

CABINET (LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK) COMMITTEE

15 July 2008

OLIVER'S BATTERY AND OTTERBOURNE VILLAGE DESIGN STATEMENTS –  
RECOMMENDED ADOPTION

REPORT OF HEAD OF STRATEGIC PLANNING

Contact Officer: Steve Opacic Tel No: 01962 848101

RECENT REFERENCES:

PHD127 – 'Draft Otterbourne Village Design Statement', February 2008  
PHD106 – 'Draft Oliver's Battery Village Design Statement, November 2007

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

Draft Village Design Statements (VDSs) for Oliver's Battery and Otterbourne were published for public consultation in November 2007 and March 2008 respectively. The procedures for producing Supplementary Planning Documents require formal consultation on draft Village Design Statements.

In order for these documents to carry weight in the planning decision-making process they need to be adopted by the City Council as a 'Supplementary Planning Documents'. This report summarises the comments received following public consultation on the draft Village Design Statements, and recommends adoption of the VDSs subject to a number of changes (see Appendices 1 and 3). The revised VDSs are attached at Appendices 2 and 4. The opportunity is also taken to update Members on progress with other Village/Neighbourhood Design Statements.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 1 That the 'Design Guidelines' of the Oliver's Battery Village Design Statement and 'Guidelines' of the Otterbourne Village Design Statement, as proposed to be amended, be adopted as a Supplementary Planning Documents.
- 2 That an offer of up to £1,000 be authorised as a contribution towards the costs of publication of the final version of each VDS.
- 3 That the relevant Village Design Statement Groups be thanked for producing the Design Statements.

## CABINET (LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK) COMMITTEE

15 July 2008

### OLIVER'S BATTERY AND OTTERBOURNE VILLAGE DESIGN STATEMENTS – RECOMMENDED ADOPTION

#### REPORT OF HEAD OF STRATEGIC PLANNING

##### DETAIL

#### 1 Introduction

- 1.1 The City Council encourages the production of Village Design Statements and Neighbourhood Design Statements by local communities so as to improve the quality of development in local areas and public involvement in the planning process. In order to carry weight in determining planning applications, such Statements need to be adopted by the City Council as Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD).
- 1.2 The Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004 set out various requirements which must be followed when producing and adopting SPD, including public consultation on draft proposals (these regulations have just been replaced but were the Regulations in force at the time the VDSs were produced). Failure to meet these requirements could either prevent the City Council from adopting the Village Design Statements as SPDs, or lead to their validity being challenged.
- 1.3 The draft Village Design Statement (VDS) for Oliver's Battery was published for public consultation for a period of 6 weeks in November/December 2007. The draft Otterbourne VDS was published for a 6-week public consultation period in March/April 2008. These consultations satisfy the requirement for formal consultation on draft Village Design Statements.
- 1.4 17 VDSs have so far been adopted in Winchester District (Kings Worthy, West Meon, Micheldever, Curdrige & Curbridge, Denmead, Soberton & Newtown, Boarhunt, Corhampton & Meonstoke, Crawley, Exton, Wickham, Itchen Abbas, Bramdean, Littleton, Swanmore, Upham and Sparsholt) and there are a number of others in preparation. In addition, 3 Neighbourhood Design Statements have so far been adopted (St Giles Hill, St Barnabas West, and West Fulflood and Oram's Arbour).
- 1.5 This report summarises progress on the VDS/NDSs known to be in production and considers the Oliver's Battery and Otterbourne VDSs, which have been submitted to the City Council with a request that they are adopted as SPD. This report recommends that this be agreed.

#### 2 Progress on Village/Neighbourhood Design Statements in the District

- 2.1 The table below summarises the situation regarding VDS/NDSs in the District. Currently, 17 VDSs and 3 NDSs have been adopted as SPG and another 10 are being prepared/updated, including Oliver's Battery and Otterbourne. Some villages/neighbourhoods have investigated the possibility but decided not to progress a VDS/NDS at this stage.

