

# **Winchester District Local Plan Part 2 – Development Management and Site Allocations**

## **Examination – July 2016**

Winchester City Council

Response to Inspectors Questions:

**Matter 10      Colden Common**

**Question i) and ii)**

**Library Reference: WCCFS10**



## **Matter 10: COLDEN COMMON – Policy CC1**

### **Inspector's Questions:**

- i) Are the policies and proposals for growth and change in this area appropriate and justified, including in relation to the NPPF/PPG, and in terms of environmental, economic and social impacts?
- ii) Are they clear and deliverable, including in respect of the associated infrastructure requirements?

### **Introduction and background**

Colden Common is broadly shaped by a triangle of roads (Appendix 1) and lies on the edge of the South Downs National Park (SDNP) which wraps around three sides - to the west, north and east of the village. It has a good range of facilities which are spread around the village and are accessible on foot and by bicycle.

As one of the larger villages in the District it has a development requirement set in LPP1 (OD7) under Policy MTRA2 which specifies *'provision for about 250 new homes'* and that development needs should be met *'within existing settlement boundaries in the first instance'*.

The capacity for development within the existing settlement boundary was assessed: the results (as paragraph 4.3.4 of the Local Plan) are at Appendix 2. Since the LPP2 was published housing development has been completed (Dunfords), dwellings are under construction (Apex Centre) and authorisation to grant planning consent given for most of the Policy CC1 allocation at Sandyfields subject to final detailed highway matters and S106 agreement – see Appendix 2, Table 2.

Following community involvement during 2013 and 2014, a single site allocation was made in the Draft LPP2 (Policy CC1) to meet the outstanding LPP1 dwelling requirements and the need for sustainable development in line with the NPPF/PPG. Policy CC2 in the Consultation Draft Plan, concerning a site for Travellers, was replaced with the Clayfield Park Housing Allocation (for the SHLAA sites within the settlement boundary) in the Publication (Pre-Submission) Plan following consultation on the Draft Plan.

### **Key issues raised in representations**

#### **Appraisal of Alternatives**

Representations refer to the process of considering alternative sites and suggest that this has not been fully carried out or has been accorded less weight than local preferences.

### Community Consultation

Some respondents comment on the consultation process, that the views expressed in the consultation carried out by Commonview do not represent those of most of the community of Colden Common due to the number of responses; or that the responses have been misinterpreted in reporting the outcome.

### Allocated and Alternative Sites

Representations seek the allocation of alternative/additional sites; for additional flexibility beyond the total 250 dwelling requirement or as part of a strategy of dispersing growth around the village rather than concentrating the allocation at Sandyfields (CC1). Comments suggest that the evidence doesn't point to this being the most sustainable location (including distance to facilities, particularly the school) and that it's the wrong side of Main Road. Other concerns include the amount of housing on one site and resulting density in order to accommodate on-site open space and constraints; the impact on the shape of the settlement, recreational impact on the adjoining ancient woodland, and claim that the allocation is not supported by the SDNP Authority. Representors therefore consider that given its proximity to the SDNP and other constraints, the allocation of 165 dwellings should be reduced. On Clayfield Park (CC2) comments are that due to existing (and previous) uses it cannot deliver the allocated 53 dwellings.

### Settlement Boundary

Representations seek amendments to the settlement boundary to enable their site to be developed, or to recognise an extant planning permission.

## **Site Selection and Allocation**

The [Housing Site Assessment Methodology](#) (EBT4) sets out the approach to identifying sites, with the settlement specific summary for Colden Common at section 7. Specific evidence was collated for various matters such as transport (EBKW1,2), landscape sensitivity (EBKW3), open space (EBKW4), historic environment (EBKW5) and an initial sustainability appraisal (SA5c) assessment of effects of the alternative sites. These documents, constraints mapping and other data can also be viewed under the [Background work with Parishes on LPP2](#). The early public consultation undertaken during 2013, including community workshops where alternative sites were compared, was carried out by "Commonview", a Community Engagement Group of volunteers established by the Colden Common Parish Council. This is "early and meaningful engagement" as in the NPPF paragraph 155. Documents relating to the outcomes of the various events are added to library as EBCC16-22.

Of the sites outside the settlement boundary, the Sandyfields site remained the one most favoured throughout that engagement period and was forwarded to WCC for inclusion in the Draft Local Plan following the Parish Council's decision on 3 March 2014 (EBCC22).

Details of the community involvement are set out in the [Council's Regulation 18 Consultation Statement \(OD5\)](#): section 3 provides a summary for Colden

Common up to the Draft Plan stage and the [Regulation 18 Consultation Statement Part 2 \(OD2\)](#) describes the consultation on the draft plan and up to the Publication (Pre-Submission) Plan. The Council cannot require or force people to respond and its conclusions about public views must be based on the responses it receives. The Parish Council worked closely with the City Council on the consultation and is the elected body responsible for representing the 'community view'. Colden Common Parish Council supports the outcome of the consultation and the subsequent LPP2.

Some representations suggest that the number of people responding to the early consultation on the shortlisted sites was not enough to give a clear mandate for site selection or avoiding the requirement to objectively assess the competing sites. The Council has undertaken an objective assessment of the sites and has not used the consultation process to avoid this, or as a substitute for it. The public consultation was undertaken so that account could be taken of the public's views, alongside (not instead of) the evidence base and the consideration of the sites as alternatives. This is illustrated by the [Report to Cabinet Local Plan Committee CAB 2711\(LP\) 16 September 2015 \(WCC3\)](#). Appendix 1 to Appendix C of WCC3 assesses each site against the selection criteria, with the results of community consultation forming one of the criteria, which was considered along with other selection criteria.

The SA provides an assessment of the possible impacts of various options and identifies potential mitigation, but the sustainability objectives are not site selection criteria and the SA should not be used as an alternative to the site selection criteria. It has been suggested that the alternatives should have been revisited when the capacity of Sandyfields was increased. However, having selected the site it was reasonable to further consider its capacity and conclude that it was not necessary to sacrifice greenfield sites in open countryside if an already developed site could accommodate the required number of dwellings. Similarly, despite it being a local rather than national designation, the existence of the SINC covering the land adjoining Glen Park means there are more preferable locations not as constrained<sup>1</sup>. Furthermore, despite some suggestion to the contrary the outcome of the early engagement did not point to an expressed preference for a dispersed development strategy.

