

Winchester District Local Plan Review

Analysis of Representations on the Deposit Plan

CHAPTER 15: GENERAL COMMENTS

Summary of Representation.
Change sought.

City Council's Response to Representation
Change Proposed

Issue 15.1 **General Comments (Whole Plan)**

Representation:

Basingstoke & Deane Borough Council (208/1)

Confirm that Basingstoke and Dean Borough Council have no comments to make on the revised plan at this stage.
Change Sought – none.

Swanmore Parish Council (1213/1)

Support the District Plan review. Pleased to see that no major development is proposed which would exacerbate problems with traffic, schools and shopping facilities. Pleased that the 'gaps' have been retained between the neighbouring villages and Swanmore.
Change sought – none.

M Waggott (1210/1)

Congratulate the Council on the obvious amount of care and attention it has given to the plan. Realise that houses have to go somewhere - if Barton Farm is to be used just make sure it is used sympathetically please.
Change sought – none.

C Fox (1206/1)

Support the Plan, in particular regard to the plans for the City of Winchester. However it's distinct character maybe lost unless there is more attention to the increasingly rapid loss of mature trees covering the City.
Change sought – not specified.

R G & S M Boddie (1207/1)

Support the whole Plan and in particular the boundary around Hambledon, which will limit the number of new houses that can be built. The village suffers from flooding, shortage of off-street parking and cottages with no access for cars, which a major increase in new houses would exacerbate.
Change sought – none.

J Hayter (138/17)

Overall the Plan is clearly written, the

City Council's Response to Representation

The various comments of general support are welcomed. The need to develop Winchester City (North) sympathetically, if it becomes necessary, is recognised. The issue of maintaining areas of tree-cover within Winchester is dealt with in response to objections to Chapter 11: Winchester. The comments by Southern Arts are taken to be supportive of the approaches and policies promoted by the Plan.

It is recognised that, in each case, the Plan's proposals represent positive statements of planning policy and must, therefore, take precedence over the accompanying text. The latter is specifically provided to support and give reasoned justification for each associated Proposal. In some cases it also amplifies and provides details of the requirements of the relevant proposal, but every effort has been made, therefore, to avoid any inconsistency in the Plan and to eliminate any unintended contradiction or modification of purpose. The respondent's specific objections are dealt with in other Issues.

The use of the terms 'proposal' and 'policy' can be somewhat confusing and are effectively interchangeable. However, it is considered that it would be more confusing to use both terms within the Plan. As the Plan is required to have a 'proposals map', the term 'proposal' was used, but it is accepted that most of the Plan's 'proposals' are in fact 'policies'. However, to change every proposal to a policy would, at this stage, involve a large number of revisions to the Plan and it is instead proposed that the Local Plan Inquiry Inspector will be asked to recommend that such a change be made.

A principal aim of the Plan is to achieve efficient use of developable land within the District's existing built-up areas, consistent with protecting the amenity value of recreational and other important open space and maintaining and enhancing the character and quality of the environment. Minor or 'incidental' areas of open space, often associated with earlier housing developments, may not always provide significant amenity or recreational benefits, and there are other areas of open or undeveloped land that were never intended as 'open space' as such. Some of these areas may be capable of making a useful contribution to 'urban capacity', without causing significant harm to the local environment. Nevertheless, it is proposed that a policy be re-introduced to protect areas of open space provided in conjunction with development, where these are of significant and genuine value to the area (see Issue 9.5, Recreation and Tourism).

The Government Office's concern is noted. The name of the Plan and its status were included on each page of the Deposit document, along with the year of publication. However, given that the City Council's name appears on the document's cover and that no other authority is responsible for producing local plans in the District, it is not considered necessary to include the authority's name on each page of the Revised Plan. Also, with reference to the date of publication, the processes of adopting a local plan are not likely to mean that there will be two versions of the Plan produced in the same year, so it is unnecessary to include a more precise date. If this does become a possibility, a more complete date will be included.

