

CAB1983(LDF) – Supplement Relating to Omitted Representations

Response No./Organisation	Summary of Key Issues	WCC Officer response and Recommended Approach
02923 (North Whiteley Consortium)	<p>Policy CP.1 / para 9.18:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Object, the policy is too prescriptive and should allow flexibility (alternative wording suggested). The impact on viability of requirements for facilities needs to be considered in relation to other requirements. 	<p>See responses to similar issues at CAB1983(LDF) Appendix B, page 13. CP.1 sets District-wide standards and does not refer specifically to Whiteley, but Policy CP.23 acknowledges the need for the cumulative impact of developer requirements to avoid harming development viability.</p>
02923 (North Whiteley Consortium)	<p>Paragraphs 10.8-10.17:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Paragraph 10.8 does not accord with PPG13 and PPS1; paragraph 10.13 should not refer to locating employment within the North Whiteley development; paragraph 10.15 should refer to an agreed (transport) approach; paragraph 10.16 should be amended to reflect the Parking SPD; paragraph 10.17 should refer to on-going work on transport measures. 	<p>The paragraphs referred to relate generally to transport measures across the District as a whole, or to all of the strategic allocations, not just North Whiteley. This Chapter does not, therefore attempt to prescribe specific measures for North Whiteley and it is recognised that work is on-going to identify these. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan, which will need to accompany the Core Strategy, will include more detail of the measures needed and how they will be implemented.</p>
02926 (Whiteley Co-ownership)	<p>Policy CP.3 / paras 11.1, 11.4, 11.7:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support Policy CP.3 and accompanying paragraphs. 	<p>The support is noted and welcomed.</p>
02923 (North Whiteley Consortium)	<p>Policy CP.6:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Object. The term ‘delivers net gain for biodiversity’ is ambiguous and reference to the ‘precautionary approach to avoid adverse 	<p>See responses to similar issues at CAB1983(LDF) Appendix E, page 25.</p>

Response No./Organisation	Summary of Key Issues	WCC Officer response and Recommended Approach
02923 (North Whiteley Consortium)	<p>impacts' needs revising to allow for greenfield development.</p> <p>Policy CP8:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support Policy CP.8. 	The support is noted and welcomed.
02923 (North Whiteley Consortium)	<p>Policy CP.10:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support the Meon Gap (Policy CP.10). 	The support is noted and welcomed.
02923 (North Whiteley Consortium)	<p>Policy CP.11:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The requirement for development to 'meet the highest standards of sustainable design' is excessive and unclear. 	See responses to similar issues at CAB1983(LDF) Appendix E, page 57.
02923 (North Whiteley Consortium)	<p>Policy CP.12:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support the expectation of at least 30 dwellings per hectare. 	The support is noted and welcomed.
02923 (North Whiteley Consortium), 02926 (Whiteley Co-ownership)	<p>Policy CP.13 / paragraphs 12.51-12.55:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence is needed to justify energy and water requirements which are ahead of national requirements and how viability issues are addressed. If the Council is considering wind power at should be reflected in policy with detail of feasibility, locations, etc; renewable energy measures need to be considered as part of wider viability considerations; para 12.55 should 	See responses to similar issues at CAB1983(LDF) Appendix E, pages 70-73. An assessment of the potential for renewables was undertaken prior to the Preferred Option and Policy CP.13 reflects its conclusions. A further study on the viability impacts of Policies CP.13 and CP.14 has been undertaken and recommends changes which can help to overcome concerns about this, see Recommended Approach at CAB1983(LDF) Appendix E, page 74.

Response No./Organisation	Summary of Key Issues	WCC Officer response and Recommended Approach
02923 (North Whiteley Consortium)	<p>refer to 'low <u>or</u> zero carbon, not 'low <u>and</u> zero carbon'.</p> <p>Policy CP.14:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Object to the hierarchy in Policy CP.14 which is not suitable for the densities likely to be achieved at Whiteley. 	<p>See responses to similar issues and Recommended Approach at CAB1983(LDF) Appendix E, pages 78-81. The Winchester Viability Study considers the feasibility of various measures for sites of different types and sizes and it is recommended that its conclusions be incorporated into Policies CP.13 and CP.14.</p>
02923 (North Whiteley Consortium), 02926 (Whiteley Co-ownership)	<p>Policy CP.15:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support Policy CP.15 and the designation of North Whiteley to help deliver the housing requirement for PUSH. 	<p>The support is noted and welcomed.</p>
02923 (North Whiteley Consortium)	<p>Policy CP.16:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy CP.16 should be deleted as its contents are covered by other policies. 	<p>See responses to similar issues and Recommended Approach at CAB1983(LDF) Appendix F, pages 25-26.</p>
02923 (North Whiteley Consortium), 02926 (Whiteley Co-ownership)	<p>Policy CP.17:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Housing mix should be determined by the Housing Market Assessment (delete reference to a large proportion being 2 and 3 bed). <p>Policy CP.18:</p>	<p>See responses to similar issues and Recommended Approach at CAB1983(LDF) Appendix F, pages 29-31.</p>

Response No./Organisation	Summary of Key Issues	WCC Officer response and Recommended Approach
02923 (North Whiteley Consortium), 02926 (Whiteley Co-ownership)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Object to Policy CP.18, which should set a target rather than a fixed requirement. 	See responses to similar issues and Recommended Approach at CAB1983(LDF) Appendix F, pages 34-38.
02923 (North Whiteley Consortium)	<p>Policy CP.19:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Object to Policy CP.19, which should set a target (35%) rather than a fixed requirement. 	See responses to similar issues and Recommended Approach at CAB1983(LDF) Appendix F, pages 41-44.
02923 (North Whiteley Consortium)	<p>Policy CP.23:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support Policy CP.23 and its link to the Delivery Plan and statement regarding viability. 	The support is noted and welcomed.
02923 (North Whiteley Consortium)	<p>Chapter 16 / Delivery Plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Object to the references to Whiteley Way, measures at M27 Junction 9, and education in relation to North Whiteley, which are too specific. 	<p>It is acknowledged that further work is needed to refine the Delivery Plan and this is being undertaken in conjunction with prospective developers. However, the revised Plan does need to be as specific as possible to meet government and PINS advice on deliverability of strategic allocations.</p> <p><u>Recommended Approach:</u></p> <p>No specific changes beyond those already recommended in report CAB1983(LDF).</p>