While the responses from some of the 'omission site' promoters suggest that policy CC1 is not sound, their arguments amount to disagreements with the performance of their sites against certain selection criteria, rather than demonstrating that policy CC1 is not sound. Indeed, most suggest that their sites should be allocated in addition to CC1 and, in any event, the Sandyfields allocation has now been tested through the planning application. While representations raise concerns about the legality of this decision the planning consent has not yet been issued and a request to the Secretary of State to call in the application has been declined – see Appendix 3.

---

<sup>1</sup> Ecosa Report (October 2015) (see Farthing representation) indicates a mosaic of National Vegetation Classification habitat areas and types across the site with associated dispersed noteworthy flora and fauna.

## **Policy CC1 – Sandyfields Housing Allocation**

The planning application for the Sandyfields site has been determined and in doing so the Council has confirmed the allocation of the Sandyfields site in the LPP2 for 165 dwellings. The owners have commented in support that the site will be available as soon as the allocation is confirmed. Developer Foreman Homes has provided a draft programme for completion of the planning process through to the start on site in August 2017 (Appendix 4) and has indicated annual build-out rates with completion in 2021/22 (Appendix 5).

Given the remaining term of the LPP2 up to 2031, the commitment by the developer and that it is not a requirement that all allocated sites are deliverable within the first 5 years, there is no need to allocate any additional site(s) for “flexibility” or any other reason. If there is any significant variation in provision from the allocation in either CC1 or CC2, in the light of updated housing needs, it will be a matter for plan monitoring and review.

The Sandyfields site (275/2495) scores best or equal best on most of the key criteria. Also of particular note:

- The majority of the site is already in development uses up to the SDNP boundary and most of the rest had planning consent to extend the caravan storage (Appendix 6);
- The view from Main Road is limited and is of built development;
- The view from Colden Common Park (Appendix 7) is of caravans beyond the tree-lined boundary and is well screened from wider views from the SDNP.

Accessibility is one criterion where Sandyfields does not score well. Policy CP10 states that, “Development should be located and designed to reduce the need to travel” and encourages the use of non-car modes. Neither the policy nor the text specifies a distance figure. The [Manual for Streets](#) in paragraph 4.4.1 describes walkable neighbourhoods as typically having a range of facilities within 10 minutes walk (up to about 800m) but states, “However this is not an upper limit”. While the Transport Accessibility Assessment (EBCC1/EBCC2) concentrated on measuring distances to the Primary School, Co-op shop / Post Office and Community Centre, at Upper Moors Road and St Vigor Way on the west side of the village, there are various other facilities along or near Main Road. On Main Road these include the Recreation Ground (children’s play, football and tennis), Hair and Beauty Salon, Dentist (not NHS), Village Garage and Eclipse Car Sales, with the Wessex Business Park and Holy Trinity Church at the southern end. The Doctors Surgery and a Pharmacy shop are along the eastern end with the Rising Sun PH and Methodist Church in the middle of Spring Lane.

Star Planning (Bray/Brook) provide a Site Appraisal Matrix however this is heavily weighted towards accessibility criteria to show site 1874 ranked 1<sup>st</sup>. While this weighting and the omission of such as brownfield or landscape criteria is questionable it is interesting to note that site 1871 is ranked below 275 (Sandyfields) and site 2561 is in last place.

Policy CP7 states, “New housing development should make provision for public open space ... in accordance with the most up to date standards” and in paragraph 7.46 refers to seeking local improvements “where deficiencies have been identified in particular types of facility”. Colden Common Park (Boyces Lane, off Main Road) is the largest area of public open space serving the village and includes football pitches, a cricket pitch and bowling rink. The allocated sites are the closest to this facility however the provision of on-site open space at Sandyfields, together with the adjoining woodland, can meet both the development’s needs and the shortfall of informal/natural green space at Colden Common (see Appendix 8). The criticism regarding the distance to the nearest play area and whether this is within the CP7 accessibility standard is therefore irrelevant.

The Landscape Sensitivity Appraisal (EBCC3) sets out the key landscape issues for the South Winchester Downs Landscape Character Area as:

- “Proximity of SDNP to the eastern boundary of Colden Common and the landscape setting of the national park, and
- Development within or adjacent to woodlands on the eastern edge of Colden Common.”

Notwithstanding this, the summary of landscape sensitivity explains the assessment of Sandyfields as “*moderately sensitive* as an existing caravan storage area, existing development and land with planning permission”.

The Landscape and Public Open Space Strategy for the planning application establishes the design principles and describes the approach and concept behind the landscape zones, and illustrates how the indicative layout can handle the incorporation of trees and other planting, greening the street scene with species that can provide food for residents and wildlife, and protection of roots etc. The Indicative Site Layout (Appendix 9) shows the protected species corridor around the site perimeter which is 15m wide alongside Stratton’s Copse, in accordance with the Standing Advice for Ancient Woodland (section 6.4), providing an appropriate transition to the woodland and SDNP.

The Woodland Management Plan for the planning application, in accordance with CC1, allows the adjacent area of ancient woodland to be respected and safeguarded while enabling it to contribute to the open space shortfall (Appendix 10). Liaison with the SDNPA has been ongoing since the start of the LPP2 process and while concerns were raised on the planning application the SDNPA maintains its support for the policy requirement to promote a housing density and layout which respects the location in relation to the National Park but refers to the designations associated with the adjoining Stratton’s Copse. The NPA is “happy for some access to Stratton’s Copse but this access needs to be sensitively managed.” And, “The open space requirements ... should not rely solely on the copse for this provision, given the highlighted sensitivities of which further studies have increased awareness; a suitable buffer will be required. If an appropriate green infrastructure strategy accompanies the scheme then this should not create an issue to the deliverability of the site and the NPA is willing to work

proactively with the Council in achieving this.” The NPA refers to Stratton’s Copse being designated a SINC, home to protected species, contains semi-natural ancient woodland and is within a SSSI Impact Risk Zone; that this should be referenced in paragraph 4.3.15 and addressed through appropriate policy criteria but does not suggest wording for this.

