

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

CHAPTER 11: WINCHESTER

Summary of Representation.
Change sought.

City Council's Response to Representation
Change Proposed

Issue 11.1 Chapter 11 - General

Representation:

Redrow Homes (Southern) Ltd. (474/7)

The proportion of the District's housing requirement proposed in Winchester is too low and there is an over-reliance on urban capacity sites. Appropriately located greenfield sites should be allocated and there should be a greater concentration of development at Winchester.

Change sought – not specified.

R Poole (1125/1)

No new building in Winchester should be higher than the Georgian and Victorian buildings which characterise the town. No new office blocks or flats should be higher than 3 storeys. The existing high-rise buildings are an eyesore.

Change sought – resist buildings of more than 3 storeys.

City Council's Response to Representation

The Local Plan makes adequate provision for housing, as demonstrated in response to objections to the Housing Chapter. Over half of the urban capacity identified in the Urban Capacity Study is in Winchester and there are many other urban capacity sites that are not classified as 'good' opportunities. In addition the Plan must provide for the possibility of a Major Development Area at Winchester City (North).

It is not, therefore, accepted that the provision for housing in Winchester is too low. The sequential approach promoted by PPG3 has been followed and there is no need to allocate any new greenfield sites for housing development. It would, therefore, not be appropriate to identify new allocations in Winchester.

The Local Plan does not promote high buildings in Winchester. Indeed, various proposals seek to ensure that development respects its surroundings (e.g. W.1, DP.3). It would not, however, necessarily be appropriate to introduce a ban on buildings of more than 3 storeys as there may be situations, albeit that they are likely to be limited, where such development can be acceptable.

Change Proposed – none.

Issue 11.2 Proposal W.1/Paragraphs 11.1-11.14

Representation:

Sparsholt College (353/21)

Support socially responsible initiatives such as environmental traffic management proposals.

Change sought – none.

H Woodrow (333/2)

Support the Plan's recognition of the importance of Winchester's heritage, environment and landscape setting, which provides many fine views.

Change sought - paragraph 11.10, add a third sentence: "There are many fine views also, from one landscape to another, across the City, the River Itchen Valley and its water meadows".

Berkeley Strategic Land (210/23)

Winchester does not have 'considerable' scope for housing development within its

City Council's Response to Representation

The support is welcomed.

The landscape setting of Winchester, parts of which have long been recognised as being of the highest quality, is composed of numerous elements which include the River Itchen, its valley setting, surrounding chalk uplands and areas of comparatively dense tree-cover. Although there are a great many outstanding views across this complex landscape, it would be unnecessarily exclusive to list some but not all of these. The Winchester District Landscape Assessment, published as a background document to the Local Plan, amplifies the variety of landscapes in the area and their importance.

Both the Plan itself and the contributing Urban Capacity Study clearly indicate that there is considerably more potential for development than respondent 210 suggests. In the light of the Urban Capacity Study and its conclusions, the word "considerable" is considered to be entirely reasonable and justified. The Urban Capacity Study suggests that over half of the total urban capacity in the District exists within Winchester: clearly a considerable amount.

There is a range of Proposals including in particular those in Chapter 3, which have been devised in order to ensure that the realisation of this development potential incorporates a design-led approach, based on townscape and landscape principles. This approach is specifically intended to avoid conflict and maintain consistency between the need to achieve the necessary amount of development within built-up areas

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

CHAPTER 11: WINCHESTER

Summary of Representation. *Change sought.*

City Council's Response to Representation *Change Proposed*

defined built-up area, although there is some potential for the development of previously developed land.

Change sought - paragraph 11.14, first sentence, delete the word "considerable".

Bewley Homes PLC and R C H Morgan-Giles (227/13)

Concern at the potential impact on Proposal W.1 of other related policies in the Plan, in particular, Proposal DP.3 and the Housing Strategy.

Change sought - identify a conflict between the Plan's reliance on windfall sites and its objective to protect and enhance the special character of Winchester.

Cala Homes (South) Ltd. (468/70)

Object to the inadequate weight attached to the findings of the Future of Winchester Study, including that which indicated the need for carefully planned future growth.

Change sought - provide for growth, in accordance with the criteria of the Future of Winchester Study.

C Gilham (1446/10)

Paragraph 11.4 sets out the qualities of Winchester but paragraph 11.7 goes on to suggest they don't count for much. Winchester's qualities should not be outnumbered by commercial imperatives that are not justified.

Change sought – not specified.

H Woodrow (333/9)

Support for Proposal W.1 and Paragraph 11.7, conditional on the Plan clarifying an aim to encourage further shared and out-of-hours use of existing sports and recreational facilities at schools and other similar locations.

Change sought – add a Proposal in Chapter 9: Recreation and Tourism, to specify that: "Where public recreational space and facilities are deficient, the potential use of existing school playing fields for public recreation out of school hours will be assessed before further land is assigned for this purpose."