Winchester District Local Plan Review

Analysis of Representations on the Deposit Plan

CHAPTER 15: GENERAL COMMENTS

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

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

exceptions being as detailed in particular comments. Welcome it being made available in a variety of forms. The Plan is lengthy compared to RPG, with several proposals and supporting text duplicated. In some cases the text modifies the proposal itself, which it cannot do because the proposal takes precedence.

Change sought – not specified.

Church Commissioners (224/1)

Object to the term 'proposal' throughout the Plan for what are clearly 'policies'.

Change sought – review the use of 'proposal' and 'policy' and only use the former for allocations.

Sport England (South East) (312/1)

Welcome the reference to land allocations to meet identified serious shortfalls of recreational land in the Strategy of the Plan and the Design and Development Principles dealing with physical and social infrastructure. Generally support the Countryside, Recreation and Tourism, Transport and Housing proposals, although the statement "additional sources of urban capacity" may be found in "minor areas of open space" should be treated with caution.

Change sought – none.

GOSE (261/1)

PPG12 states that where possible, the name of the authority and type of plan, status of the document and date of production should be placed on every page of the document. It is not clear that this is the first deposit and the date refers to a year.

Change sought – include reference to name of authority, type of plan and status of the document on every page.

GOSE (261/2)

PPG12 refers to the incorporation of social considerations, to the extent that they are relevant to land use policies, for example social exclusion, need for schools, higher education, community facilities etc. The introductory chapters do not make clear that a full range of social considerations have been

The introductory Chapters of the Plan make it clear that the City Council is currently developing a Community Strategy for the District. This Strategy, together with other, related initiatives, pays particular attention to social and community considerations. Nevertheless. The Local Plan Review, which is a land-use document, already makes clear that where such matters are subject to the control of, or influence by the Plan, every effort will be made to achieve positive improvements to the environment and quality of life within the District and to address, by way of development and other means, local housing, business, leisure and other facility needs.

The District Local Plan Review is required generally to conform to the approved Hampshire County Structure Plan (Review). It cannot be certified as achieving this if its end-date exceeds that of the Structure Plan. Any extension of the Local Plan's duration, to compensate for the likely period of time still needed to reach its adoption, would result in the Local Plan no longer being in conformity with the Structure Plan.

A new Circular (ODPM 01/2003), regarding the safeguarding of aerodromes, has recently been published, coming into effect from 10th February 2003. The requirement for safeguarding refers to a map, which indicates areas surrounding airports where particular forms of development may cause a threat to the safe operation of the airport. The map shows various areas within which the Local Planning Authority is required to consult the airport operator for different types/heights of development.

The Circular outlines the procedures for consulting with the aerodrome operator regarding development within the safeguarded areas and describes the particular types of development for which it will be a requirement to consult. The Circular contains a requirement for local authorities to include a policy in their local plans stating that officially safeguarded areas have been established, that certain planning applications will be subject to consultation with the operator of the aerodrome and that there may be restrictions on development permitted as a result. There will also be a requirement to identify the safeguarding zones on Proposals Maps and to "state why an area has been safeguarded and that it is neither the responsibility nor the proposal of the local planning authority".

It is, therefore, necessary to include a new Proposal to cover this issue, together with required alterations to the Proposals Map. It is proposed that the new Proposal should be located within the Design & Development Principles Chapter (Chapter 3).

The generalised concerns of Railtrack are noted. Development, including possible Major Development Areas, which might be of a sufficient scale or nature to have some bearing on the running or maintenance of operational railway lines within the vicinity, would be the subject of formal consultations with Railtrack. Clearly, such consultations would take on added importance if any such development proposals were to require additional pedestrian or other crossing points, or an alteration to any existing crossing, whether at

Winchester District Local Plan Review

Analysis of Representations on the Deposit Plan

CHAPTER 15: GENERAL COMMENTS

Summary of Representation. *Change sought.*

City Council's Response to Representation *Change Proposed*

assessed.

Change sought – *illustrate that social considerations have been considered in formulating the Deposit Plan through the introductory chapters.*

GOSE (261/3)

PPG12 advises that the duration of a local plan should be 10 years from adoption. As the time frame for alterations is up until 2011, it is not clear how this requirement will be met.