Policy CP19 expects that development adjoining the SDNP which would have a significant detrimental impact on the setting and landscape is not permitted unless it is of over-riding national importance, or its impact can be mitigated. Apart from the woodland which adjoins the site, to which there is currently no public access, the SDNP is actually further away from the Sandyfields site than most of the other alternative sites. The view of the site from Colden Common Park near to the boundary of the SDNP is currently that of the stored caravans; it is not one of countryside free of development. The caravans are parked up to the boundary of the site adjoining Stratton’s Copse whereas the Sandyfields scheme provides for a broad swathe of green space alongside the Copse and for reinforcement of planting along the boundaries in accordance with LPP2 Policy CC1. The purposes of the SDNP include conserving and enhancing the natural beauty and wildlife and promoting opportunities for the understanding and enjoyment of its special qualities by the public. In this regard the woodland access strategy aims to provide a nature walk with some interpretation as referenced in Appendix 10.

The housing density at 30 dwellings per hectare would respect the location of the site in relation to the National Park, particularly as the need to maintain an easement for the water main sets dwellings back some distance from Stratton’s Copse and the National Park boundary.

The existing use for caravan storage does not require the Council to make alternative provision for the storage. Relative to the size of the site in question the storage use provides minimal employment and does not provide tourist accommodation therefore there is no conflict with LPP1 Policies MTRA1 and MTRA2.

Regarding loss of employment uses, the permitted uses of the Sandyfields site do not generally fall within the ‘B’ use classes (see Appendix 11) and therefore Policy CP9 is not generally applicable. Even if a part of the site does fall within a ‘B’ class, then the policy includes that losses will only be permitted where retaining a business use would not be reasonable having regard to a number of considerations. These include the strength of local demand for the type of accommodation and the benefits of the proposed use compared to the benefits of retaining the existing use. In this case the benefits of the proposed use, i.e. housing development to meet the needs set out in the LPP1, outweigh the benefits of retaining the existing use.

Historic England requests a specific criterion relating to archaeology. The Council’s approach is only to include a specific archaeological requirement where there is known interest rather than where there is just ‘potential’. The Local Plan contains sufficient policies to ensure that appropriate conditions are attached to planning consents and to require necessary investigation (CP20 and DM25). Agreement has been reached with Historic England that

this approach is appropriate - see WCCSCG01 (amendment to paragraph 4.3.18.)

Natural England suggests adding “landscaping” to the masterplan requirements in CC1, due to close proximity to the SDNP. There is already specific reference in CC1 to reinforcing planting along boundaries.

## **Policy CC2**

SHLAA sites 888 and 889 are now included in the LPP2 as an allocation under Policy CC2, with the justification set out in the Cabinet Report (WCC3). The owner has confirmed support for housing development through the SHLAA 2015 update and supports allocation in LPP2, subject to the retention of an element of commercial use, but suggests an addition to include the requirement for a masterplan. A modest reduction in the number of dwellings will keep within the “about 250” requirement.

## **Settlement Boundary**

The LPP1 expects any review of settlement boundaries or site allocations, where necessary, to be through LPP2 and this approach is consistent with the conclusions of the LPP1 Inspector’s Report and the approach promoted in the NPPF.

Land at Trellisick was not put forward during the call for sites at the start of the LPP2 process and not made known to WCC as a request to include this plot (existing dwelling and rest of plot) within the settlement boundary until the representation in December 2015. Since then a Certificate of Lawful Use or Development has been issued such that lawful implementation of a planning permission (dating from 1986) for two further dwellings can go ahead without the need for any alteration to the settlement boundary.

Consultation Draft LPP2 (OD4) included some proposed revisions to the settlement boundary at Colden Common, as recommended by the Settlement Boundary Review 2014 (EBT5). Following the receipt of objections to the relocation of the settlement boundary a review was undertaken of the area in relation to the principles for the inclusion or otherwise of land within the settlement boundary. The outcome of this was for the settlement boundary to revert in the Publication (Pre-Submission) LPP2 to its original position. An addendum to the Settlement Boundary Review (EBT6), setting out the revised assessment, was also published at the same time. Further detail with respect to land to the rear of Main Road is set out in Appendices 12-14.

SHLAA site 2497 (rear of Main Road) was omitted from further consideration as undeliverable because the majority of landowners did not support its development.

Allocations have been made to meet the requirements of LPP1 and the settlement boundary amended as necessary such that no further changes are needed.

## **Conclusion**

The preparation of this part of LPP2 has an extensive evidence base, both factual assessments and local community engagement. The policies express the necessary detail to achieve well planned and considered developments without being overly prescriptive, whilst allowing for flexibility, in accordance with NPPF para 154.

Policy CC1 was amended and Policy CC2 added at the Pre-Submission stage to reflect the SA and representations received. They requires the provision of infrastructure, as highlighted in the Council's [Infrastructure Delivery Plan](#) (SUB7), which is necessary given the scale of development and will benefit both the new and existing communities, including open space provision. In addition to the site specific requirements, development proposals will need to comply with adopted policies in LPP1.

The Council considers that this part of LPP2 complies with the requirements of the NPPF, reflecting local circumstances and aspirations whilst providing for a balance of economic, social and environmental considerations to achieve sustainable development. The strategy and proposals for Colden Common are sound:

- it is *positively prepared*, as it delivers the 'remainder to be allocated' to meet the objectively assessed housing requirement for Colden Common, as well as open space provision;
- it is *justified*, as it reflects the outcome of assessing alternative sites and consulting on them, and demonstrates there are no unforeseen constraints;
- it is *effective*, CC1 is promoted by a house builder;
- it is *consistent with national policy*, as the Local Plan process and planning application decision have followed the guidance of the NPPF.

Sufficient development opportunities exist in Colden Common it is not necessary to allocate further land, so no Modifications are proposed in this respect. Minor modifications are included at Appendix 15.

