

1.0 Chapter 9 – Health and Well Being

- 1.1 Health and Well Being is one of the five themes of the Sustainable Community Strategy. It is aimed at making healthy lifestyles the norm for all residents. The achievement of this objective is being encouraged by the availability of facilities for sports and other physical activities, with residents not prejudiced by the unavailability of facilities or poor accommodation.
- 1.2 Policy CP1 deals with the recreational elements of this outcome, through the provision of facilities to ensure that a range exists to serve all the residents of the District.
- 1.3 PPG17 requires local authorities to undertake assessments of the existing and future needs of their communities for open space, sports and recreational facilities. Audits are also required of existing open space, sports and recreational facilities, the use made of existing facilities, access in terms of location and costs (such as charges) and opportunities for new open space and facilities. Local authorities should consider both the quantitative and the qualitative elements of open space, sports and recreational facilities.
- 1.4 A joint 'PPG17 study' was carried out by Winchester City Council and East Hampshire District Council (see CAB1545 (LDF) and CAB1651 (LDF)). It suggested revised open space standards from those set out in the Winchester District Local Plan Review and included recommended new standards for built facilities.
- 1.5 A total of 453 responses were received to Chapter 9. The majority of responses related to the methodology of the PPG17 study and proposed new standards set out in Tables 1 and 2. In addition, comments were received regarding the close relationship between CP.1 and CP.5 (green infrastructure) and whether the two policies should be merged. Indeed, natural open space is included in CP.1, but as it also forms an element of 'green infrastructure' it was also covered by policy CP.5.

2.0 Conclusion and Recommended Approach

- 2.1 It is apparent that there is a close relationship between the provision of open space and green infrastructure and this needs to be made clearer in the Core Strategy. The Council has commissioned consultants to produce a District-wide

Green Infrastructure Study. This is not yet complete, but initial indications are that it will recommend a series of guiding principles for the provision of Green Infrastructure. These will help to develop Policy CP.5 on Green Infrastructure and to provide the greater level of 'local distinctiveness' needed in that policy. However, the GI Study will not be at the level of detail that would be needed to develop and justify a 'standard' for Green Infrastructure provision and that would need to follow, if needed, in the Development Management and Allocations DPD.

- 2.2 Policy CP.1 includes a standard for various types of recreation facility and these comprise some (but not all) components of GI. As the standards in CP.1 have been fully researched and justified by the PPG17 Study it is recommended that Policy CP.1 and its associated standards be retained. Subject to the conclusions of the GI Study, Policy CP.5 (Green Infrastructure) could remain as a free-standing policy or be combined with CP.1. It should be amended so as to be more locally distinctive, taking account of the GI Study's results, but would not include a quantitative standard for GI provision.
- 2.3 In relation to the standards set out in Tables 1 and 2 there have been various comments on these, but the standards are justified by the PPG17 Study. Accordingly the only change recommended in relation to these Tables is to clarify the heading of one of the open space categories.

Recommended Approach:

1. Maintain Policy CP.1 generally as drafted, subject to the possibility of combining it with Policy CP.5 (Green Infrastructure) once the Green Infrastructure Study is completed.
2. Amend the 'Informal Green Space' heading in Table 1 to 'Informal Open Space'.

Chapter 9 Health & Well Being		
Response no./Organisation	Summary of key issues	WCC officer response and Recommended Approach
01463	Para 9.1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to the term well-being as it is difficult to define and means nothing. 	The term well-being is widely used and reflects one of the five themes in Winchester City Council's Sustainable Community Strategy.
0247	Para 9.2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consideration should be given for a health centre in the North Whiteley development noting that a site was identified in the original Whiteley master plan but it did not materialize. • Should be facilities for the deceased (cemetery etc). 	The Infrastructure provision for North Whiteley is considered in policies SH1, SH3 and the Delivery Plan.
03199 (Sport England), 02592 (The Forestry Commission)	Para 9.5 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support the reference to open space, sports and recreation study, but it is also appropriate to refer to the Council's Playing Pitch Strategy and other sports strategies. • Seek assurance that WCC intends to uphold a broader consideration of PPG17 that accommodates provision in rural areas (i.e. woodlands) and make connection to green infrastructure assets. • Keen for the contribution made by The Forestry Commission to the delivery of the open spaces 	Support is noted. The Open Space, Sports and Recreation Study (part 3), includes the Council's Playing Pitch Strategy. Other sports strategies should be included in the Evidence Base. Natural greenspace does include woodland and is also considered to be part of the green infrastructure for the District (see policy CP5). It is recognised that there needs to be strong links between adjoining authorities, especially in the case of