Change sought – *not specified.*

GOSE (261/97)

The Plan does not contain reference to aerodrome and technical site safeguarding at Southampton Airport. Additional text is recommended.

Change sought – *add the following text:*

'The Council should consult the airport operator on planning applications for buildings or structures which exceed specified heights, and on planning applications for developments which might attract large numbers of birds, within the safeguarding area for Southampton Airport. It will consult National Air Traffic Services Ltd on planning applications for buildings or structures exceeding specified heights within the safeguarded area for Southampton Airport VOR.'

Railtrack PLC (298/4)

So far as development or works of any description on land adjacent to the railway are concerned, request that detailed plans showing the development work including, foundations, fencing, altered ground levels, landscaping and drainage arrangements are supplied to Railtrack. Railtrack do not encourage the provision, creation or development of open, recreational spaces adjacent to the railway. Furthermore any additional crossings should be provided in the form of a footbridge and not a level crossing.

Change sought – *not specified.*

Headbourne Worthy Parish Council (1128/1)

Object to the apparent omission of any policy regarding allotments. Within Headbourne Worthy Parish there are

grade or overhead. It is not, therefore, considered necessary to amend the Plan to provide specifically for such circumstances, which would be dealt with under normal development control procedures.

The objection by Headbourne Parish Council is noted. Proposals SF.5 and SF.6 of the Review Plan provide for the protection of existing allotments as community facilities and the creation of additional areas of allotment gardens. Government Planning Guidance (PPG17) advises local authorities that allotment sites should be included in the definition of areas of open space that are considered to be "of public value". As part of the proposed Open Space Review, a detailed survey will be carried out which will, in part, assess the extent and nature of allotment provision and usage within the District. It may, therefore, be possible for any positive outcomes from this Review to be referred to at a later stage in the emergence of the Local Plan.

The representation by the Prison Service is noted. It is understood that this representation is primarily intended to alert the City Council to the fact that a search process is being initiated, with the strategic aim of identifying a suitable location for an additional prison facility within southern Hampshire. However, such a search may not necessarily be focused on, or indeed give particular attention to, this District. Furthermore, it has been accepted by the Prison Service that such a complex and potentially sensitive undertaking should, at least in its initial phase, be conducted in a Regional or Sub-Regional context. In the light of this, Hampshire County Council has now been requested to engage with the Cities of Portsmouth and Southampton, as well as the Hampshire Districts, in order to co-ordinate discussion and further examination of this important issue.

Change Proposed – new Proposal and explanatory text:

Add new sub-heading, Proposal and paragraphs after existing Proposal DP.9.

Aerodrome safety

The Civil Aviation Authority has prepared 'Safeguarding Maps' around civil aerodromes. Within these areas, certain forms of development may potentially cause a hazard for the safe operation of the aerodrome. The safeguarding maps are used to advise local authorities where certain types of development may potentially be a threat. There are several different zones of safeguarding depending on the form of development proposed and the distance from the relevant aerodrome.

Some south-western parts of the District are subject to the safeguarded areas surrounding Southampton Airport, as shown on the Proposals Map and Inset Maps. The whole of the District is subject to a safeguarding area in relation to wind turbine development. The Airport operator will be consulted on planning applications relating to the developments specified within these areas (see paragraph below).

The forms of development that may cause concern within Winchester District are:

- *Developments over 90 metres, 45 metres or 15 metres in height within the appropriate safeguarded zones (see Proposals and*

Winchester District Local Plan Review

Analysis of Representations on the Deposit Plan

CHAPTER 15: GENERAL COMMENTS

Summary of Representation. *Change sought.*

City Council's Response to Representation *Change Proposed*

allotment gardens which are extremely well used with a waiting list of prospective plot holders.

Change sought – protect allotments within settlement boundaries.

H M Prison Service (1436/1)

The Prison service has identified the broad area of Winchester District as part of an area of strategic importance for additional prison places to serve the greater London area.

Change sought - HM Prison Service would like to submit formal representations seeking a policy/allocation for a new prison.

Southern Arts (1445/1)

Support the Plan's emphasis on sustainable, design-led and mixed development. There should be a range of approaches and outcomes including: the highest quality design and construction in buildings; an appropriate relationship between the natural/historic environment and public/private space; ensure the provision of accessible arts and cultural facilities.