P E Jones (887/5)

High-density development in certain well-

and preserve open spaces and maintain/ enhance the character and quality of the environment.

As the Plan indicates, the findings of the Future of Winchester Study and, in particular, its "Framework for Change", set out clear management and policy-making guidelines which are particularly focused on those attributes and qualities which are important in maintaining Winchester's special character. Among the Study's findings was the conclusion that there should be a sequential approach to development, concentrating first on the area within the City's built-up area. Nevertheless, the Study also recognised that, at some point, carefully planned growth might be needed in order to relieve potentially harmful pressures within the town. However, as the Plan makes clear, the subsequent imposition of a requirement to plan for a 'reserve' MDA at Winchester City (North) has superseded the need to consider other forms of growth around the margins of the City.

There is not considered to be a conflict between paragraphs 11.4 and 11.7 of the Plan, both of which summarise the Future of Winchester Study. Paragraph 11.7 states that the Future of Winchester Study showed that objectives requiring investment or development outnumbered those that would constrain it: it does not say that development pressures *outweigh* constraints. The constraints remain important and should be reflected in accordance with the value attached to them.

The issue of shared use of established sports facilities is dealt with in the responses under Chapter 9: Recreation and Tourism. However, the shortfall of open space in Winchester is such that shared and out-of-hours use is not likely to be a solution. A new proposal of the type suggested would not, therefore, be appropriate.

The issue of higher-density development and the extent to which this could result in a conflict with the requirement to respect local character and townscape/landscape quality has been dealt with in the analysis and responses under Issue 3.14 in Chapter 3: Design and Development Principles and in response to objections to the Housing Chapter. Higher-density forms of development within the built-up areas, including Winchester, will inevitably result in some further concentration of development. However, it is not accepted that this will unavoidably lead to developments harmful to distinctive local environments, such as those with high levels of tree cover.

The 'omission site' to the north of Francis Gardens is dealt with in the responses relating to objections to Chapter 6: Housing (see Issue 6.50). It is concluded that the site should not be allocated for housing development or included within the Winchester settlement boundary.

Change Proposed – none.

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

CHAPTER 11: WINCHESTER

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

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

wooded parts of Winchester, as stipulated by PPG.3 and provided for in the Plan, will result in tree loss and, therefore, character changes.

Change sought – retain a policy similar to EN.1 in the adopted District-wide Local Plan.

I W L Jones (888/7)

Low density well-treed areas such as Sleepers Hill should be conserved and not subjected to indiscriminate density targets as embodied in PPG.3.

Change sought – not specified.

Redrow Homes (Southern) Ltd (474/1)

Object to the omission of land to the north of Francis Gardens from the defined policy boundary of Winchester.

Change sought – include land at Francis Gardens within the Winchester policy boundary.

Issue 11.3 **Proposal W.1**

Representation:

Strutt and Parker (877/14)

Proposal W.1 contradicts DP.5 and makes no specific reference to areas important to the City's landscape setting, as articulated in the Future of Winchester Study. Among the most important and visible landscape constraints are the "green wedges" on the city's main northern approach, identified as the 'area of search' for a reserve MDA site at Winchester City (North).

Change sought – identify on the Proposals Map, as local landscape designations, those areas which are important to the setting of Winchester.

D W Briggs (967/8)

Object to the statement, in Paragraph 11.8 of the Plan, that "not all aspects of Winchester's setting are sacrosanct". Such an interpretation undermines the findings and conclusions of the Future of Winchester Study, which refers to the need for new development "to be sustainable and maintain Winchester's core characteristics".

City Council's Response to Representation

Proposal W.1 refers to the landscape setting of Winchester and is entirely complementary to Proposal DP.5, which seeks to maintain or enhance the District's townscape and landscape. Government and strategic advice is moving away from the designation of areas for landscape purposes and this is reflected in the approach taken to the Winchester District Landscape Assessment. Even so, the land identified as an area of search for the Winchester City (North) reserve MDA is not currently defined as an Area of Special Landscape Quality and is not one of the most important parts of Winchester's setting.

The statement that not all aspects of Winchester's setting are sacrosanct comes from the Future of Winchester Study (paragraph 7.14) and is not, therefore, in conflict with it. It is a fact that major development may be required on the edge of Winchester (in the form of the reserve MDA) and it would, therefore be misleading to suggest that all undeveloped land around the town can be preserved.

The importance of Winchester's setting, especially the Itchen Valley, has been fully recognised in policy-making relating to the City and its surroundings. The Plan's overall strategy, which is to contain new development within the defined policy boundary, is partly a reflection of the need to protect the countryside around the City and is, therefore, aimed at preventing intrusive development which does not conform to that strategy.

However, there is a specific strategic requirement for the Local Plan to make provision for the development of an MDA at Winchester City (North). The Deposit Local Plan identified an 'area of search' for this development. The Revised Deposit Plan identifies a specific development site for the reserve MDA, as required by the strategic

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

CHAPTER 11: WINCHESTER

Summary of Representation.
Change sought.