	<p>sports and recreation is fully integrated across District boundaries, especially in relation to the SDAs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would welcome specific reference to the benefits provided by children and young people's play in rural areas as defined in the Winchester District Play Strategy 2007 – 2012 'It's OK to Play' 	<p>the SDAs, and the City Council is working with the relevant Authorities and SDA Project Officers.</p> <p>.</p> <p>The policies in the Core Strategy reflect the spatial elements of strategies such as the Play Strategy, however it is not possible to reiterate the content of all strategies in detail.</p>
<p>00841, 02324, 02341, 02349, 02354, 02359, 02360, 02361, 02362, 03107, 03116, 03118, 03119, 03129, 03132, 03133, 03223, 10070, 10103, 10104, 10106, 10107, 10109, 10110, 10111, 10112, 10253, 10275, 10277, 10278, 10279, 10280, 10281, 10282, 10283, 10285, 10286, 10287, 10288, 10290, 10291, 10292, 10293, 10294, 10295, 10296, 10297, 10298, 10299, 10300, 10301, 10302, 10303, 10304, 10305, 10306, 10307, 10308, 10309, 10310, 10311, 10312, 10313,</p>	<p>Para 9.6</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fails to recognise that horse and pony riding is a leisure sport and enjoyed by many in Denmead who use the country lanes 	<p>While horse and pony riding are not specifically mentioned (as it was not possible to include all sport and leisure pursuits in the PPG17 study), other projects are on-going in the District which should have a positive effect for recreation in the Denmead area. The PUSH green infrastructure study is promoting projects to improve access to the Forest of Bere and other areas. The designation of the South Downs National Park will also have a positive impact, as one of the remits of the National Park Authority will be to encourage recreational use within the National Park.</p>

<p>10314, 10315, 10316, 10317, 10318, 10319, 10320, 10321, 10322, 10323, 10324, 10325, 10326, 10327, 10328, 10329, 10330, 10331, 10332, 10333, 10334, 10335, 10336, 10337, 10338, 10339, 10340, 10341, 10342, 10343, 10344, 10345, 10346, 10347, 10348, 10349, 10350, 10350, 10351, 10352, 10353, 10354, 10355, 10356, 10357, 10358, 10359, 10360, 10362, 10363, 10364, 10365, 10366, 10367, 10368, 10369, 10370, 10371, 10372, 10373, 10374, 10375, 10376, 10378, 10379, 10380, 10381, 10382, 10383, 10385, 10428, 10429, 10430, 10431, 10433, 10434, 10425, 10436,</p>		
<p>00091 (Natural England), 01994</p>	<p>Para 9.8</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support – can be achieved through a variety of ways including community partnerships, working with key 	<p>Support and associated comments are noted. Whilst the City Council encourages businesses to buy local produce, this is not something which the Core</p>

	<p>land managers such as Forestry Commission, as well as through Environmental Stewardship agreements with Natural England.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land does need to be well maintained and managed. It is often farm land, which should be protected and supported and needs to be viable. Business should be required to buy local produce. 	Strategy can require.
00120	<p>Para 9.9</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are long waiting lists for allotments in Winchester. Need new allotment schemes in locations accessible to families, including near schools. 	The new standards in Table 1 of the Core Strategy include the provision for allotments. The location of allotments will reflect areas of need and the availability of suitable land.
03204, 01994, 02362, 03107, 03116, 03147, 10253, 10277, 10278, 10279, 10280, 10281, 10282, 10283, 10285, 10286, 10287, 10288, 10290, 10291, 10292, 10293, 10294, 10295, 10296, 10297, 10298, 10300, 10301, 10302, 10303, 10305, 10307, 10310, 10311, 10313, 10314, 10318, 10321, 10324, 10331, 10428,	<p>Paras 9.12 -9.13</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support the principle of increased open space standards, but need to protect settlement boundaries. Natural green space for leisure use must recognise need to maintain and protect biodiversity. • Support – if possible open space standards should be increased. • There needs to be more clarification of the changes in open space categories and requirements between the Local Plan and Core Strategy as the increase in provision required does not appear to be justified by 	<p>The review of settlement boundaries will take place as part of the Development Management and Allocations Development Plan Document and will consider a wide range of factors, including the need for open space and other ‘non-housing’ uses.</p> <p>The open space standards have been developed in close consultation with Sport England using the methodology set out in PPG17 and the Companion Guide. Justification for the increases in open space</p>