<u>VDS/NDS</u>	<u>Stage of VDS/NDS Reached</u>
Bishops Sutton	Investigating VDS
<b>Boarhunt</b>	<b>Adopted 2002</b> , started update 2007
<b>Bramdean</b>	<b>Adopted 2000</b> , started update 2007
Colden Common	Investigating VDS
Compton & Shawford	Undertaking VDS following Parish Plan
<b>Corhampton &amp; Meonstoke</b>	<b>Adopted 2002</b> , started update 2007
<b>Crawley</b>	<b>Adopted 2001</b>
<b>Curdrige</b>	<b>Adopted 2002</b>
<b>Denmead</b>	<b>Adopted 2007</b>
Droxford	VDS drafted 2004, not taken forward
Durley	Investigating VDS
<b>Exton</b>	<b>Adopted 2002</b> , started update 2007
Hambledon	VDS started 2002, not taken forward
<b>Itchen Abbas</b>	<b>Adopted 2001</b> , started update 2006
Kilmeston	VDS drafted but not submitted for adoption
<b>Kings Worthy</b>	<b>Adopted 2006</b>
<b>Littleton</b>	<b>Adopted 2001</b> , started update 2007
<b>Micheldever</b>	<b>Adopted 2002</b>
<b>New Alresford</b>	<b>Adopted 2008</b>
<i>Olivers Battery</i>	<i>Consultation on draft VDS Nov 2007</i>
<i>Otterbourne</i>	<i>Consultation on draft VDS Mar 2008</i>
Owslebury	VDS started 2008
Shedfield	Investigated VDS, not progressing?
<b>Soberton</b>	<b>Adopted 2002</b>
South Wonston	VDS started 2008
<b>Sparsholt</b>	<b>Adopted 1999</b> , revised VDS adopted 2008
<b>Swanmore</b>	<b>Adopted 2001</b>
<b>Upham</b>	<b>Adopted 1999</b> , started update 2008
Warnford	Investigated VDS, not progressing?
<b>West Meon</b>	<b>Adopted 2002</b>
<b>Wickham</b>	<b>Adopted 2001</b> , started update 2007
<b>Winchester – St Giles Hill</b>	<b>Adopted 2004</b>
Winchester – Sleepers Hill	Investigated NDS, now subject of a LADS
<b>Winchester – St Barnabas</b>	<b>Adopted 2007</b>
<b>Winchester – West Fulflood</b>	<b>Adopted 2008</b>

- 2.2 Offers of up to £1000 towards printing costs are normally made at the draft and adoption stages of the process to help cover the costs of producing documents at these stages. This is funded from a growth budget approved in 2007/08 (for 3 years) to assist in improving design quality.

### 3 Oliver's Battery and Otterbourne Village Design Statements

- 3.1 **Oliver's Battery.** The VDS has been drafted by a Working Group of 12 local residents, including 4 Parish Councillors. The Group had advice from consultants (Atkins) appointed by the City Council to assist with VDS

production, as well as from City Council officers. A questionnaire survey was distributed in 2005 and the Group then drafted the VDS. The VDS has been produced in consultation with the Parish Council, local groups and residents. A more detailed summary of the early stages of public involvement was included in Appendix B of the draft VDS.

3.2 The draft VDS was published for a 6-week public consultation stage in November/December 2007 and a public exhibition was held in November 2007. Appendix 1 of this report summarises the 16 comments received at the public consultation stage, which were mostly from local residents. The comments raised some useful points and have been considered by the VDS Group and City Council officers. Appendix 1 recommends a response to the comments made and includes several recommended changes to the VDS, as follows:

- Amendment/updating of various descriptive sections of the VDS;
- Additions to clarify policies on building heights;
- Addition of extra viewpoints on Map 3;
- Amendments to Policies SV1 and SV5 concerning the village centre;
- Addition of a new policy encouraging cycling and walking;
- Changes and additions to the Transport Objectives section.