City Council's Response to Representation
Change Proposed

Change sought – paragraph 11.8, third sentence, replace with: “This is particularly applicable to maintaining the town’s setting”.

planning authorities. In the identification of the area of search and its narrowing down to a specific allocation, landscape issues have been an important consideration. However, the Structure Plan does specify that an MDA should be identified to the north of Winchester and carefully sited development in this location is least likely to be harmful to the setting of any historic parts of the town.

Cala Homes (468/71)

Object to Proposal W.1, in that it does not make sufficiently clear how the City’s special character and features will be protected, or recognise the need to strike a balance between protecting such features and meeting other sustainability targets.

In regard to transport and other issues related to the Winchester City (North) MDA, these are considered in more detail in response to objections to Proposal NC.3.

Change sought – not specified.

Change Proposed – none.

**Save Barton Farm Group (175/4),
I White (349/10), M J Maidens (1184/1)**

Both the Local Plan and the Future of Winchester Study emphasise the importance of the City’s setting. Object to the destruction of a significant part of that setting if a reserve MDA was to be developed at Winchester City (North).

Change sought – delete references to Winchester City (North) as an MDA.

T West (1121/2)

The loss of the land around Barton Farm to major development would undermine both the overall character of the landscape setting of Winchester and would remove opportunities for informal recreation which the area currently provides.

Change sought – delete reference to a reserve MDA at Winchester City (North) and put greater emphasis on use of ‘brownfield’ opportunities.

**J Burrows (1246/2), S Burrows
(1111/3)**

Areas of undeveloped land like Barton Farm greatly enhance the setting of the City and also provide opportunities for informal recreation. The proposal to develop a major development area would destroy part of that historic setting and additionally result in traffic congestion and further noise and air pollution.

Change sought – abandon plans to develop the green ‘fingers’ of land which project into central Winchester and make better use of brownfield sites.

G I Kingdon (1186/1)

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

CHAPTER 11: WINCHESTER

Summary of Representation.
Change sought.

City Council's Response to Representation
Change Proposed

The designation of (part) of Barton Farm as a potential MDA is incompatible with the stated aim of Proposal W.1 and would affect the setting of the City, which is of exceptional quality. In addition, a Winchester City North MDA would exacerbate existing traffic congestion and could not benefit, in any meaningful way, from attempts to place greater reliance on public transport

Change sought – *abandon Proposal NC.3 and its accompanying text.*

C R Bradshaw (1164/1), J Bradshaw (1168/1), M E Moore (1369/3)

The proposed development of an MDA at Winchester City North is not necessary to meet local needs and would result in an overloading of the City's infrastructure. It is also unacceptable in terms of its effects on the special character of Winchester and its conflict with other environmental aims of the Plan. The proposal takes inadequate account of flood-risk and would be likely to heighten the effects of flooding elsewhere. The proposal is premature in the absence of more detailed information on hydrology, transport impacts and other important considerations.

Change sought – *a radical change to the entire basis for the Plan's strategy.*

P Roderick (907/2), J P English (1401/4), M E Butterworth (1402/4), M Raw (1403/4), J Wong (1404/4), C Butterworth (1405/4), J Foreman (1406/4), Col. Langdon-Mudge (1407/4), Mrs Langdon-Mudge (1408/4), N A McPherson (1409/4), P Q Stubbs (1410/4), J Barnett (1411/4), Mr & Mrs Eames (1412/4), J Cullen (1413/4), Mr & Mrs G Cox (1414/4), G Wickes (1415/4), Mr & Mrs Bull (1416/4), Mr & Mrs Denham (1417/4), Mr & Mrs Early (1418/4), S English (1419/4), Mr & Mrs Keigher (1420/4), J A Foreman (1421/4).

Development of 2,000 dwellings at Winchester City (North) would severely damage the City's historic setting within a sensitive rural landscape and its core characteristics, not least as a 'compact city'. The impact of a major development

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

CHAPTER 11: WINCHESTER

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

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

area and its associated infrastructure would increase traffic congestion and pollution and would further exacerbate parking problems within the City centre.

Change sought –delete all references to a Major Development Area at Winchester City (North).

Issue 11.4 **Proposal W.2/Paragraphs** **11.21-11.27**

Representation:

Ramblers Association, Winchester Group (1254/2)

Support Proposal W.2 and request the opportunity to be consulted on future detailed planning.

Change sought – none.

Save Barton Farm Group (175/3)

Object to formal recreation areas being provided beyond the City's policy boundary. If Winchester lacks sufficient sports provision Bushfield Camp is the best place for this. However, the area proposed, situated to the north-west of Courtney Road, is sited in the countryside and is, therefore, unacceptable. It is also unnecessarily close to the existing Abbots Barton Playing Field area.

Change sought – delete reference to the proposed allocation of new recreational provision north-west of Courtney Road.

E W Lee (1187/1)

Object to the provision of additional sports pitches. Another indoor leisure centre is required but in the northern part of Winchester.