**Appendix 1: Aerial Photo Colden Common**



**Appendix 2: Dwelling Capacity and Status of Allocated & Permitted Sites**

**Table 1: Capacity for housing development within the existing settlement boundary**

<b>Category</b>	<b>No. of dwellings</b>
a. Requirement (2011-2031)*	250
b. Net Completions 1.4.2011 to 31.3.2015	4
c. Outstanding permissions at 31.3.2015	28
d. SHLAA sites within settlement boundary	53
e. Windfall allowance	0
f. Total supply (b+c+d+e)	85
<b>Remainder to be allocated (a – f)</b>	<b>165</b>

**Table 2: Status of allocated and permitted sites**

The following table provides an update of the status of the sites that make up the remaining (from 31/03/15) housing provision in Colden Common as at 1 July 2016:

<b>Policy Ref as LPP2</b>	<b>Site</b>	<b>Status Update</b>
Outstanding Permission	Dunfords, Main Road	14 dwellings now completed.
Outstanding Permission	Apex Centre, Church Lane	Under construction - 12 dwellings. (Permitted on 14/03/13 under 12/02635/FUL).
Outstanding Permission	Land off Chestnut Avenue	One dwelling completed. (13/00254/FUL permitted 16/09/13)
Outstanding Permission	Black Horse Inn, 47 Main Road	Alterations to form 3 bedroom dwelling. (14/02048/FUL permitted 04/11/14). New dropped kerb for vehicular access permitted 11/03/16.
	44 r/o Spring Lane	New permission. Pair of semi-detached houses. 15/02409/FUL permitted 08/01/16.
CC1	Sandyfields	14/01993/OUT – 165 dwellings and associated works (outline) - amended plans including revised indicative site layout for up to 165 dwellings, landscape strategy and other supporting documents. Resolution to grant permission given by Planning Committee 21 <sup>st</sup> April 2016 subject to S106 agreement, with outstanding highway issues at Hampshire County Council (HCC) delegated to Head of Development Management to resolve. Secretary of State decided not to call in this application – see letter dated 24 May 2016 (see Appendix 3).
	The Gorse	Current residential use. Update from landowner 29/06/16 - still available & within 12 months.
CC2	Clayfield Park	Existing uses on Clayfield Park and vacant land adjoining Avondale Park. Landowner supports allocation but requests amendment to policy to refer to mixed uses.

NB There are 3 further consents for single dwellings, 2 of which are known to be under construction, but as replacing previous dwellings there is no net gain.

**Appendix 3: DCLG Letter re Sandyfields Application 14/01993/OUT**



Department for  
Communities and  
Local Government

Simon Avery  
Principal Planning Officer  
Development Management  
Winchester City Council

Please ask for: Letitia Holden  
Tel: 0303 44 2887  
Email: Letitia.holden@communities.gsi.gov.uk

Your ref: 14/01993/OUT

Our ref: NPCU/RTI/L1765/76681

By email only –  
SAvery@WINCHESTER.GOV.UK

Date: 24 May 2016

Dear Simon,

**Town and Country Planning Act 1990**  
**Sandyfields Nurseries, Main Road, Colden Common Winchester**  
**Application Number: 14/01993/OUT**

I refer to the above application which has been the subject of third party requests to call in for determination by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government.

The Secretary of State has carefully considered this case against call-in policy, as set out in the Written Ministerial Statement by Nick Boles on 26 October 2012. The policy makes it clear that the power to call in a case will only be used very selectively.

The Government is committed to give more power to councils and communities to make their own decisions on planning issues, and believes planning decisions should be made at the local level wherever possible.

In deciding whether to call in this application, the Secretary of State has considered his policy on calling in planning applications. This policy gives examples of the types of issues which may lead him to conclude, in his opinion that the application should be called in. The Secretary of State has decided, having had regard to this policy, not to call in this application. He is content that it should be determined by the local planning authority.

In considering whether to exercise the discretion to call in this application, the Secretary of State has not considered the matter of whether this application is EIA

National Planning Casework Unit  
Department for Communities and Local Government  
5 St Philips Place  
Colmore Row  
Birmingham B3 2PW

Tel: 0303 44 48050  
npcu@communities.gsi.gov.uk

Development for the purposes of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2011. The local planning authority responsible for determining this application remains the relevant authority responsible for considering whether these Regulations apply to this proposed development and, if so, for ensuring that the requirements of the Regulations are complied with.

Yours sincerely

*Karen Partridge*

**Karen Partridge**  
**Planning Casework Manager**



**Appendix 5: Sandyfields Estimated Phasing Update**

**Extract from WCC AMR 2015 - Appendix 1 Local Plan Part 2 Sites Estimated Phasing**

LPP2 Policy no.	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24	2024/25	2025/26	2026/27	2027/28	2028/29	2029/30	2030/31	Total	Notes
<b>Colden Common</b>																		
CC1 Main Road		10	40	40	40	35											<b>165</b>	

**Update: June 2016 – LPP2 Policy CC1 Sandyfields Site Estimated Phasing**

LPP2 Policy no.	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24	2024/25	2025/26	2026/27	2027/28	2028/29	2029/30	2030/31	Total	Notes
<b>Colden Common</b>																		
CC1 Main Road			10	40	40	40	35										<b>165</b>	

Confirmed by: Steve Carrington, Foreman Homes Group, 23/06/16

**Appendix 6: Sandyfields Site – area of existing development and extent of planning consent for further caravan storage**



**Appendix 7: Sandyfields viewed from Colden Common Park**

(Photos taken 28 June 2015, 35mm focal length equivalent = 41)



1 Looking towards north corner of Sandyfields (caravans glimpsed through trees) and Colden Common Farm



2 Towards Sandyfields (caravans glimpsed through trees) & corner of SDNP



3 Looking towards ancient woodland (SDNP)



## **Appendix 8: Open Space Shortfall and Calculation of Requirements**

Policy CP7 states that, “The LPA will seek improvements in the open space network and in built recreation facilities within the District, to achieve the type of provision, space required and levels of accessibility set out in the council’s most up to date open space and built facilities standards”. Policy CP15 states support for proposals that provide a net gain of green infrastructure in accordance with CP7 and appropriate for the scale of development through on-site provision which “addresses deficits in local green infrastructure provision where appropriate”.

In most settlements it is difficult to overcome the quantity shortfalls without new enabling development, and the accessibility standards in every category. So the strategy has been to take additional green space that is on offer and on some sites not every category of open space is going to be appropriate or feasible to provide anyway. The standard in CP7 is therefore an aspiration.

It is unrealistic to expect that every LPP2 allocation site in Colden Common must not only meet its own on-site CP7 open space requirement but must also fully account for current shortfalls. The introduction to the latest Open Space Strategy 2015 (EBT11) explains that “not all of the open space types set out in the standard will be appropriate in every case” and “the quantum and type of open space required will vary with the size and type of housing development and the particular open space needs in that location”. But that “in many existing settlements, while it will be possible to ascertain notional shortfalls in open space and identify specific needs, it will not always be necessary or possible to over come these shortfalls”.