3.3 Appendix 1 sets out the detailed wording of the changes that are recommended and these are highlighted in the recommended VDS, attached at Appendix 2. In addition, some updating has been undertaken by the VDS Group and the recommended version of the VDS (Appendix 2) also highlights these changes. The VDS (as proposed to be amended) promotes a total of 60 'Design Guidelines' and also a further 6 'Transport Objectives'. It is only the Design Guidelines which supplement Local Plan policies and set out design guidance, so it is only these which should be adopted as part of the Supplementary Planning Document. The 'Transport Objectives' are community aspirations that emerged during the VDS process, which are useful and important, but which will be pursued outside the planning process and should not form part of the SPD.

3.4 **Otterbourne.** The production of a VDS for Otterbourne was one of the recommendations of the Otterbourne Parish Plan, produced in 2004. This process started in 2006 and a VDS Team of 16 local residents has worked on the production of the VDS. The Group had advice from Planning Aid South, as well as from City Council officers. The VDS has been produced in consultation with the Parish Council, local groups and residents, with progress reports to Parish Council meetings. Public workshops and exhibitions were held in 2006 and 2007 and there was an opportunity to comment on the draft VDS in Summer 2007. A more detailed summary of the early stages of public involvement was included in Appendix 2 of the draft VDS.

3.5 The draft VDS was published for a 6-week public consultation stage in March/April 2008. Only 1 comment was received, perhaps reflecting the high level of public involvement in earlier stages of the production process. Appendix 3 of this report summarises the comment received and recommends a response, including several recommended changes to the VDS, as follows:

- Changes to Guideline 21 regarding traffic generation;
  - Updating to reflect the purchase of Oakwood Copse by a Conservation Trust;
  - Amendments to the credits list.
- 3.6 Appendix 3 sets out the detailed wording of the changes that are recommended and these are highlighted in the recommended VDS, attached at Appendix 4. The VDS promotes a total of 32 'Design Guidelines' which supplement the Local Plan's policies and set out design guidance. It is recommended that these should be adopted as a Supplementary Planning Document.
- 4 Conclusions
- 4.1 The Design Guidance proposed by the Oliver's Battery VDS and the Guidelines in the Otterbourne VDS generally accord with the policies of the adopted District Local Plan (2006) and Government guidance. The Design Statements also meet other requirements for adoption as a SPD, having been subject to appropriate consultation and sustainability appraisal. These are, therefore, VDSs that officers recommend are appropriate for adoption as Supplementary Planning Documents. Some of the guidance proposed in the VDSs relates to matters that do not come within the scope of planning control. However, it is appropriate and normal for such matters to be included, as the aim is to influence all changes and development, not just those needing planning permission.
- 4.2 The Committee is asked to adopt the VDSs, excluding the 'Transport Objectives' in the Oliver's Battery VDS, which should not form part of the SPD. In accordance with recent practice for other approved VDS/NDSs, it is recommended that the VDS groups be thanked for their work in producing the VDSs and informed that the Council will offer up to £1000 per VDS to assist with printing costs for the adopted document.
- 4.3 VDS/NDSs are proving valuable in dealing with applications and are having an influence on the design of development proposals. It is, therefore, considered important that the interest and enthusiasm for undertaking VDS/NDSs within the District continues to be encouraged by the City Council.

#### OTHER CONSIDERATIONS:

##### 5 CORPORATE STRATEGY (RELEVANCE TO):

- 5.1 Although not specifically mentioned in the Corporate Strategy, the production of VDS/NDSs will contribute to the 'High Quality Environment' aims of the Council, particularly with regard to protecting local distinctiveness and promoting the public realm.

##### 6 RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS:

- 6.1 It is proposed that a contribution towards printing costs of up to £1000 for each VDS/NDS be offered. Funding exists within the Strategic Planning Division's budget for such an offer.

### BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS:

Comments on draft Oliver's Battery and Otterbourne VDSs, summarised in Appendices 1 and 3.

### APPENDICES:

1. Oliver's Battery Village Design Statement – Analysis of Comments on Draft VDS
2. Oliver's Battery Village Design Statement – as recommended for adoption\*
3. Otterbourne Village Design Statement – Analysis of Comments on Draft VDS
4. Otterbourne Village Design Statement – as recommended for adoption\*

\*Due to their size, the Design Statements (as set out in Appendices 2 and 4) are attached for Committee Members and relevant Ward Councillors only. Copies are available in the Members' Library and can be accessed on our Website via the following link:

<http://www.winchester.gov.uk/CouncilAndDemocracy/ElectedRepresentatives/Committees/CommitteeMeeting.asp?id=SX9452-A7840608&committee=15084>

**APPENDIX 1****Oliver's Battery Village Design Statement – Analysis of Comments on Draft VDS**

The statutory consultation period for the draft Olivers Battery Village Design Statement ran from 8<sup>th</sup> November to 20<sup>th</sup> December 2007.

Copies of the draft document were published on the Winchester City Council website and the Olivers Battery Parish Council website. In addition, a public exhibition was held on Saturday 24<sup>th</sup> November 2007 at St. Mark's Church and attended by over 100 residents. Approximately fifty printed copies of the Consultation Draft were made available for discussion during the exhibition and retention by members of the public.

Comments were received from:

Rod Biles  
Anne Bristow  
David Brown  
Mark Burman  
Philip Davies  
Jennifer Dixon  
Paul Draper  
Roger Forrest  
Revd. Mike Gardner  
Hampshire County Council Spatial Strategy Group  
Prudence King  
Padmini Kurukulaaratchy  
Doreen May  
Paul Moon  
Hugh O'Neill  
Anne & Roger Vince  
Robert Williams

The majority of these expressed support for the draft Village Design Statement although a small number of respondents were critical of certain aspects, especially guidelines limiting some forms of development. Two of these respondents had professional involvement with the planning process and one produced an extensive critique of the draft statement. The following analysis attempts to capture the key points of this critique as well as the range of comments received.

A number of the comments touched on multiple sections within the draft document. In the analysis, comments are listed in order of the sections to which they apply. General expressions of support or criticism, comments on matters not relevant to the Village Design Statement such as litter or highway maintenance, and comments on typographical errors have been omitted.

This analysis has been reviewed by members of the Working Group which produced the draft Village Design Statement in conjunction with the Head of Strategic Planning at Winchester City Council.

<b>VDS Section</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Made by</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Recommended Change</b>
Community/ History/ Economy	Should acknowledge the relationship between Oliver's Battery and Badger Farm. Shops and school depend on Badger Farm.	M Burman	Accepted	Amend paragraph 5 on page 6 to read "The development of Badger Farm provided a significant stimulus for community development, ... The enlarged population also helps to sustain Oliver's Battery school (approximately 75% of pupils now being drawn from Badger Farm) and local bus services, whilst the creation of a superstore and health centre changed the local economy affecting the shops in Oliver's Battery."
	Should acknowledge the active local WI and Women's Fellowship.	M Gardner	Accepted	Amend last paragraph on 6 to read "... women's group, Women's Institute, retired persons' club, ...".
	Improve Parish Council web site to include photographs of Councillors and user forum.	R Forrest	Not relevant to planning policy but accepted as a recommendation to Parish Council.	None.
Landscape Guidelines	Mobile phone masts at Maybush should be discouraged since they are close to Oliver's Battery School.	M Gardner	Policy LM1 applies. Masts are over 200 metres from school buildings and school management has raised no objection.	None
	Should acknowledge dog walking as a leisure activity in the countryside area.	J Dixon	Accepted	Amend paragraph 4 on page 8 to read "... recreational activities including "rambling, dog walking, horse riding, ...".
	Should provide more challenging play/sport facilities at the Recreation Ground.	R Forrest	Existing Parish Council policy. Design study initiated 2007.	None