10429, 10430, 10431, 10433, 10434, 10425, 10436	the evidence base.	standards is set out in part 1 of the Open Space, Sport and Recreation study and for built facilities in part 4. The Local Plan included a commitment to undertake the PPG17 Study, which has now been completed, and it is appropriate that the Core Strategy should bring the new standards into effect.
00089 (Hampshire County Council), 03199 (Sport England)	<p>Para 9.17</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sport Hampshire & IOW are currently developing a sub-regional sports facility evidence base of existing provision and future need, which includes a Sports Facility Report for the Winchester District (developed through consultation with the Leisure Department at Winchester City Council). HCC seeks an early dialogue with the Council to ensure that the strategic issues for sports facility provision identified within the Winchester District are appropriately met. • Welcome the commitment to undertake a supplementary planning document for providing open space, which is consistent with the South East Plan. 	<p>This work is now underway. The dialogue between the Leisure Department at Winchester and Hampshire County Council has now been completed.</p> <p>This section of the Core Strategy refers to the intention to produce a Supplementary Planning Document to replace the Open Space Strategy and implement the new recreation standards. With the commencement of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) from April 2010 the Council may need to reconsider the best way to implement the new</p>

		standards as part of the process of deciding whether / when to implement CIL.
Policy CP.1 - Health & Well Being		
Sustainability Appraisal/Strategic Environmental Assessment – extract of SA/SEA report on Core Strategy Preferred Option:		
The policy will actively progress the SA Framework and Community Strategy objectives relating to a healthy population. There are also potential related benefits for biodiversity, the landscape and car related pollution. Overall this is a positive policy which will have long term, cumulative and synergistic benefits.		
10274 (Cllr Jackie Porter)	<u>Policy CP1 (including tables 1 & 2), para 9.14</u> <u>General comments</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The value of open space and meaningful activity are extremely important for health and well being. • Flat dwellers in the district must have access to usable, multi purpose, but accessible areas of open space and public buildings in which to share activity with friends. • The community levy should include a levy for public buildings, as well as play. • An 'older person's levy could be included to provide powered buggy parking (with chargers) and more seating to accommodate our ageing population. 	The Policy recognises the value of open space and activity and applies to all forms of housing, including flats. Community Infrastructure Levy regulations have recently been published and will come into effect from April 2009. The Council will need to look in detail at CIL and decide whether it is appropriate to introduce it in the District, along with the types of infrastructure that should be included.
0004 (Bishops Waltham Parish Council), 00006 (Bramdean and	<u>Support CP1</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NHS Hampshire would like to work closely with the Council to ensure that the health needs of the new 	Support and associated comments are noted.

<p>Hinton Ampner Parish Council), 00042 (Wickham Parish Council), 03199 (Sports England), 10268 (NHS Hampshire)</p> <p>00086 (Environment Agency), 00089 (Hampshire County Council), 00091 (Natural England), 02592 (Forestry Commission), 10450</p> <p>00841, 02107, 02116, 02173, 02174, 02324, 02341, 02349, 02354, 02359, 02361, 02991, 02360, 02361, 02362, 03071, 03107, 03116, 03118, 03119, 03129, 03132, 03133, 03147, 03198, 03199 (Sport England) 03204, 03223, 10058, 10070, 10103, 10104, 10106, 10107, 10109, 10110,</p>	<p>population are met and that they have easy access to primary care services (in line with the Primary Care Strategy – Health Horizons in Primary Care 2009). Developer contributions (S106/CIL) may be needed where appropriate.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support CP1 – development proposals should only be accepted which address the shortfall in recreation facilities. • Generally support, but any replacement provision should be better than ‘like for like’ • Support the commitment to seeking improvements in open space and built recreation facilities but suggest amending third paragraph: “...that alternative facilities are at least as accessible to current and potential new users, and at least equivalent or better in terms of size, usefulness, attractiveness and quality.” • Peter Symonds College supports the principles of the strategy for Open Space, Sport and Recreation. However, if the College is to move forward with improvements, this will result in changes to the way that sport and recreation facilities are provided and may affect the way in which the whole of College land is used, including the playing fields and recreational open spaces. 	<p>New development can only be required to make provision for its own needs, not to resolve existing shortfalls.</p> <p>Policy CP.1 specifies that where replacement provision takes place, it should be at least as accessible and at least equivalent in terms of size, etc. The wording change suggested would add ‘or better’ which would repeat the existing requirement for facilities to be ‘at least’ equivalent to those existing.</p> <p>Peter Symonds comments are noted. The Core Strategy cannot consider individual sites, but the Council would be pleased to discuss the implications and options for the future of this important facility.</p>
--	--	--