### **Open Space types and adequacy of provision at Colden Common (EBT11)**

CP7 category	CP7 Requirement	Existing provision	Adequacy
Allotments	0.78	0.85	0.07
Equipped Children's Play	1.95	0.59	-1.36
Informal Green Space	3.12	1.1	-2.02
Natural Green Space	3.9	2.86	-1.04
Parks & Recreation Grounds	2.93	1.3	-1.63
Sports Grounds	2.93	8.25	5.32
<b>Totals</b>	<b>15.61</b>	<b>14.95</b>	<b>-0.66</b>

To work out what CP7 would require at Sandyfields, we first work out the number of people likely to be resident on site. So, 165 dwellings x 2.3 (average occupancy) = 379 people. Policy CP7 sets out the standard for open space provision per head of population, but this should be read in conjunction with Policy CP21 (Infrastructure and Community Benefit). This says that “infrastructure should be provided on site as an integral part of a development, wherever possible and appropriate”. Any on-site provision should “be related to the size and type of each development and the nature of

improvements required". Policy CP7 says that provision should be made on site "where feasible".

Turning then to the categories of open space which CP7 lists, given the above shortfalls and excesses, it would be inappropriate to insist that Sandyfields provided any parks, sports or recreation grounds on site and also possibly not feasible to insist on there being allotments. This then brings down the CP7 requirement to children's play space (5m<sup>2</sup> per head), Informal Green Space (8m<sup>2</sup>) and Natural Green Space (10m<sup>2</sup>) 5+8+10=23m<sup>2</sup> per person, or 0.87 ha or 8,717 m<sup>2</sup> for a minimum on-site provision. If we were to be more flexible we could include Allotments in to the requirement, and this would result in a total requirement of 0.95 ha or 9,475m<sup>2</sup> on site.

The indicative masterplan with the planning application shows there being 1.3 ha or 13,000m<sup>2</sup> of open space provided on site, clearly meeting the Policy CP7 requirement, with some surplus towards the shortfall. This satisfies the SDNP's opinion that Stratton's Copse '*should not be relied upon as the open space provision for the whole residential development but should merely compliment it.*' (SDNPA letter to Simon Avery 21 April 2016 re 14/01993/OUT). As this was an Outline application with only access and the number of units being considered, and an indicative masterplan, the location of the children's equipped play area within the application area will be a matter for the reserved matters application, although officers were satisfied that it could be accommodated on site.

With the addition of public access to the adjoining Strattons Copse (2.6ha) the Sandyfields own requirement plus the shortfall in informal and natural green space is met.

In the considering the provision at Sandyfields, not every category of open space is appropriate on this site, so this lowers the requirement from 4.0 ha to 2.5 ha/1000.

**Appendix 9: Sandyfields Indicative Site Layout**



C	Final	Final	Final	Final	Final
H					
A					
Rev	Date	Description	By	For	
REVISIONS					

**NOTE:**  
This layout is based on a layout provided by Foreman Homes and is shown as an indicative layout only and the position, size and disposition of the units are approximate. Final layout will be determined following a detailed survey of site, and subject to planning, highways and existing infrastructure.

**Planning**



**Sandyfields  
Colden Common  
Indicative Site Layout**

**HGP ARCHITECTS**  
FURZELL FARM, WICKHAM ROAD  
FARHAM, HAMPSHIRE, PO18 7AH  
T: 01256 200 225  
F: 01256 207 004  
E: EMAIL@HGP-ARCHITECTS.CO.UK  
W: WWW.HGP-ARCHITECTS.CO.UK

Scale @ A2: 1:1000  
Date: Dec'16  
Drawn by: HJE  
Checked by:  
Drawing No: 14.128.02  
Revision: C

### **Appendix 10: Ancient Woodland at Stratton's Copse**

The Landscape and Public Open Space Strategy for the Sandyfields planning application also sets out the approach to the future management of the adjoining Stratton's Copse. The latter is also explained in the Proposed Woodland Trail and Woodland Management Plan Supplementary Notes on Ecology document. The woodland access strategy as described aims to provide a nature walk / trail of about 450m with some interpretation that enables views of the bluebells, wild daffodils and orchids without encroaching directly on these and other sensitive areas. The management strategy also aims to enhance areas that have been degraded by paintballing activity and previous tree clearance, and remove invasive plants to improve the environment for both ground flora and fauna.

The Ancient Woodland Assessment Guide is useful as the first question asks if the development has to be on the ancient woodland site. Sandyfields is not on the woodland but adjoins it and no area of ancient woodland will be lost (Q3). The Sandyfields allocation is not relying on Stratton's Copse for any of the open space requirements of the development itself and it's being offered to the community (Parish Council) to meet the pre-existing shortfall in informal and natural green space (Policy CP7 and CP15).

Neither the connectivity (Q4) nor the root protection area (Q5) will be damaged by the development on the Sandyfields site. With the wide set back from the woodland boundary (about 15m), to safeguard the pipeline and provide a protected species / informal open space corridor, the Sandyfields scheme is an improvement in the current situation where the caravans are parked closer to the woodland than the access road or houses are proposed. The root protection area of some trees within the woodland could be affected by the footpath as the route will result in removal of some trees however, this is controlled removal of some less important trees within a heavily wooded area. The Woodland Management Plan ACD Environmental dated 29/06/15 revised 21/03/16) also makes clear that no plant machinery is to be used in the area and the posts to support the boardwalk are to be dug by hand.

The Sandyfields application included a protected species survey (Q6) and also a paper by Ecosupport entitled Supplementary Notes on Ecology (March 2016) which relates to the Proposed Woodland Trail and Woodland Management Plan. Although not a hydrological survey report as such (Q7), information was submitted on drainage and permeability and the conditions require a detailed drainage scheme with the reserved matters application.