<b>VDS Section</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Made by</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Recommended Change</b>
	Olivers Battery does not fall within the area defined by Local Plan policy CE.5	M Burman	Rejected. Part of Olivers Battery Parish falls within the countryside area defined by the Local Plan.	None
	Tree planting cannot be controlled. (Policy L3, L4)	M Burman	Rejected. Landowners can be required to maintain hedges fronting footpaths and major changes of land use (eg. Forestry) can be controlled. Even in other cases the VDS should aim to influence property and land owners, regardless of whether planning permission is needed	None
	Four other SINC's immediately surround the Yew Hill Butterfly Reserve and deserve mention as they form an important biodiversity and landscape unit in the area.	HCC Spatial Strategy Group	Accepted	Amend paragraph 1 on page 15 to read "Yew Hill, together with four neighbouring scrapland SINC's, form an important biodiversity and landscape unit, which may rightly ..." etc.  Amend wording of LY1 to add "The creation of a wildlife corridor linking Yew Hill SINC's with the Whiteshute ridge SINC should be encouraged."
Settlement Guidelines	Map 3 should include additional public viewpoints at the southern end of Oliver's Battery Road and Compton Way, and Parliament Place.	D Brown A Vince R Biles D May	Accepted	Include these viewpoints on Map 3.

<b>VDS Section</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Made by</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Recommended Change</b>
	The current density in Oliver's Battery is lower than that identified in the Local Plan and any new development must balance existing character, housing pressures and site specific characteristics.	R Williams	Accepted.	Amend paragraph 3 on page 18 to read "These require any developer to submit a design statement which relates their proposal to its immediate environment. This must provide protection for important public views, trees and hedgerows, open areas and landscape, and seek to protect the character of the surrounding environment."
	Building new dwellings in back gardens should be restricted.	P Kuru-kulaarachy	Policy SK2 applies in the relevant area.	None
	Clarify the meaning of "two storey dwelling"; bungalow conversions should not be included in this category and should be permitted (Policies S1, SD1, SK3).	P Draper M Burman	Accepted. The intention here was to protect the low profile of some areas of the parish. Bungalow roof conversions may achieve this if well designed. However, dwellings having two storeys plus a roof should be restricted to the central area.	Retain policy S1 unchanged. Amend the wording of policies SD1, SK3 to read: "Conversion or replacement of single storey dwellings with two storeys should only be permitted where the roof height and overall bulk of the resulting building would not dominate the street scene, adversely affect neighbouring properties, or restrict outward views and the low profile of the settlement when seen from outside the parish".
	Policies S2 and S4 are contradictory. Preserving trees will limit outward views	M Burman	Rejected. Policy S2 calls for protection of important trees. These do not usually restrict views but, even if they do, are important enough to warrant protection.	None

<b>VDS Section</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Made by</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Recommended Change</b>
	Dormer windows should be permitted in roof conversions to prevent over large roofs dominating the street scene.	P Draper M Burman	Existing Policy SK1 applies in the relevant area.	Amend wording of SK1 to read “roof lines should remain low to avoid dominating the street scene, with a preference for Velux roof lights or small dormers”.
	There is a need for a cafe or meeting point in the Village Centre	R Forrest	The document acknowledges this need, which has been highlighted by previous surveys.	None
	Opportunistic development of the Village Centre should be discouraged. Hardware store site should not be developed as “back land”. (Policies SV1, SV4)	M Burman	Accepted. In practice it's not going to be possible to redevelop the whole village centre so this shouldn't rule out 'piecemeal' development of the nursery/hardware site	Amend wording of SV1 to read: “Opportunities to improve its appearance and amenity via new or refurbished buildings, improved open space and appropriate planting should be welcomed and be integrated with other parts of the Village Centre”.
	Three storey buildings should be permitted in the Village Centre. (Policy SV2)	M Burman	Rejected. The majority of the buildings should remain two storey although the VDS does allow for exceptions where justified.	None
	Clarify Policies SV3 & SV5. How do these limit changes of use?	M Burman	Accepted.	Amend wording of SV5 to read “Change of use of commercial premises may be permitted but operators should be encouraged to address local needs within the parish and neighbouring areas, and discouraged from converting employment premises or local facilities/services to purely residential use.”.