Change sought – not specified.

City of Winchester Trust (223/3)

Although outdoor sports facilities might be acceptably integrated with the important recreational opportunities which the site currently provides, the erection of buildings on this sensitive site for associated and/or additional uses should be resisted.

City Council's Response to Representation

The support is welcomed.

The request to be consulted if development proposals should be put forward is noted.

There is a clear and established local need for additional sports pitches, rather than indoor provision. Achieving a balance between meeting this need and the need for accessibility to the area served requires a degree of compromise, particularly in view of the relatively extensive areas of land which may be needed. Given the amount of additional recreation land needed, it is necessary to look for suitable areas adjacent to Winchester, rather than only within the built-up area. While the aim would be to provide smaller open areas, especially play areas, within the built-up area, this is not realistic when considering the large amounts of new sports provision needed. Open recreational uses such as playing fields are a normal and appropriate use within areas subject to countryside policies and are, indeed, positively encouraged adjacent to settlements and in Gaps (see Proposal RT.7).

The allocation to the north of Courtney Road has been introduced primarily to meet existing and anticipated recreational shortfalls within the north-western parts of the City. The site is located within Winchester-Kings Worthy/Headbourne Worthy Local Gap, but as noted above, this would not diminish the important function of the local gap. Objections to specific recreation allocations such as this are considered in more detail in response to objections to Proposal RT.4. Proposal W.2 proposes the allocation of land at Bushfield Camp for recreational use.

The findings of the Bushfield Camp Study, published in 1997, and the City Council's subsequent efforts to promote outdoor recreational and sports facilities at Bushfield, have been consistently based on the premise that such provision (together with any associated elements of Park and Ride or small-scale recreational/tourism-related uses) should not diminish the site's sense of openness and should take full account of its sensitivity and contribution to the landscape of the Itchen Valley and the setting of St Cross and the City. The importance of preserving the protected belt of beech trees at the highest point of the site and keeping free from any form of built development the long dip-slope down to St Cross are both fully recognised, particularly as the natural regeneration of those areas of open down land to the north and east of the site has continued, increasing their importance for nature conservation.

As part of its policy in regard to recreational provision for Winchester,

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

CHAPTER 11: WINCHESTER

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

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

Change sought – delete “and small-scale tourism-oriented uses”. The photograph and the accompanying caption on page 106 are mis-matched and, therefore, one should be changed.

Church Commissioners (224/10)

Bushfield Camp should be developed in a way that recognises the commercial constraints and, therefore, reflects the site's capacity for more than simply recreational and parking uses.

Change sought – amend Proposal W.2 and its accompanying text to encourage a comprehensive mixed-use development proposal, including housing and other commercial uses.

Hampshire and Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust (330/8)

Support the general provisions of Proposal W.2 and the proposed allocation for sports and recreational facilities. Would object, however, if the provision of sports pitches and other formal facilities proved detrimental to this rejuvenating downland landscape.

Change sought – not specified.

Winchester City Residents Association (331/3)

Object to the urbanising aspects likely to be associated with the proposed sports facilities and any small scale tourism-related uses i.e. lighting, structures, roadways and traffic. Better use should be made of existing facilities at schools and colleges and within the urban centres.

Change sought – delete Proposal W.2.

Winchester Landscape Conservation Alliance (333/12)

Concerned that planning permission for the development of this site should not be granted before public consultation has taken place. Wish to see a clarification of the scope and size of “small-scale tourism-related uses”. Wish to see any external lighting carefully controlled to avoid undesirable impacts on landscape and wildlife.

Change sought – amend W.2, first paragraph, to read “planning permission will be sought”. An environmental

the City Council has endeavoured to encourage the sharing of facilities at existing establishments such as schools and colleges. However, the need for additional recreation land is of such a scale that, even if this were considerably more successful than to date, substantial new land would be required. Bushfield Camp is an excellent opportunity for the additional provision of formal and informal recreational facilities, to meet the needs of the southern parts of the City, as well as relieving some of the current pressure for cross-town journeys to reach the pitches at River Park.

Whilst parts of the former army camp are well suited to the provision of play pitches, a part of the site close to the Badger Farm Road frontage is well-screened in the wider landscape and could absorb the visual impact of a well-designed and well-landscaped Park and Ride car-park. The question of lighting has been carefully considered in the context of both this and recreational uses of the site. The issue is an important one and would need very careful design consideration. However, it is considered that it would be possible to meet operational lighting needs for the more southerly parts of the site without unreasonably extending, or intensifying, the light ‘halo’ that already exists at night over the Badger Farm and Olivers Battery areas.