Change sought – not specified.

Inset Maps);

- Development involving intense lighting (within 4.8km radius of the airport);
- Developments that attract large numbers of birds (such as landfill sites, sewage works, reservoirs and nature reserves) or applications connected with aviation uses (within 13km radius from the airport);
- Wind turbines, which may affect the operation of electrical equipment in addition to any issues related to their physical size (within 30km radius of the airport).

The Regulations require local planning authorities to consult with the relevant aerodrome operator before giving planning permission for certain prescribed forms of development within the safeguarded areas. The Proposal below is included in accordance with the requirements of the Town and Country Planning (Safeguarded Aerodromes, Technical Sites and Military Explosives Storage Areas) Direction 2002, but is neither the responsibility nor the proposal of the Local Planning Authority.

Proposal DP.xx

The Council will consult the operator of Southampton Airport on planning applications for certain types of development (summarised above) within the officially safeguarded areas established for the Airport (shown on the Proposals and Inset Maps). This may result in a refusal of planning permission, or in restrictions being placed on the proposed development, in the interests of securing the safe operation of the Airport.

Change Proposed – Proposals and Inset Maps:

Amend to show the 'aerodrome safeguarding areas'.

Issue 15.2 **General Comments** **(Countryside)**

Representation:

English Nature (251/5)

Recommend that a new proposal is added. 'Development including the re-use and adaptation of existing buildings which would have an adverse impact on species protected by schedules 1,5 and 8 of the Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 or badgers, will not be permitted until satisfactory safeguards for these species can be agreed with English Nature and/or DEFRA'.

Change sought – include new proposal as stated above.

English Nature (251/11)

City Council's Response to Representation

It is considered that, overall, the Plan's group of Proposals relating to nature conservation (C.8-C.10) and their explanatory text, make sufficiently robust provision for the protection and enhancement of sites, habitats and ecological networks. In a large number of instances these are also subject to formal designations confirming their local, national or international importance. The detailed comments made by English Nature and others in relation to the Plan's nature conservation proposals have resulted in several changes being made to these proposals (see Issues 4.24-4.26). The Plan now contains a comprehensive range of proposals dealing with all relevant aspects of nature conservation and it is not considered necessary to add further detail by making the changes proposed here.

English Nature's comment about Proposal S.17 is noted, but the Proposal does require that the adjacent SSSI is protected and cross-refers to the relevant countryside policy. It would not necessarily be appropriate for this proposed development to be required to enhance an off-site feature such as the SSSI, nor clear how this would be achieved. Therefore, no addition is considered necessary. The comment regarding Proposal T.12 is noted and is similar to one made by the Wildlife Trust. This is responded to at Issue 10.21.

Winchester District Local Plan Review

Analysis of Representations on the Deposit Plan

CHAPTER 15: GENERAL COMMENTS

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

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

Winchester City Council should, when proposing these types of works, ensure that any proposals enhance rather than simply maintain SSSI interest features. (Subsequently clarified that this comment relates to Proposal S.17).

Change sought – *Change the wording to read 'enhance' rather than protect.*

English Nature (251/12)

There is insufficient information to allow us to form an opinion on whether this proposal will be good for nature conservation. (Subsequently clarified that this comment relates to Proposal T.12).

Change sought – *not specified.*

East Hants AONB JAC (1248/1)

No policies appear to cover signs, advertising or exterior lighting in rural areas. Needed in order to protect rural areas from light pollution and the cumulative impact of signs and advertising.

Change sought – *addition a policy to protect rural areas from a plethora of signs. Internally illuminated signs should not be permitted in rural areas. Conditions should be imposed on all development in rural areas restricting the use of flood lighting.*

Eastleigh Borough Council (1427/5)

Concerned that no nature conservation designations are identified on the Proposals Map. This may cause confusion along the District boundary, where designations will be shown in the Eastleigh Borough Plan.