While public access to the woodland will increase (Q8) the Woodland Management Plan and woodland trail / board walk is intended to allow controlled access and avoid trampling on sensitive areas, whereas some previous access has resulted in degradation and damage to trees by such as paintballing activities. The intention is for provision of public access to enable appreciation and education regarding such as the daffodils and orchids rather than allowing general rampaging around the woodland. The Management Plan will allow maintenance to improve the habitats by such as removal of

invasive species. Q9 is not relevant as none of the ancient woodland area will be lost to development. The landscaping proposals (Q10) associated with the planning application includes native species and much more detail will be provided with the scheme to be submitted with the reserved matters.

It should be noted that if, as intended, the Colden Common Parish Council takes over this woodland then planning permission may not be required as the creation within the copse of the woodland walk (including gravel paths, board walk and platform resting points) could be permitted development in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 Part 12 — Development by local authorities, Class A.

### **Appendix 11: Use classes at Sandyfields**

From the planning history the permitted use of the major part of the site that is currently developed is “open storage for touring caravans”. Permission 98/01618/CHU granted 04/12/98 includes as condition 3. “The site shall be used solely for the storage of touring caravans, and for no other purpose.”

When the change of use permission for the extension of the caravan storage was granted on the southern field (11/01153/FUL permitted on 24/11/11 refers) for the change of use of existing field to caravan and mobile home storage site (B8), to provide an additional 196 spaces to the existing and mobile home storage facility and erection of a new office building, condition 6 stated, “The site shall be only used for the storage of caravans.” NB This permission was never implemented and the field remains a grass field.

The use class for the storage of caravans does not appear to have been conclusively established in terms of the UCO although it may be in some cases be regarded as B8. However, and in any case, the permissions granted at Sandyfields for the caravan storage were restricted by condition to be used only for caravan storage and for no other purpose therefore a change to other form of B8 is specifically prevented.

The front part of the site includes vacant buildings that were part of the former Sandyfields Nursery and the report on application 12/02370/FUL, to demolish the nursery building and erect 4 dwellings (refused and dismissed on appeal), describes the site as containing a single storey retail building and associated attached glasshouses. The planning statement submitted with the application in November 2012 refers to the former garden centre having become unviable and closed and the need to consider alternative uses for the now vacant previously developed site.

Policy CP9 states that, “In order to retain a mix of employment land and premises in the District, the Local Planning Authority will resist the loss of existing or allocated employment land and floorspace within Use Classes B1, B2 or B8.”

Given the above, the permitted uses of the Sandyfields site do not largely fall within the ‘B’ use classes and therefore Policy CP9 is not generally applicable. Even if a case can be made that part of the site does fall within a ‘B’ class, then the policy includes that losses will only be permitted where retaining a business use would not be reasonable having regard to a number of considerations. These include the strength of local demand for the type of accommodation and the benefits of the proposed use compared to the benefits of retaining the existing use. In this case the benefits of the proposed use, i.e. housing development to meet the needs set out in the LPP1, outweigh the benefits of retaining the existing use.

## **Appendix 12: Settlement Boundary Review and Land to the rear of Main Road**

In 2014, Winchester City Council issued its 'Settlement Boundary Review' (EBT5) as a background paper to the Winchester District Local Plan Part 2. Paragraph 30 of the SBR explained that "Settlement boundaries need to be logical and easy to identify on the ground where possible." Principle 2 stated that "Boundaries will include...(d) Curtilages which are contained, are visually part of the urban area, and are separated from the open countryside".

With regard to "Gardens to the rear of properties fronting Main Road (part SHLAA site 2497)", the 'Colden Common' section recognised that the "Boundary cuts through long rear gardens of residential properties...Most of SHLAA site is least sensitive in landscape terms, has good degree of containment and separation from the open countryside but southern part is sensitive landscape, due to group TPO". The 'Action' proposed by the SBR was to "Redraw boundary to allow some development opportunity of least sensitive part of SHLAA site". Map Ref. (1) shows the Settlement Boundary of Colden Common extending to the ends of the gardens on the northeast side of Main Road, so as to include land to the rear of 49 Main Road.

Following representations made to the Consultation Draft LPP2, (see also letter from the Colden Common Parish Council below) a review was undertaken with the findings as set out in the email below dated 14 May 2015. The City Council's position therefore changed with the publication of the 'Settlement Boundary Review Addendum 2015 (EBT6)'. The Addendum explains that "Where these (objections made to the changes proposed in the Draft Plan to settlement boundaries) relate to a change that was considered in the Settlement Boundary Review 2014 the specific locations have been reviewed with the outcome and recommendations being recorded in this paper. It should be noted that the methodology used is the same as in the Settlement Boundary Review 2014 and is not repeated here."

For "Gardens to the rear of properties fronting Main Road (part SHLAA site 2497)" the Addendum concluded that "The rear gardens support local characteristics which visually relate to the adjacent countryside as set out in Principle 3 criterion (e). Therefore the site should not be included within the settlement boundary." The 'Action' states "Boundary to remain as illustrated on the Local Plan Review (2006) Policies Map".

The Francis Copse estate (off Main Road to the south) is built on a site which was occupied by a large house, the Parish Hall and Francis Yard (a builder's yard) as a redevelopment scheme involving the demolition of existing buildings. The land upon which that development stands lies within the settlement boundary as was established at the time of the original proposal back in 2004. The situation is therefore not comparable with the rear gardens area which are part of a row of frontage properties with long rear gardens the tranquillity of which is noticeably different further from the Main Road and transitions to the countryside beyond.

**Appendix 13: Colden Common Parish Council Letter 22 April 2015 re Settlement Boundary Changes**



**COLDEN COMMON PARISH COUNCIL**

Community Centre, St Vigor Way,  
Colden Common, Winchester, SO21 1UU  
Telephone: 01962 713700/07775 627131  
Email: clerk@coldencommon.hants.gov.uk  
Clerk to the Council: Debbie Harding

Jenny Nell,  
Principal Planner, Strategic Planning Team,  
Winchester City Council,  
Colebrook Street  
Winchester, SO23 9LJ.

22 April, 2015

Dear Jenny,

Proposed Changes to Settlement Boundaries in Colden Common

I refer to the meeting on 25 March, 2015, between representatives of Winchester City Council's Planning staff, the City Council and Colden Common Parish Council, when the settlement boundary to the rear of gardens on the east side of Main Road was discussed (SHLAA site 2497). The Parish Council made clear its wish that the settlement boundary should revert to its original position, following representations made to the Parish Council by a number of the residents who are affected by the proposed change.