With regard to additional facilities at Bushfield, this is a further issue taken into account by the original Study. It was recognised that there may be some reasonable need for limited additional facilities which could be directly associated with, and supportive of, the site's primary recreational purpose. Whilst, the potential requirement for any particular leisure or tourism facility, such as walkers' or riders' “bunkhouse”, has not been assessed in detail, it would be imprudent at present to seek to rule out some modest development. This could help to create a more viable overall proposal, in conjunction with the main recreation/leisure uses. The Bushfield Camp Study was subject to consultation and itself took account of the recommendations of the previous Local Plan Inspector. It is accepted, however, that further consultation may be needed, when more specific proposals in line with Proposal W.2 are put forward.

The suggestion that housing and other elements of commercial development should be permitted is considered inappropriate. Such development would not reflect the sensitivity of the site, would be poorly related to the existing built-up area, and would prevent the development of the most appropriate parts of the site for recreation, for which a much greater need exists.

Although the photograph and caption on page 106 are related to Bushfield Camp and to each other, it is accepted that they could be improved. However, the photographs and the captions are not a formal part of the Local Plan's proposals or explanatory text, but merely illustrative ‘space-fillers’. As such, it is not considered necessary to include any changes to them as formal changes to the Plan and the intention is to update and replace all of the photographs in the Plan, subject to adequate space being available in the revised layout. No formal change is, therefore, proposed in response to this point.

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

CHAPTER 11: WINCHESTER

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

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

assessment and the contents of the Bushfield Camp Study be appended to the Plan as additional background information.

Change Proposed – none.

C Gillham (1446/11)

Object to proposals the introduction of Park and Ride on one of Winchester's last hills and unspecified recreation and tourism.

Change sought – not specified.

Issue 11.5 **Proposal W.3**

Representation:

M Charrett (1370/21)

Support the principle of Park and Ride but brownfield sites should be used and any greenfield sites should only be considered as an alternative, if undergrounding or some other means of screening can be used in order to prevent urbanising effects and light pollution.

Change sought – not specified.

CPRE (Havant & Winchester Branch) (1387/17)

Support the principle of Park and Ride. Such schemes should be linked to other measures to boost public transport services and give enhanced opportunities for walking and cycling. Sites for Park and Ride car-parks should be on previously developed land, exploiting opportunities to use existing parking areas and avoid, wherever possible, greenfield sites on the urban fringes.

Change sought – not specified.

Heron Land Developments Ltd (204/2), Bovis Homes (205/1)

Object to the omission from the Plan of specific Park and Ride site allocations i.e. at Winnall and to the north of Winchester.

Change sought – identify sites for Park and Ride car parks at Winnall and to the north of Winchester. Selection of the latter should be made in the context of landscape and transport studies undertaken in regard to Proposal NC.3

Cala Homes (468/72)

City Council's Response to Representation

The support for the principle of Park and Ride is welcomed.

The Plan's position on Park and Ride, as part of an integrated transport strategy which is aimed at boosting public transport use, is generally dealt with in the responses to objections to Proposal T.7 and its explanatory text.

Nevertheless, given the land-take required to provide a successful, effective and viable Park and Ride car park, it is not realistic to require that only sites within the Winchester policy boundary can be developed. It is also questionable whether the use of large areas of land within the built-up area for Park and Ride would be the best use of land for which there is considerable competition for other uses. In other towns and cities Park and Ride is frequently (indeed normally) provided outside built-up areas and this is provided for by Government and strategic planning policies. Therefore it is necessary to at least consider permitting sites beyond the settlement boundary, in suitable and carefully selected locations which are best placed to intercept traffic approaching Winchester on the principal peak-time access routes. Proposal W.3 therefore provides for the development of Park and Ride car parks 'around', as well as 'in', Winchester.

Placing any such facilities underground may not be practically or financially realistic, although every effort is made to integrate any future Park and Ride car-parks with their surroundings and to ensure that potential impacts on the landscape kept to the minimum.

The Winchester Movement Access Plan, which forms part of the Local Transport Plan developed jointly by the County and City Council's, is partly based on an incremental approach to the implementation of the main elements of its strategy. Among these elements is the development of appropriate land for Park and Ride car parks. As indicated in Proposal W.3 and its supporting text, the Local Transport Plan has, in addition to Bushfield Camp, identified a need to provide at least two further sites within the time-period covered by the Local Plan Review. To reflect this, the Local Plan makes a general reference to two locations which are well-placed to provide Park and Ride in relation to radial routes into Winchester. These broad locations are not yet directly served by Park and Ride. However, the development of the Park and Ride scheme has not yet reached the point where specific sites, or alternative sites at each broad location,

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

CHAPTER 11: WINCHESTER

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

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

Proposal W.3 fails to provide a comprehensive strategy for Park and Ride or identify sites at all required locations.

Change sought – not specified.

M E Moore (1369/4)

Object that measures to prevent or reduce levels of cross-town traffic do not go far enough. Further specific provision for Park and Ride car-park sites should be made at Winnall, Magdalen Down, Harestock and Kings Worthy. No mention is made in the Plan of compensating reductions in town-centre surface car-parks.

Change sought – not specified.