Change sought – *add nature conservation designations to the Proposals Map.*

As the result of a proposed change to Proposal DP.13 (Chapter 3: Design and Development Principles), which deals with developments which may give rise to various forms of unacceptable 'pollution', 'light pollution' will be resisted. The Plan already contains policies that seek to avoid development (which could include signs) that is harmful to the AONB, and to the character of rural areas generally. The Landscape Assessment will also help to emphasise such issues. It is considered that these policies, and the change proposed, will achieve the protection sought by the respondent.

It is correct that nature conservation designations are not shown on the Proposals Map. The reasons for this are set out in response to objections to the Countryside Chapter (see Issue 4.24). It is concluded that such designations should continue not to be shown on the Proposals Map.

Change Proposed – *none.*

Issue 15.3 **General Comments** **(Housing)**

Representation:

Environment Agency (253/2)

The Agency considers that an additional paragraph should be included, outlining

City Council's Response to Representation

The Plan already contains policies seeking to prevent pollution, in particular DP.13. The explanatory text to this Proposal advises applicants to contact the Environment Agency for advice, but to include advice on septic tanks or other detailed issues is considered to be going into more detail than would be appropriate for the Local Plan. The Plan also requires that adequate infrastructure is provided by developers to serve their proposed development. It is, therefore, concluded that it is not necessary or appropriate to include detailed references to the acceptability of septic tanks.

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

CHAPTER 15: GENERAL COMMENTS

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

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

the concerns over a proliferation of septic tanks in new development. This form of sewage disposal is not sustainable, a view supported by DETR Circular 03/99.

Change sought – add new paragraph (after 6.33): 'Where possible, all housing development should be encouraged to connect to existing adequate sewage provision to reduce the proliferation of septic tank discharges.Where this is not possible, the proliferation of high numbers of septic tanks discharges in a small area (i.e. a village) should lead to appraisal of whether first time rural sewerage is required for the area.'

Bishops Waltham Society (212/1)

The brownfield capacity for housing has been well demonstrated, but it has not been equally well demonstrated that sufficient capacity will come forward during the plan period. A balance needs to be struck between avoiding greenfield development and over developing the urban areas. Some existing proposals are not carried forward in whole or in part as intended.

Change sought – not specified.

Estates Practice, Hampshire County Council (1434/1)

The document concentrates on issues of residential development and the nature that this might take in considerable detail. However, the accommodation of other land-uses and their integration are only lightly covered in the document.

Change sought – further details of other land-uses such as employment, retail and leisure, sport, recreation and tourism to be included within the Plan.

Estates Practice, Hampshire County Council (1434/2)

Local Plan processes and documents are all too often dominated by housing.

Change sought – Local Plan processes should be more holistic and approach the future of the borough from the point of view of the communities rather than just issues and chapters based on land use and transport divisions.

Estates Practice, Hampshire County

It is impossible to prove that a certain number of dwellings will be provided on 'brownfield' sites in the Plan period. As the respondent says, the capacity for such development has been shown. The responses to objections concerning the Urban Capacity Study show that the necessary level of development is likely to come forward (see Issue 6.4). The fact that sites do not yet have planning permission does not mean that they cannot gain it during the Plan period. The purpose of the Local Plan is to put in place policies that will allow 'brownfield' sites to come forward and ensure that there is no unnecessary planning impediment to sites gaining permission.

Regular Housing Monitoring Reports will be produced to track the development of urban capacity and other development opportunities and to assess these against the assumptions made in the Plan. This may require corrective action that, at one extreme, could include a review of the Plan to bring forward greenfield sites in accordance with a sequential approach. However, Government advice is that there is no need to search for additional sites beyond those needed to meet strategic requirements and there is, therefore, no need to identify additional greenfield sites at this stage.

Objections to the alleged failure to carry forward specific proposals are dealt with in response to detailed objections.

The objections by Respondent 1434 are noted. The need for the Plan to pay detailed attention to housing provision within the District stems, partly, from the fact that this form of land-use activity is subject to certain specific requirements, imposed by Regional Planning Guidance and translated to the County level by the Hampshire County Structure Plan (Review). Such requirements, which set the strategic framework for the provision of new housing, are reinforced by the need for the Plan to comply with and incorporate, planning guidance issued by central Government. Currently, such guidance plays a considerable part in influencing the general form of housing development, as well as more detailed issues of density, highways/parking standards and design. Notwithstanding this, the Plan also gives thorough consideration to other elements of land-use activity, such as the provision of employment, sport and leisure and other services and facilities. However, for uses in such categories, it would generally be less appropriate for the Plan to be prescriptive, particularly in terms of location-specific requirements.