<p>10111, 10112, 10247, 10253, 10275, 10277, 10278, 10279, 10280, 10281, 10282, 10283, 10284, 10285, 10286, 10287, 10288, 10289, 10290, 10291, 10292, 10293, 10294, 10295, 10296, 10297, 10298, 10299, 10300, 10301, 10302, 10303, 10304, 10305, 10306, 10307, 10308, 10309, 10310, 10311, 10312, 10313, 10314, 10315, 10316, 10317, 10318, 10319, 10320, 10321, 10322, 10323, 10324, 10325, 10326, 10327, 10328, 10329, 10330, 10331, 10332, 10333, 10334, 10335, 10337, 10338, 10339, 10340, 10341, 10342, 10343, 10344, 10345, 10346, 10347, 10348, 10349, 10350, 10351, 10352, 10353, 10354, 10355, 10356, 10357, 10358, 10359, 10360, 10362, 10363,</p>	<p><u>Object to CP1</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CP1 needs to link to the Green Infrastructure (CP5) and Sustainable Transport (CP2) policies. • Paragraph 3 should be amended to read “presumption against the loss of any open space, sports or built recreation facility”. • The policy should also consider the potential for land contamination in terms of human health on sites designated as open space with public access. • Concerned at references within the policy to ‘educational provision’ being included within a blanket protection of open space, sport and recreation. Suggest final paragraph of CP1 should be amended to include further criteria of “any loss will result in an overriding benefit to the local community by facilitating enhancements to local education infrastructure”. • CP1 is too narrow to encourage healthy lifestyles, especially in rural areas. The new standards of provision are likely to require contributions from most development and it will not be possible to 	<p>It is agreed that there are links between the Open space, Green Infrastructure and Sustainable Transport policies and the Core Strategy already recognises these.</p> <p>The phrase ‘open space, sports or recreation facility’ reflects the terminology used in PPG17. The term ‘recreation facility’ can include built facilities and there is, therefore no need to add the word ‘built’.</p> <p>Potentially hazardous past uses of sites are taken into account when designating public open spaces.</p> <p>The proposed additional criteria relating to local education infrastructure is contrary to national guidance as set out in PPG17. This states that “Existing open space, sports and recreational buildings and land should not be built on unless an assessment has been undertaken which has clearly shown the open space or the buildings and land to be surplus to requirements.”</p> <p>It will usually be possible to offer hall provision for sport, tennis courts and sports pitches near to contributing dwellings. It is recognised that other facilities may be more thinly-spread, hence the</p>
--	--	--

<p>10364, 10365, 10366, 10366, 10367, 10368, 10369, 10370, 10371, 10372, 10373, 10374, 10375, 10376, 10378, 10379, 10380, 10381, 10382, 10383, 10385, 10387, 10390, 10393, 10401, 10411, 10420, 10421, 10426, 10427, 10428, 10429, 10430, 10431, 10433, 10434, 10435, 10436, 10440 (Cllr Learney on behalf of Winchester Liberal Democratic Group)</p>	<p>make provision within a reasonable distance of the contributing dwellings. This conflicts with Government advice and it will be difficult to determine what is required, e.g. for swimming pool provision.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CP1 should be amended to require financial contributions only when justified having regard to viability issues. • CP1 is contrary to the South East Plan by failing to consider cultural as well as sporting activity and by failing to provide for disadvantaged groups. 	<p>reference to a driving catchment. It is appropriate that contributions towards facilities such as swimming pools and synthetic turf pitches should be combined from within a 20-30 minute driving catchment.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that viability is a key issue for the deliverability of sites. It is intended that the viability of Strategic Sites will be assessed on an individual basis and policy CP.23 acknowledges that the impact of infrastructure requirements on viability will be taken into account. If the Council decides to introduce CIL, there is scope for allowing relief in exceptional circumstances for developments that would otherwise not proceed.</p> <p>CP1 relates to open space, sport and recreation. The South East Plan advocates cultural activity through local development documents and other measures. The Council does not currently have an adequate basis of evidence to justify standards of provision or developer contributions which would equate to those for open space and recreation. These could, however, potentially be included within subsequent LDF documents, or within the CIL if the Council chooses to adopt it. The Core Strategy is subject to an Equalities Impact Assessment and the published Core Strategy will reflect the EIA's recommendations.</p>
--	--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The strategy fails to consider the ability of the environment to accommodate change, avoiding risk to the environment, etc. Winchester appears to be open to manipulation by Parish Councils attempting to change the status of reserve sites. <p><u>Standards</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support the standards-based approach but need to take account of quality also. • Natural England recommends the standards for green space as set out in 'Access to Natural Green-Space Standards (ANGSt) – this will help achieve one aspect of a wide and robust green infrastructure network. • Need clarity over what is meant by green infrastructure and the Council should be liaising with HCC to improve rights of way. There is a case for development in Level 1 and 2 settlements to contribute to this. • The reference to informal green space which should 	<p>The ability of the environment to accommodate change is taken into account and the Plan's strategic allocations are subject to sustainability appraisal and other assessments. The Core Strategy does not make non-strategic allocations or proposals for the Local Reserve Sites.</p> <p>For comments on quality see response to the Supports to CP1</p> <p>The PPG17 Study concluded that, given the significance and importance attached to natural green spaces, it would be desirable to develop local standards of provision. The ANGSt guidance was used as a starting point for a local standard, but it was considered unrealistic to aim for a general minimum level of provision of 2 ha per 1000, as it would be largely impossible to find additional land available to achieve this standard.</p> <p>There is on-going communication between the City Council and Hampshire County Council on the quality and provision of Rights of Way. See also responses to comments on Policy CP.5 in relation to green infrastructure.</p> <p>Informal Open Space is categorised in the PPG 17 study as including "those spaces open to free and</p>
--	--	---