The very strong feelings of the residents were further endorsed at the meeting of the Parish Council on 13 April, 2015, and the Parish Council undertook to write formally to Winchester City Council in support of residents' views and to make clear the Parish Council's wishes on this matter.

The City Council is, I am sure, aware of considerable controversy on this site that goes back some years to the unlawful siting of a caravan behind the Black Horse Public House, which resulted in an Enforcement Order and a Government Inspector's decision to secure its removal. Further, the proposal for SHLAA site 2497 was not supported by the majority of the residents affected, who had not been consulted on the possibility of development taking place in their back gardens, and who are adamantly opposed to this. There is now a deeply felt concern among residents, some of whom are very elderly and in frail health, that development on this site will take place without their agreement. They were not consulted, either, about the proposed settlement boundary change and they fear that this will undermine their position in opposing development in their back gardens. This is a most unsatisfactory position for all concerned.

To add to the residents' anxieties, they are now being seriously annoyed by approaches from Goadsby Estate Agents who are targetting them with letters and house calls, in an attempt to persuade them to sell their land for development. The Parish Council has a responsibility to support its residents in this position.

The Parish Council fully understands that the City Council wished to "tidy up" the settlement boundary, and assumes that the City Council were not aware of the serious consequences of this exercise. However, in this case the Parish Council believes that the boundary should remain in its original setting for the following reasons:

Unless all the residents agree to development, there will not be adequate or suitable

access to any development on this site. Apart from one person, the residents are strongly opposed.

Current access is at the side of the Black Horse Public House and is not in our opinion considered safe for any increased traffic.

The SHLAA site was proposed by the occupant of the unlawfully sited caravan which has now been removed, but without any consultation taking place with the other residents affected.

This site is in close proximity to a SINC site.

The target of 250 residential dwellings is certainly capable of being met without the need for this site to be developed.

Were this site to be developed in whole or in part, it would not provide a sufficient number of dwellings to materially affect the allocated provision of 250, and it is not needed.

The Parish Council is concerned that the boundary change may grant planning permission by default.

At the meeting on 25th March, WCC officers were asked to consider writing to all owners/occupiers of dwellings along the north east side of Main Road (where the settlement boundary has been changed) to reassure them that their property will not be allocated for development and that nothing will happen unless they decide to sell of their own free will. This letter reiterates that request. WCC officers are further asked to make it clear in the letter to residents that if the boundary is moved it does not automatically grant planning consent.

The Parish Council also formally requests that Winchester City Council allows the settlement boundary on this site to revert to its former position, despite its acknowledged desire for uniformity and consistency across Parishes, because of the profound effect this change has had on this site.

The adjustments to the settlement boundaries at Upper Moors Road/Spring Lane and at the rear of Church Lane are not a concern of the Parish Council at the moment, because they have not to date caused controversy among residents.

It is a great pity that the boundary change at site 2497 took place without the opportunity for consultation and/or explanation to the residents affected. Throughout the whole consultation process for LPP2, there have been many acknowledgements of the productive and harmonious working relationship between the Parish Council, residents and WCC. Sadly, unless the situation outlined in this letter can be swiftly and suitably remedied, then the credibility of the whole consultation exercise is jeopardised. I do hope that we can work together on this to provide a satisfactory outcome.

Yours sincerely,



Richard Izard  
Chair  
Colden Common Parish Council

**Appendix 14: WCC Internal Emails dated 27 April 2015 & 14 May 2015 re Settlement Boundary Changes at Main Road**

**Linda Jewell**

---

**From:** Linda Thomas  
**Sent:** 14 May 2015 11:57  
**To:** Linda Jewell  
**Cc:** Ivan Gurdler  
**Subject:** RE: SHLAA Site 2497 Main Road, Colden Common & LPP2 Settlement Boundary Changes

Linda

I have now visited SHLAA site 2497 and walked the area to assess potential visual and landscape impacts that may be relevant for the boundary review.

The WCC landscape sensitivity appraisal (2013) states the following:

***Area west of Main Road, along Boyes Lane and back of housing east of Main Road (SHLAA sites 2494, 2497, 888, 889, 2052, 2498 and 2499)***

- *Context: These areas are mostly within the existing urban environment or on the urban fringe, with good connectivity to the centre of Colden Common.*
- *Character of site: Enclosed areas surrounded by both urban development or in some cases countryside, with good accessibility, with the exception of the field adjacent to Ashbrook Stables, which is a green field site without good accessibility.*
- *Mainly contained short views due to the surrounding urban environment, or in the case of the site east of Main Road enclosed views due to Taylor's Copse. The site along Church Lane close to Upper Brambridge Farm would have long views south across the countryside.*
- *Important or panoramic views: none*
- *Skyline features: woodland*
- *Landmarks to connect with place: local residential development within Colden Common*

As outlined in your email below, the proposed settlement boundary has been extended to include all rear gardens in the SHLAA site. There are a number of mature specimen oak trees of high amenity and biodiversity value in the rear gardens. Their canopies are visible from the public realm ie from recreation ground opposite; also glimpses from Main Road between houses and seen above rooftops. I could not see any views from public rights of way. Oak trees are a key characteristic of the local area. Trees within the site are not currently protected although nearby oak trees do have TPOs. Extending the settlement boundary will increase vulnerability of trees within gardens. One of the oak trees is located on the rear boundary of 49 Main Road, which is currently subject to a planning application for a dwelling in the rear garden. This particular oak tree is situated on an old raised bank, which runs along rear garden boundaries. The bank, which supports diverse hedgerow species and ground flora as well as trees, is considered to be a locally characteristic feature worthy of retention and enhancement. I have spoken to our Tree Officer, Ivan Gurdler, regarding tree protection. He is hoping to visit site tomorrow.

Other constraints: The area beyond gardens is sensitive as it is a locally designated SINC with its boundary adjoining rear gardens. The SINC includes Taylors Copse which is also a designated ancient woodland. Together they provide an effective countryside setting and backdrop for existing settlement. A yard with extensive areas of hard standing, parking, various buildings and storage areas lies between Taylors Copse and rear garden boundaries which does not presently maintain or enhance woodland setting and is visually unattractive. Extending the settlement boundary would I believe further compromise and suburbanise this area, which would not support policy CP20. A suitable access to rear gardens is also unclear. Any access into the site from the northern or eastern boundaries would have visual and landscape impacts.