<b>VDS Section</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Made by</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Recommended Change</b>
	Hardware store site should be developed as affordable homes for younger people / families and not the elderly.  Village Centre not a suitable location for sheltered housing.  (Policy SV4)	R Forrest  M Burman	Rejected. This policy enables creation of special needs housing but does not limit other types of housing. Village Centre meets criteria defined by Local Plan policy H.8	None.
	New development should include routes for walking and cycling within the settlement.	M Burman	Accepted.	Create Settlement Guideline S7 to read “Walking and cycling are important modes of travel within the settlement. Where possible, developers should consider the provision of additional routes within their plans. [DP.9]”.
	Redevelopment within Olivers Battery Road should be permitted according to Local Plan policy H4 to provide sheltered and affordable housing.	M Burman	Rejected. Local Plan policy H4 does not apply to Winchester, where the relevant policy is H3.	None.
Buildings and Features	Replant trees on Ancient Monument to provide additional shelter / screening.	P Davies	Policy F1 applies. Additional planting not permitted.	None.
	Care should be taken in erecting additional signage; the character of the archaeological sites in the area must be protected.	HCC Spatial Strategy Group	Accepted.	Amend last sentence of F1 to read “providing the <i>design and materials</i> used ...”
	St Marks Church has a timber roof. Food service area does not meet requirements for food preparation and is not a kitchen	M Gardner P Draper	Accepted.	Modify paragraph relating to St Marks Church on page 30 to read “It is housed in a pre-fabricated concrete building, ..., with a barrel-vault style timber roof. ... Internally, it provides ... a small food service area.”.

<b>VDS Section</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Made by</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Recommended Change</b>
	New development should be required to make a contribution towards creation of new community facilities.	M Burman	This can be done where existing Local Plan policies provide a basis for seeking contributions (such as public open space). The Government is considering a 'Community Infrastructure Levy' which could include a wider range of facilities, but there is no statutory basis for this currently.	None
Survey Evidence	17% return rate on survey is disappointing and therefore unrepresentative.	A Bristowe R Forrest	Rejected. This rate is acceptable when compared with surveys by other local authorities. Results were consistent with 2001 Parish Appraisal, which received a 50% return, and the 2001 Census.	None
Sustainability Appraisal	More development is required to sustain shops, public transport and community facilities and would be beneficial to the community.	M Burman	The VDS seeks to guide the nature of new development rather than to prevent it. However it must be consistent with the Local Plan which defines a clear boundary to Oliver's Battery and sets standards for the design of new development.	None
Traffic & Transport	Traffic delays at junction of Oliver's Battery Road and Badger Farm Road should be reduced via installation of a mini-roundabout.	P Moon H O'Neill	Policy T1 applies. Insufficient space for a mini roundabout.	None
	Traffic delays at junction of Oliver's Battery Road and Badger Farm Road should be reduced via installation of "smart" traffic signs/lights.	P Davies J Dixon	Policy T1 applies. Funding for traffic sign/lights dependent on P&R bus route decision.	None

<b><i>VDS Section</i></b>	<b><i>Comment</i></b>	<b><i>Made by</i></b>	<b><i>Response</i></b>	<b><i>Recommended Change</i></b>
	Parking near road junctions, e.g. Olivers Battery Road with Old Kennels Lane, is potentially hazardous and should be prohibited.	P King A Vince	Accepted	Modify Transport Objective T2 to read: "There appears to be ... little need for additional speed restrictions or traffic calming measures, but parking restrictions may help to improve safety near important junctions" .
	A pedestrian crossing should be provided at the Sainsbury roundabout.	A Bristow	The document acknowledges this need which is stated in Policy T4.	None
	Should encourage cycling. Include paragraph to discuss needs of cyclists and required physical measures, e.g. signs.	P Draper	Accepted	Create Transport Objective T6 to read: "There is potential to increase the use of cycling within the parish. Consideration should be given to signage for cycle routes, creation of new cycle routes, and provision of cycle racks in the Village Centre, to encourage this.".