Winchester City Residents Association (331/4)

Object to W.3. Greenfield sites for Park and Ride car parks should be a policy of last resort. Alternative sites already exist or could be developed for Park and Ride. In any event, this should not be undertaken without more information on the detailed traffic benefits to be set against the social and environmental costs of establishing peripheral car parks in environmentally sensitive sites.

Change sought – not specified.

K. Story (882/4)

Brownfield sites should be given priority in extending the Park and Ride scheme and providing additional car parks.

Change sought – paragraph 11.35, second sentence, after “for this reason”, substitute the wording: “priority will be given to Brownfield sites and no Park and Ride sites will be identified in the Winchester Conservation Area or the East Hampshire Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty”.

Winchester Landscape Conservation Alliance (333/13)

The issue of Park and Ride was not adequately explored in the earlier public consultation exercise and has not been open to public debate since the approval of the Future of Winchester Study. Object, therefore, to the declared intention to grant further planning permissions.

can be specifically identified in the Local Plan. As the text at paragraphs 11.33 - 11.35 makes clear, it may be necessary to consider certain possible sites that are subject to countryside policies. However, any sites in areas subject to specific protection or landscape designations, such as the Conservation Area or the East Hampshire Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, are unlikely to be considered suitable. This is made clear in paragraph 11.35.

As indicated above, every effort has been made, through careful design, landscaping, etc, to minimise the landscape impact of developing the Garnier Road site (which already has planning permission and is not a proposal of the Local Plan). Similar care would be adopted in regard to any further Park and Ride car-parks needed to carry forward this part of the Local Transport Plan's overall strategy - which is to reduce traffic pressures on the centre of Winchester. The Plan already makes clear that Park and Ride is not intended to increase parking provision in the town overall and contains a commitment to manage town centre car parks so as to maintain current levels of parking (paragraph 11.38). The strategy of providing Park and Ride has been subject to several consultation exercises, principally through the Local Transport Plan and Winchester Movement and Access Plan. It has been strongly supported in public comments, although any planning application for future schemes would be subject to its own consultation procedures.

With regard to the representation made by respondent 224, the issue of a more commercially mixed development at Bushfield Camp has been dealt with under Issue 11.4, above. With regard to objections to park and Ride development at Winnall, it is acknowledged that there are significant landscape constraints to development outside the settlement boundary, as well as potential access problems. However, Proposal W.3 already contains what are considered to be adequate safeguards to prevent unduly intrusive development as well as to secure suitable means of access.

Change Proposed – none.

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

CHAPTER 11: WINCHESTER

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

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

Change sought – Proposal W.3, first sentence, insert at beginning: “following publication of a comprehensive Park and Ride Plan for the City for public consultation, planning permission will be sought for”.

J Royston-Smith (273/1)

Object to the landscape impact and loss of local amenity, which would result from the development of a Park and Ride car park at Garnier Road.

Change sought – amend the Plan to put greater emphasis on the provision cycle ways and cycle-parking facilities.

Church Commissioners (224/11)

A Park and Ride car-park and associated infrastructure at Bushfield Camp should form part of a mixed development for the site.

Change sought – amend Proposal W.3 and accompanying text to encourage a comprehensive mixed use development, which includes Park and Ride, as well as housing, commercial uses and recreation.

Itchen Valley Parish Council (286/8)

Object to the proposed identification of additional sites for Park and Ride car-parks in the Winnall area. If such a car park was to be located beyond the City's built-up area it would be subject to countryside policies. Such a development would be intrusive and undesirable, especially with regard to light pollution.

Change sought – Proposal W.3 (i), delete the word “unduly”. Proposal W.3, third line, add “West of the M3” after “Winchester”. Paragraph 11.33 add “West of the M3” after “the Winnall area”. Delete Paragraph 11.34. Paragraph 11.35, delete second sentence and replace with: “for this reason Park and Ride car parks will not be permitted in or near to Conservation Areas, the East Hampshire AONB or within the proposed boundary of the South Downs National Park”.

Issue 11.6 **Proposal W.4**

City Council's Response to Representation

The Plan seeks to make it clear that the objective, in traffic management terms, is to give increasing priority to non-car modes, in

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

CHAPTER 11: WINCHESTER

Summary of Representation. *Change sought.*

City Council's Response to Representation *Change Proposed*

<p>Representation:</p> <p>Consignia PLC (209/1) Support the overall intention of Proposal W.4, but Royal Mail vehicles need constant access to existing city centre premises for collection, delivery and other operational purposes, including the provision of Main Post Office services. Proposals for a managed reduction in vehicular traffic in Winchester's central area, leading eventually to the exclusion of most traffic, should not hinder or prevent its normal activities. <i>Change sought - include references to "appropriate exemptions for certain essential business traffic".</i></p> <p>J Pope (892/2) Object to proposals to restrict/exclude town centre traffic. This would have a detrimental effect on local residents who might wish, or need, to continue to shop by car, but would travel to other locations to continue with this, to the detriment of business viability in the City's central area. <i>Change sought - not specified.</i></p>	<p>an effort to prevent further increases in traffic volumes within central Winchester. It is accepted that such an approach must, however, take account of the day-to-day access and mobility requirements of local businesses and residents. There is nothing in the Proposals or explanatory text to suggest that vehicular access for servicing and residents will be prevented, and this is not the intention.</p> <p>The aim of the proposal is to limit new developments that would generate significant additional volumes of traffic. This particular strand of the strategy is intended to move towards eliminating "most", not all, traffic from the core area. It will, therefore, be necessary as part of a more detailed implementation programme to make provision for business and residential access to be maintained.</p> <p><i>Change Proposed – none.</i></p>
--	---

