Local Plan.

Change Proposed – none.

Issue 5.25
Proposal HE.16

City Council's Response to Representation

The support is welcomed.

Change Proposed – none.

Representation:

P A Warner (1249/15)

Support Proposal HE.16, an excellent proposal.

Change sought - none.

Issue 5.26
Proposal HE.17

City Council's Response to Representation

The support is welcomed (see also Issue 5.1, support from English Heritage).

Representation:

P A Warner (1249/16)

Support Proposal HE.17, sympathetic conversion of agricultural buildings is to be encouraged (good examples listed).

Change sought - none.

Fay & Son Ltd (356/1)

Proposal HE.17 should be more flexible to allow residential use of converted buildings where there are circumstances mitigating against employment use (traffic impact, size of HGVs, amenity of the locality).

Change sought - amend HE.17 to allow changes to residential use in these circumstances.

Mr Venn (411/9)

Proposal HE.17 provides no reference to alternative uses or mixed uses which may also be appropriate. The last sentence is not appropriate to the policy.

Change sought - amend to allow other uses and delete last sentence.

Estates Practice, Hampshire County Council (1434/24)

Object to the restriction on conversion to residential, which is surprising given PPG3 and the aim of using previously developed land for residential use. In many cases such buildings are in

Proposal HE.17 does not contain a total presumption against residential use of converted buildings. The final section of HE.17 refers to residential conversions not being permitted 'unless this is the only means of ensuring the retention of the building and its character'.

The mitigating circumstances referred to by respondent 356 would be considered as part of the assessment of whether residential conversion is the only suitable and appropriate use. Proposal HE.17(ii) would allow other uses of a building if employment uses proved not to be suitable. The main consideration is whether the proposed use is the most appropriate in terms of conserving the historic building.

The suggestion that residential use is the 'last resort' (final sentence of Proposal HE.17) is considered warranted and consistent with Structure Plan policy and PPG7. It provides clarification of the assessment process and further justifies the exploration of other acceptable land uses prior to consideration of residential conversion. It responds to concerns by English Heritage and others about the damaging effects of residential conversions on certain historic buildings, especially barns. In several cases this has led to buildings being 'de-listed' due to the scale of the damage caused by conversion.

PPG3 does not promote residential development of all previously developed sites and includes sustainability and other criteria. Sustainability issues will, therefore, be taken into account but even if these buildings are in sustainable locations, such as existing settlements where policies would otherwise permit housing, residential use may be too damaging to the building to be acceptable. The Plan's suggestion that housing use is likely to be a last resort derives from experience of the appropriateness of conversion proposals. Residential use is not, however, ruled out completely and

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

CHAPTER 5: HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT

Summary of Representation.
Change sought.

City Council's Response to Representation
Change Proposed

settlement boundaries.
Change sought - remove this section.

may exceptionally prove the most appropriate use in some cases.
Proposal HE.17 provides for this possibility.

Change Proposed – none.