**APPENDIX 3****Otterbourne Village Design Statement – Analysis of Comments on Draft VDS**

<b>Name</b>	<b>VDS Ref</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Recommended change</b>
Julie Ayre	Preamble	Very impressed with the excellent design and all of the information. It was easy to read, and the Summary of Guidelines is excellent and should be referred to at Parish Council meetings. What is said reflects my knowledge and understanding of the Parish and the Timeline is particularly effective at communicating how the village has developed. It shows that steady but manageable growth has taken place at almost every decade in the last Century and in that respect Otterbourne should be classed as a planning success. There are only a couple of minor comments or questions.	This support is welcomed.	None
Julie Ayre	Guideline No. 15 (page 27 and also 36)	Refers to “plots with small enclosed front gardens”. Am not sure about the “enclosed” - the Team is probably trying to avoid building up to the pavement boundary line or proliferation of flats, but most front gardens are open plan or enclosed by very low wall/shrubs which does not interfere with the feeling of openness.	The Team was referring to the distinctive historic pattern in pre-war properties which is part of the distinctiveness of the village. The support for this approach is welcomed.	None
Julie Ayre	Guideline No. 21 (page 28 and also 36)	Refers to “carefully assessed in terms of the capacity of the highway”. The capacity of the road network may be far more than currently recorded so full road capacity would be an intolerable strain on the village. The cumulative effect of traffic should be taken into account so could this be used - WCC used the	The Team understands this comment, and agrees to delete “in terms of the capacity of the highway”.	Modify the second sentence of Guideline 21 to read.... “Additional industrial/commercial uses which generate more commercial traffic, particularly of heavy goods vehicles, should be carefully assessed in terms of <i>the effect on the highway network and on the residents’ quality of life.</i>

		following wording re R&W Four Dell Farm application “.....associated lorry traffic would have an unacceptable impact on the quality of life of the occupants of the nearest houses and houses along the route through Otterbourne.....”, so could unacceptable impact on the quality of life be used?		The impact on the village of noise particularly by night-time traffic, fumes and pollution should be analysed and minimised ”.
Julie Ayre	Page 32	To bring the document up to date Southern Water should be changed to “Sparrowgrove and Oakwood Conservation Trust” as this sale is currently agreed and contacts are being drawn up.	Agreed that this update is helpful.	Replace paragraph “Other open spaces in the village.....the Woodland Trust” with: “Other open spaces in the village include Oakwood Copse, a delightful bluebell wood, and the larger Sparrowgrove Copse on the boundary between Otterbourne Parish and Compton and Shawford Parish, formerly in the ownership of Southern Water. The sale of land in 2008 to the newly-formed Sparrowgrove and Oakwood Conservation Trust ensured that the two copses are in community ownership in perpetuity”  Retain following text as new paragraph: “Otterbourne Park Wood to the south is managed by the Woodland Trust.”
Julie Ayre	Page 44	The credits have been put in alphabetical order but I think the Team Leader, Suzanne Hudson, should be properly acknowledged for her work and head the list. There are also a couple of things still with ? for references on the hard copy I read, which may have been inserted by now: Page 11 No 2. See map page? Also at the Note:.....see index page? Page 16 Biodiversity Note; on page? Page 36 No 2 see map page?	Agreed to alter back page credit list with Team Leader to head list  Typos done	Amend credit list on back page.