Issue 11.7 **Proposal W.5/Paragraphs** **11.36-11.38**

City Council's Response to Representation

<p>Representation:</p> <p>GOSE (261/68) Paragraph 11.38 does not make it sufficiently clear that town centre parking will be managed in order to avoid any significant increase in the stock of parking which is currently available. <i>Change sought - not specified.</i></p> <p>E Thorn (1188/1) Object to the development of city centre car parks. This will lead to increased pressures being put on the remaining parking and add to on-street congestion. A reduction in the availability of current parking will also have a negative effect on the viability of local retail business and would reduce the number and/or opportunity to hold popular and</p>	<p>Whilst it is accepted that paragraph 11.38 does not attempt to set out a specific sequence of events in order to satisfy the aims of Proposal W.5 it is, nevertheless maintained that, in conjunction with Paragraph 11.37, the Plan's intention with regard to preventing any significant increase in the stock of public parking available in Winchester is made quite clear.</p> <p>The aim of moderating, and in the longer term reducing, levels of vehicular activity in the town centre is addressed in Chapter 10: Transport. The Plan makes it clear that it is particularly long-stay parking that will be managed to prevent any increase in provision. The aim is not, therefore to reduce short-stay parking, as it is recognised that this is of particular importance to the economy of the town.</p> <p>Events such as farmers' markets, antiques sales and other fairs have become a vital part of the City's social and business calendar. The Plan's purpose in reducing traffic levels, whilst encouraging commensurate improvements for other modes including public transport, would provide an even more attractive framework for such events, adding further to their present popularity. The aim is not to redevelop all car parks, or even all of those listed as having redevelopment potential in paragraph 11.38. There will, therefore, be adequate opportunities to use car parks for such events and the aim</p>
---	---

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

CHAPTER 11: WINCHESTER

Summary of Representation.
Change sought.

City Council's Response to Representation
Change Proposed

economically successful events such as antique fairs, farmers markets and car-boot sales. If more development sites are required, these should incorporate parking at surface level or, where the water-table permits, below ground.

Change sought - not specified

C Allen (1258/2)

Object to the development of city-centre car parks and the reduction in parking availability. For many Winchester residents, Park and Ride will not provide a convenient or practical substitute, especially for the elderly or disabled. City centre commerce and businesses would suffer as a result of this strategy.

Changes sought - paragraph 11.37, third sentence, delete "withdrawn all". Paragraph 11.38, delete after second sentence.

M E Moore (1369/5)

Urban regeneration in Winchester is essential to maximise the use of wasteful and unsightly surface car parks. More specific references should be made to the location of Park and Ride car parks, linked to a corresponding reduction in city centre car park capacity.

Change sought - not specified.

R Bayley (1379/2) (Councillor)

Park and Ride car parks on 'countryside' sites on the periphery of Winchester are unattractive and will prove unpopular. Improved parking at, or close to, stations such as Winchester and Micheldever would be a better alternative.

Change sought - not specified.

is to improve provision for the market in any redevelopment of the Broadway/Friarsgate area.

The issue of locating Park and Ride car-parks is dealt with under Issue 11.5, above. The measures for reducing city centre car-park capacity will be made more specific as the overall strategy evolves and reaches the point where locations referred to in Paragraph 11.38, together with any other suitable candidate sites, can be examined in more detail. The question of parking opportunities at railway stations within the District is dealt with under Issue 10.15.

Change Proposed – none.

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

CHAPTER 11: WINCHESTER

Summary of Representation.
Change sought.

City Council's Response to Representation
Change Proposed

Issue 11.8 Proposal W.6

Representation:

Winchester City Residents Association (331/5)

Objection is made to the reference to minimal, if any, on-site parking to be permitted in the city centre. This is considered too restrictive in all but those cases where site constraints dictate that this should be the case. Such a policy would also act against the maintenance of a balanced community.

Change sought - amend Proposal W.6 to permit some parking provision in design briefs for city centre residential development.

City Council's Response to Representation

The issue of parking standards and the extent to which these conform with Government advice and take account of the wider transport strategy is fully dealt with in the responses set out under Issues 10.9 - 10.12, relating to Proposal T.4 and its explanatory text. Government advice is clear that parking provision should be minimised and that town centre locations offer a particular opportunity to do this, due to their good accessibility to facilities and to public transport. It has long been the planning policy in central Winchester that parking should be limited to a maximum of one space per residential unit and no parking provision at all is frequently accepted where site constraints necessitate this.

