

Winchester Heritage Centre

32 Upper Brook Street

Winchester

SO23 8DG

01962 851664

secretary@cityofwinchestertrust.co.uk



Chairman: Keith Leaman

20th June 2016

Ref No: 501668

Publication (Pre-Submission) Local Plan Part 2:
Development Management and Site Allocations

Further Written Submission

Soundness

The Trust does not consider the Plan is sound as set out in the following further representations:

Station Approach Area

Paragraph 3.7.19 and Policy WIN 5(iv) and 5(viii)

Not justified

WIN5(iv)

In its earlier submission the Trust commented on the parking arrangements in the Station Approach Area (The Area). Since then there has been an architectural competition for the development of the Area based on a brief prepared by Winchester City Council. This resulted in two architectural practices proposing schemes. These have been subject to assessment by officers of Winchester City Council to evaluate content and viability, followed by design evaluation by an appointed jury. There was also a public exhibition of both schemes in May. Members of the Trust attended the exhibition and following debate the Trust published its comments at the end of May.

The Trust was critical of the quality of the public exhibition which made it difficult to understand and compare the two schemes and one of the schemes omitted any information about the

Cattlemarket site. Nevertheless sufficient information was provided for the Trust to conclude that it has a number of significant concerns if either of the two schemes were to be implemented.

The major objection to both schemes was the mass of the buildings proposed especially on the Carfax site which would dwarf both the Hampshire Record Office, a large building compared with most buildings in Winchester and also the railway station. This has prompted the Trust to review the policies proposed in the Local Plan and it is comforting to see that WIN6 requires any development on the Carfax site to respect the Hampshire Record Office and Station buildings. But at the same time it is worrying that this requirement was not observed in either scheme and reminds the Trust of the widespread concern expressed about the height of the buildings proposed in the recently abandoned Silver Hill scheme. The Trust therefore believes the criteria restricting the height of buildings in WIN5(iv) needs to be revised to reinforce the need for all buildings to be of an appropriate scale on the Area to ensure that new development does respect existing adjoining buildings and to take in to account the difference in levels within the Carfax site where buildings on the higher land will have a greater impact on views and adjoining buildings. So an amendment is proposed shown below with the changes highlighted in red.

WIN5(viii)

A close look at the increase in the number of parking spaces proposed by the two schemes, suggests that the amount proposed on both sites and in particular on the Carfax site, is likely to be a major reason for the unacceptable height and considerably increased floor area of the proposed buildings. As scheme B is currently the one preferred by Winchester City Council, it is sensible to look at the number of parking spaces proposed there. The increase on the Carfax site in scheme B is 283%, from 108 public parking spaces now to a combined proposed total of public and private spaces of 414 spaces of which there would be 200 public spaces and 214 new private parking spaces. The increase in parking spaces on the Cattlemarket site is from 347 public spaces to 456 spaces for both public and private spaces. The guidance given for parking in the Local Plan is 'that the overall quantity of public parking spaces in the area is not reduced' and little is said about private parking provision. This reinforces the reasons for the changes the Trust proposed in its earlier comments to the wording on parking in this policy. The wording of Trust's earlier comments is as follows

'WIN5(viii) Delete reference to 'Council's adopted Parking Strategy' and the requirement to retain the existing amount of car parking. Include a requirement for consultation with the railway companies to establish whether they are proposing any more parking spaces on either side of the station and also consultation with HCC as transport authority.

'Also delete reference to retaining the existing amount of parking and include the requirement for an overall movement study to establish the amount and location of public car parking.'

Given the amount of private parking now being proposed in the Area, private parking needs to be considered by a movement study in addition to the amount of public car parking. All parking proposed needs to be justified and taken into account the proximity of railway and bus services and also, in due course, a park and ride service on Andover Road which is a requirement in the planning permission for the Barton Farm development.

Paragraph 3.7.19.

This paragraph refers to certain assumptions being made about the quantity of development that can be delivered in the Station Approach Area. The figures set out there should be re-examined in

the light of the outcome of the architectural competition which proposes buildings of such inappropriate scale and massing.

Proposed Changes in wording

WIN5(iv) assess the impact of buildings ~~over 3 storeys~~ on views and adjoining areas and do not exceed 4 ~~5~~ storeys in height, unless a taller building can be justified in townscape terms. Taller buildings are unlikely to be acceptable in close proximity to nearby residential properties

WIN5(viii) Delete this clause and require a movement study which should take in to account the proximity of bus and train services, the increased parking capacity of the station car parks and the planned park and ride site on Andover Road.