Given this balance of factors, it is considered that the Plan provides a suitable framework for the provision of a wide spectrum of uses and activities, in a manner most appropriate to meet the economic, social and community needs of the District. Furthermore, it is considered that the Plan and its proposals are sufficiently responsive to changing needs and other contingencies that may arise in the future with regard to educational and social care facilities, both in terms of their overall provision and distribution within the District.

Change Proposed – none.

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

CHAPTER 15: GENERAL COMMENTS

Summary of Representation.
Change sought.

City Council's Response to Representation
Change Proposed

Council (1434/3)

The County Council owns a large number of service properties within the District, which are related to the delivery of educational and social care needs. As a result, the Plan should contain greater flexibility in respect of future housing provision.

Change sought – add a new policy supporting rationalisation and reuse of surplus property.

Issue 15.4
General Comments
(Transport)

City Council's Response to Representation

This representation corresponds to a similar objection made by ESSO Petroleum, which has already been dealt with in the responses under Chapter 10: Transport (see Issue 10.1).

Representation:

Change Proposed – none.

B Eastoe (1449/1)

Object to the proposed motorway service area at Meon Valley being removed from the Draft Local Plan.

Change sought – include an allocation for a Motorway Service Area at the Meon Valley.

Issue 15.5
General Comments
(Appendix 1)

City Council's Response to Representation

It is accepted that Appendix 1 is not entirely clear as to whether Village Design Statements are Supplementary Planning Guidance. A number of VDSs have now been adopted as SPG and the Appendix should be amended to make it clear that these (along with Development Briefs and Masterplans) are indeed SPG.

Representation:

Itchen Valley Parish Council (286/8), P Windsor-Aubrey (335/9)

It is not clear which documents are included in the heading "Supplementary Planning Guidance" on page 151. It appears that only those listed on page 151 are included, but it was understood that village design statements had also been given this status. The Itchen Valley Management Strategy should be adopted as SPG.

Change sought – revise headings on pages 151 and 152 to show which documents are supplementary planning guidance. This should also include the Itchen Valley Management Strategy as supplementary planning guidance.

The Itchen Valley Management Strategy was not adopted as Supplementary Planning Guidance when it was produced. It is primarily a management document and could not, therefore, legitimately be adopted as SPG. The Strategy is listed under the 'Other Background Documents' heading, which is the appropriate location for it.

Change Proposed – Appendix 1:

Amend headings to make it clear that Supplementary Planning Guidance includes Village Design Statements and Development Briefs & Masterplans.

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

CHAPTER 15: GENERAL COMMENTS

Summary of Representation.
Change sought.

City Council's Response to Representation
Change Proposed

Issue 15.6

General Comments **(Appendix 2)**

Representation:

Ramblers Association – Winchester Group (1254/5)

Support last bullet point of the Dever River Valley: Landscape Management Strategy but would request that they be consulted when the detailed planning commences.

Change sought – none.

Environment Agency (253/38)

The wording for the two sections which relate to river valleys (Dever, Itchen/Meon) contains a significant inaccuracy. They are not 'nutrient rich' and this wording should be deleted.

Change sought – Appendix 2.

Dever River Valley: Key Characteristics.

- *Clear alkaline, spring river supporting...*

Management Strategies

- *Conservation of the rich bio-diversity associated with the clear spring water.*

River Valleys: Itchen/Meon Key Characteristics

- *...Nature conservation value of clear alkaline spring water....*
- *...rise in chalk with clear spring water....*
- *...valley sides; watercress beds in alkaline water....*

River Valleys: Itchen/Meon Landscape Management Strategies

- *flora and fauna associated with the clear spring water arising*

Environment Agency (253/39)

The fifth bullet point for the Itchen/Meon character Area, starting 'The rivers rise...' and listing habitats has no equivalent bullet point for the Dever. All of the habitats listed occur in the Dever Valley with similar frequency as they are found in the Itchen/Meon valleys and the Agency considers that they merit similar consideration.