Change Proposed – none.

Issue 11.9 Proposal W.7

Representation:

City of Winchester Trust (223/4)

To avoid confusion, Proposal W.7 should make it clear that, before considering the granting of planning permission for residential development, it will be necessary for any such application to be assessed against other relevant policies in the Plan.

Change sought – an additional reference to the need for other relevant policies in the Plan to be satisfied before applications for development in Winchester are approved.

City Council's Response to Representation

It is accepted that other permissive proposals in the Local Plan usually require that development 'accords with Proposal DP.3 and other relevant proposals of this Plan'. It is, therefore, agreed that this should apply to commercial development in Winchester, especially as the Plan contains other proposals that would affect such development.

Change Proposed – Proposal W.7:

Commercial development will be permitted in Winchester provided that it is designed and located to minimise the impact of service vehicles and accords with Proposal DP.3 and other relevant proposals of this Plan.

Issue 11.10 Proposal W.9

Representation:

J Pilkington (1250/4)

Support Proposal W.9 and, in particular, W.9 (i), (ii) and (iii).

Change sought – none.

Ramblers Association – Winchester

City Council's Response to Representation

The support is welcomed.

Given that occasional, seasonal flooding is a known factor in this part of the river valley, the design of any footpath link behind premises along Easton Lane would need to take this particular issue into account.

In attempting to improve conditions for pedestrians in this part of the City Centre, the Plan is seeking to achieve a desirable and beneficial link to bring safety and other benefits. This route would enable pedestrians to access the County Reference Library without the need

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

CHAPTER 11: WINCHESTER

Summary of Representation. *Change sought.*

City Council's Response to Representation *Change Proposed*

<p>Group (1254/3) Support Proposal W.9 (v). Change sought – none.</p> <p>Chief Executive's Department, Hampshire County Council (1432/10) Support Proposal W.9(v), with the proviso that the route, which is susceptible to seasonal flooding, would require some improvement. Change sought – none.</p> <p>Palmer Fry (79/1), SCATS Country Stores PLC (1189/1) Object to Proposal W.9 (i) which crosses private land where there is no public right of way. Change sought - not specified.</p>	<p>to pass the complex crossing at the City Road/Jewry Street/Hyde Street Junction. The Plan therefore encourages the provision of such a route, over what is clearly understood to be private land, by negotiation or as a planning gain in the event that any future development proposals might make such a link possible. Given the value of such a link it is concluded that it should be retained within Proposal W.9.</p> <p>Change Proposed – none.</p>
--	--

Issue 11.11 Proposal W.10

City Council's Response to Representation The support is welcomed.

<p>Representation:</p> <p>J Pilkington (1250/5), Chief Executive's Department, Hampshire County Council (1432/11) Support Proposal W.10 Change sought – none.</p> <p>Ramblers Association – Winchester Group (1254/4) Support Proposal W.10, which also needs a footpath link from the end of Hockley Viaduct to cross the motorway approach road and link with Compton Street. Change sought - not specified.</p> <p>Winchester Landscape Conservation Alliance (333/10) Support Proposal W.10, which should be linked to a proposal to ensure the maintenance and repair of the Itchen Navigation and Hockley Viaduct. Change sought - amend Proposal W.10 to read: "A new unmetalled bridleway..." Add a new Proposal (W.11) to read: <i>Ways will be found to ensure the structural integrity of the Itchen Navigation and the embankments and Viaduct of the disused railway as historic and essential parts of the landscape setting of the City."</i></p>	<p>The need to ensure the proper connection of the proposed new bridleway through to Compton Street/Compton is accepted and is referred to in the text accompanying Proposal W.10. Any possible routes for this, which can take cyclists and pedestrian users away from the heavily traffic Bushfield link road, would be preferred. The County Council support the proposed bridleway, but point out that a bridleway already exists along part of this route (Garnier Road to Hockley). This is acknowledged in paragraph 11.52 of the Plan, but there remain missing sections at Bar End and south of Hockley. It is, therefore, proposed that this Proposal should be retained unchanged.</p> <p>In terms of their care and maintenance, Hockley Viaduct and the Itchen Navigation represent quite distinct issues. The Viaduct is in the ownership and care of the City Council. It is currently managed in order to maintain the integrity and basic safety of the structure. With wider safety considerations uppermost, its future use as a dedicated public bridleway would require a more rigorous programme of repair and general maintenance. The Navigation fulfils several important functions not least, in terms of river catchment management. However, to seek to impose specific maintenance requirements on the number of different agencies involved in this issue is considered to be outside the scope of the Local Plan and would not be a 'land use' issue.</p> <p>Change Proposed – none.</p>
---	--

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

CHAPTER 11: WINCHESTER

Summary of Representation.
Change sought.

City Council's Response to Representation
Change Proposed