	<p>be to 'informal open space' to be consistent with PPG17 study.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased open space standards and the requirement for built facilities may make sites uneconomical. References to built facilities should be deleted from CP1. Tables 1 & 2 should be replaced by the current Local Plan standards. • The open space standards in tables 1 and 2 are not adequately justified by the PPG17 Study. • There have been no discussions or consultation with the equestrian stakeholders in Denmead to support the standard of 1.0 ha/1000 of natural greenspace. • The need for the provision of allotments should be assessed on a site by site basis and should only be required where there is a local shortfall to serve likely demand from future residents. • The provision of a full range of social and physical infrastructure should include the standard provision of allotments 	<p>spontaneous use by the public, but neither laid out nor manage for a specific function such as a park, playing field or recreation ground; nor managed as a natural or semi-natural habitat. The PPG17 Study refers to both Informal Green Space and Informal Open Space. For clarity, one term should be used.</p> <p>For response to comments on viability, see CP1 above. The justification for the open space standards is set out in section 6 of the PPG17 study main report.</p> <p>Although equestrian stakeholders in Denmead were not directly consulted, the standard for natural greenspace was developed with a range of both urban and rural stakeholders across the District during the consultation process for the PPG17 Study. This reflects the wide range of potential users of natural green space</p> <p>The provision of all the categories of open space and recreation facilities set out in Tables 1 and 2 (including allotments) will be assessed on a site by site basis, taking account of existing surpluses or shortfalls. This would be done through the Council's Open Space Strategy which is updated annually (or through any successor document as part of CIL) and will identify local deficiencies. This potentially may become a Supplementary Planning Document if required.</p> <p>Allotments are included within the range of</p>
--	--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CP1 should take into account local variation as identified in the PPG17 Study, hence, open space requirements and built facilities standards should be judged on a site by site basis. This will ensure that there is not under or over provision of open space and or related built facilities for the District whilst also avoiding duplication of provision. • Table 1 should take account of local circumstances and distinguish between on and off-site provision. • Fails to recognise that horse and pony riding is a leisure sport and enjoyed by many in Denmead who use the country lanes. Also should make references to other users of quiet country lanes including walkers and cyclists. • There are differences in the walk distance requirements and driving catchment areas. They need further explanation/justification as to how distances have been reached • The section on walking and cycling is non committal, there is no discussion on how to address the issues that prevent people doing these things that are obviously beneficial. 	<p>infrastructure requirements by virtue of their inclusion in Table 1.</p> <p>It is not possible for Table 1 to specify whether provision should be on or off site, but this will be subject to clarification in future documents.</p> <p>See response to paragraph 9.6.</p> <p>The PPG 17 Study explains how walk distances and driving catchment areas have been calculated.</p> <p>It is recognised that there are barriers to encouraging people to walk and cycle. However, this a wider issue which cannot be addressed only through the open space and built facilities standards. It is an issue which needs to be considered throughout the Core Strategy. especially policies relating green infrastructure, sustainable transport and the strategic allocations.</p> <p>The Core Strategy will not allocate LEAPs, as this is</p>
--	--	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Open Space Strategy identifies the possible need for a LEAP be provided to serve the eastern side of Alresford. The provision of a LEAP would be appropriate in any further development at Langton's Farm. 	<p>too detailed for consideration by the Core Strategy. This should be done through the Open Space Strategy.</p> <p><u>Recommended approach</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Table 1 - amend the name of the category from 'Informal Green Space' to 'Informal Open Space'
--	--	---