Change sought – Dever River Valley: Key Characteristics (new bullet point)

City Council's Response to Representation

Appendix 2 of the Deposit Local Plan indicated that a Landscape Assessment was being undertaken and set out a number of Key Characteristics and Management Strategies for different Landscape Character Areas. These were taken either from the Landscape Assessment Pilot Study or from Hampshire County Council's 'The Hampshire Landscape: A Strategy for the Future'. Since the publication of the Deposit Plan, the Landscape assessment has been drafted and will be published for consultation with the Revised Deposit Local Plan. Appendix 2 will, therefore, be replaced and the Landscape Assessment will be available for comment. Detailed responses to the points made have not, therefore, been made, but the issues raised were taken into account in drafting the Landscape Assessment.

Objections to the inclusion of land within the defined countryside, and/or its exclusion from settlement boundaries, are dealt with in responses under Countryside or Housing Issues.

Change Proposed – Appendix 2:

Replace Appendix 2 with Landscape Strategies and Built Form Strategies from the draft Winchester District Landscape Assessment 2003.

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

CHAPTER 15: GENERAL COMMENTS

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

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

-
- *The rivers rise in chalk with clear spring water supporting rich aquatic flora and fauna. Rich and diverse habitats along floodplains including unimproved neutral grassland, grazing marshes, reed beds, fen vegetation, carr, swamps, numerous ponds and lakes, and ephemeral headwaters. Occasional ancient woodlands on valley sides and floor.*

Environment Agency (253/40)

The Agency objects to the omission from the Dever Key Characteristics of the recreational facilities listed under the Itchen and Meon. The Dever supports fisheries, views and public access and significant riverside footpaths (e.g. at Bransbury, Micheldever and Sutton Scotney).

Change sought – *Dever River Valley: Key Characteristics. (new bullet point)*

- *Recreational facilities including fishing; also nature reserves and hillside view points with public access and major valley footpaths.*

Environment Agency (253/41)

The Landscape Management Strategies for the Itchen / Meon relating to habitats, water levels, wetland pastures, and woodlands are all considered to be as relevant and important to the Dever as they are to the Itchen and the Meon and should be included in the Dever section.

Change sought –

- *The diverse range of wildlife habitats particularly on the floodplains, including unimproved grazing marshes, reed beds, fen vegetation, carr, swamps, numerous ponds and lakes, ephemeral headwaters and occasional ancient woodlands; also, rich aquatic flora and fauna associated with the clear spring water arising in the chalk; enhance biological diversity especially within areas of intensive farming with particular low biodiversity levels.*

Environment Agency (253/42)

Appendix 2, 8. River Valleys: Itchen /

Winchester District Local Plan Review

Analysis of Representations on the Deposit Plan

CHAPTER 15: GENERAL COMMENTS

Summary of Representation. *Change sought.*

City Council's Response to Representation *Change Proposed*

Meon Key Characteristics. Bullet five – the list of habitats should also include 'ephemeral headwaters'. These headwaters (winterbournes) are typical of the chalk river landscape, and support rare and specialised wildlife which can be extremely vulnerable to impacts associated with development. Ephemeral headwaters should also be added to the Landscape Management Strategies.

Change sought –

- *Neutral grassland, grazing marshes, reed beds, fen vegetation, carr, swamps, numerous ponds and lakes, and ephemeral headwaters.*

River Valleys: Itchen / Meon Landscape Management Strategies (bullet four)

- *...including unimproved grazing marshes, reed beds, fen vegetation, carr, swamps, numerous ponds and lakes, ephemeral headwaters, and occasional ancient woodland.*

Environment Agency (253/43)

Page 257 states that one Landscape Management Strategy is the 'restoration of disused watercress beds'. The agency considers that this statement is too vague as it does not state what the disused watercress beds will be restored to.

Change sought – a clear indication of what form of restoration is acceptable should be included.