Conclusion:

In view of above, rear gardens support local characteristics which visually relate to the adjacent countryside.. Therefore advise retaining existing settlement boundary to support the following:

3. *Boundaries will exclude:*

*(e) Large gardens and other open areas which visually relate to the open countryside rather than the settlement.*

Trust this helps.

linda

Linda Thomas CMLI JFRI MA  
Landscape Architect  
Winchester City Council

Direct Dial: 01962 848482

---

**From:** Linda Jewell  
**Sent:** 27 April 2015 15:27  
**To:** Linda Thomas  
**Cc:** Sean Quigley; Jenny Nell  
**Subject:** SHLAA Site 2497 Main Road, Colden Common & LPP2 Settlement Boundary Changes

Dear Linda

The LPP2 in Chapter 2 deals with Settlement Boundaries. This section (paragraphs 2.30-2.35 on pages 17-18) refers to the fact that the boundaries of the larger settlements with a housing target to meet have been reviewed and where sites need to be allocated outside the settlement boundaries to meet the growth needs in the LPP1 the opportunity has been taken to consider whether other adjustments to existing settlement boundaries are needed. In paragraph 2.33 it states, "Minor revisions to settlement boundaries are recommended where small sites falling below the size threshold for inclusion as allocations are either surrounded on three sides by existing boundary, or are part of established rear gardens, and were assessed during the site assessment process and found not to be sensitive in landscape terms or otherwise harmful to settlement pattern or character."

Colden Common is an example of this and the map on page 65 of the LPP2, and Map 2 in the Draft Policies Map section at the back, illustrate the proposed revised settlement boundary. The rationale for this is set out in the Settlement Boundary Review paper which can be viewed from [this page on our website](#). The criteria for including or excluding sites from the boundary can be found on pages 7 and 8 and the Colden Common section is on pages 11 and 12.

Regarding the SHLAA site 2497 the document includes the following:

"Boundary cuts through long rear gardens of residential properties. SHLAA site considered in site assessment process but delivery uncertain as in multiple ownerships and lack of access so not shortlisted for possible allocation. Most of SHLAA site is least sensitive in landscape terms, has good degree of containment and separation from the open countryside but southern part is sensitive landscape due to group TPO. Redraw boundary to allow some development opportunity of least sensitive part of SHLAA site."

A couple of representations to the LPP2 Consultation Draft 2014 have objected to the redrawing of the boundary in this location and following a meeting with the Parish Council on 25 March 2015 the Colden Common PC has written to request that the settlement boundary in this location reverts to its original position for the reasons set out in its letter dated 22 April (attached). The PC is content with the other revisions to the boundary elsewhere. At the meeting on 25 March, WCC officers made it clear that moving the boundary does not mean that development will take place unless the owners want to develop or sell their land, subject to access etc, and that there is no intention for the Council to CPO the land for development.

The issue at stake is that while we'd like to keep the CCPC satisfied we need to ensure that the Settlement Boundary review is applied consistently. Therefore please would you look at this area of rear gardens in relation to your comments on landscape sensitivity previously provided to us and consider whether you agree that the Settlement Boundary Review criterion 2(d) is the correct one to apply or you think that 3 (e) or (f) are more applicable?

*Settlement Boundary Review extract from Principles:*

*2. Boundaries will include:*

*(d) Curtilages which are contained, are visually part of the urban area, and are separated from the open countryside.*

*3. Boundaries will exclude:*

*(e) Large gardens and other open areas which visually relate to the open countryside rather than the settlement.*

*(f) Large gardens or other areas e.g. adjacent paddocks and orchards whose inclusion or possible development would harm the structure, form and character of the settlement.*

#### Brief Background to SHLAA Site 2497 Main Road, Colden Common

The Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment Update July 2013 included site reference 2497 'Land to the east of Main Road, Colden Common', as a new site submitted. The submission was made by agent Robert Tutton Town Planning Consultants Limited on behalf of Ms J. Castle of Burley near Ringwood as part owner. Confirmation was received by email from Bob Tutton on 23 August 2013 that the land subject of SHLAA 2497 was still available for development but that as the site is in multiple ownership it is likely that this land would be brought forward in step with the varied wishes of the owners (part within 5 years, part within 5-10 years and the balance over 10 years away).

The site was not included in sites put forward for comment at Commonview's Engagement Day on 21<sup>st</sup> July 2013. At the technical workshop with Commonview (the Colden Common Parish Council's community engagement group) and various WCC officers held on 10<sup>th</sup> September 2013 to determine the spatial development strategy/options to be presented for public consultation later in 2013, it is noted regarding site 2497 (Rear of properties fronting Main Road):

- Delivery uncertain – multiple ownerships.
- Access also unclear – no direct road access.
- Concerns over possible change to settlement boundary if 2494 is allocated.

*[NB Site 2494 is the Main Road site to the north].*

There is no further mention in correspondence regarding site 2497 however a spreadsheet titled 'Results of info request August 2013' records re 2497 that 'all owners not interested - Mr Tutton put forward as settlement boundary change'.

I shall be grateful for your advice on this matter, meanwhile If you need any further information please let me know.

Kind regards

Linda Jewell  
Principal Planner, Strategic Planning  
Winchester City Council  
Colebrook Street  
Winchester

**Appendix 15: Proposed Minor Modifications****Proposed Modifications to the Plan:**

Page	Policy/ para	Amendments to Document	Reason	Source
62	4.3.1	Add "(grade II* listed)" after "Brambridge House"	For clarification.	Historic England
66	4.3.18	Agreed (WCCSCG01) reference in para 4.3.18 to read " <i>...the preparation of an archaeological assessment will be needed to define the extent and significance of any archaeological remains and reflect these in the proposals, in accordance with Policy DM25 prior to the commencement of development</i> "	The historic environment assessment undertaken to inform LPP2, identifies 'archaeological potential' in the vicinity of CC1. To be consistent with other LPP2 policies where there is 'potential' this matter is reflected in the supporting text. Detailed matters are covered by Policy DM25.	Historic England
448	Map 2	Add green colour wash to area of gardens outside the settlement boundary to the north east of Main Road.	To correct error in mapping.	WCC