George Wimpey UK Ltd. (473/4)

Land at Albany Farm, Bishops Waltham has a number of built structures and development would be well related to the built environment. The site does not relate to the open countryside.

Change sought – include the site within the H.2 policy boundary.

Redrow Homes (Southern) Ltd. (474/2)

Land at Francis Gardens, Winchester does not relate to the open countryside.

Change sought – include the site within the H.2 policy boundary.

Charles Planning Associates (227/18)

At present, the Landscape Character Area Key Characteristics are too vague

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

CHAPTER 15: GENERAL COMMENTS

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

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

and should not form part of the Development Plan. The Character Assessment should be undertaken at the earliest opportunity, in order to support specific policy proposals to be included within the Development Plan.

Change sought – *The character Assessment should be undertaken at the earliest opportunity.*

Issue 15.7 **General Comments** **(Appendix 3)**

Representation:

None.

City Council's Response to Representation

There have been no representations concerning the Sustainability Appraisal at Appendix 3. However, as some of the Plan's proposals have been changed or deleted, and others added, the Appendix needs to be updated.

Change Proposed – Appendix 3:

Amend Appendix 3 to take account of new, changed or deleted Proposals.

Issue 15.8 **General Comments** **(Glossary)**

Representation:

Environment Agency (253/44)

Suggest a correction of the definition of the Environment Agency.

Change sought – *amend to read:*
Environment Agency (EA): A Government agency whose primary aim is to protect and improve the environment and contribute towards sustainable development through the integrated management of air, land and water. The Agency has specific responsibilities for water resources, pollution prevention and control, flood defence, fisheries, conservation of wetland wildlife and waterside recreation.

A Foster (878/4)

The affordable housing definition does not accord with that in Circular 6/98. 'Built-up area' is not defined. 'Urban area' is not defined. 'Gross' and 'Net' density are not defined.

Change sought - *affordable housing – explain why the plan has a more restrictive definition. 'Built-up area' –*

City Council's Response to Representation

It is accepted that the definition of the Environment Agency should be amended, as proposed by the Agency.

The term 'affordable housing' is defined in the Plan and the definition is based on that proposed by the consultant that undertook the Housing Needs Assessment. It relates to housing needs in Winchester District and is justified in the Plan. It should, therefore, be retained.

It is accepted that it would be beneficial to define the term 'built-up area'. This should be defined as the areas within defined settlement boundaries and development frontages (H.2 and H.3). The Local Plan does not use the term 'urban area' and it need not therefore be defined. The Urban Capacity Study explains what constitutes urban capacity.

Gross and net density is explained in the Glossary, although in view of the addition to Proposal DP.3 relating to the exclusion of areas that are important to the character of the wider area, it would be beneficial to add to the definition, as suggested by the respondent.

Change Proposed – Glossary:

Add new entry in Glossary for 'Built-up Area'.

Built-up Area: an area within a settlement defined by a policy boundary (Proposal H.2) or development frontage (Proposal H.3).

Environment Agency (EA): A Government agency responsible for: conserving and managing water resources; river pollution control; flood defences; protection of freshwater fisheries; water conservation and recreation as well as pollution control and other activities. whose primary aim is to protect and improve the environment and contribute towards sustainable development through the integrated

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

CHAPTER 15: GENERAL COMMENTS

Summary of Representation.
Change sought.

City Council's Response to Representation
Change Proposed

define and explain the policy significance of the boundary. 'Gross' and 'Net' density – explain the difference (using PPG3 Annex C as a basis) but clarify on a local basis that the net area of a site does not include retained existing landscape features.

management of air, land and water. The Agency has specific responsibilities for water resources, pollution prevention and control, flood defence, fisheries, conservation of wetland wildlife and waterside recreation.

Density: The accommodation per unit of area of land. Density in residential areas is generally expressed as dwellings per hectare. Densities may be expressed as gross or net according to whether ancillary uses and activities such as open space and planting belts are included. The Local Plan seeks to avoid net densities of less than 30 dwellings per hectare. In measuring net density, features of the site that make an important contribution to the wider area (e.g. important trees) can be excluded (see Proposal DP.3).
