

CABINET (LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK) COMMITTEE

17 DECEMBER 2012

COLDEN COMMON VILLAGE DESIGN STATEMENT - ADOPTION

REPORT OF HEAD OF STRATEGIC PLANNING

Contact Officer: Steve Opacic Tel No: 01962 848101

email: sopacic@winchester.gov.uk

RECENT REFERENCES:

PHD423 – [‘Draft Colden Common Village Design Statement’](#) August 2012

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

A draft Village Design Statement (VDS) for Colden Common was published for public consultation in August 2012.

In order for this document to carry weight in the planning decision-making process, it needs to be adopted by the City Council as a ‘Supplementary Planning Document’. The procedures for producing Supplementary Planning Documents require formal consultation on draft Village Design Statements. This report summarises the comments received following public consultation on the draft Village Design Statement, and recommends adoption of the ‘Planning Guidance’ contained within the VDS, subject to a number of changes following the public consultation, as outlined in the schedule of comments at Appendix 1.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 1 That the ‘Planning Guidance’ of the Colden Common Village Design Statement, as proposed to be amended, be adopted as a Supplementary Planning Document.
- 2 That ‘Commonview’ be thanked for producing the Design Statement.

CABINET (LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK) COMMITTEE

17 DECEMBER 2012

COLDEN COMMON VILLAGE DESIGN STATEMENT - ADOPTION

DETAIL:

1 Introduction

- 1.1 The City Council encourages the production of Village and Neighbourhood Design Statements (VDSs/NDSs) by local communities so as to improve the quality of development in local areas and to promote 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 (SPDs).
- 1.2 The Town & Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 set out various requirements which must be followed when producing and adopting SPD, including in relation to public consultation on draft proposals. Failure to meet these requirements could either prevent the City Council from adopting the Village Design Statement as SPD or lead to its validity being challenged.
- 1.3 There is not currently a VDS for Colden Common so this Design Statement is the first to be produced for the village. The draft VDS contained a statement of community involvement which will need to be updated to reflect consultation on the draft VDS earlier this year.

2 Production of the VDS

- 2.1 The draft VDS has been produced by a group of local residents who volunteered to develop and produce the VDS, following initial Parish Council and public meetings dating from 2008. The group adopted the name 'Commonview' and set up a website to progress the VDS, including inviting input from the local community. The VDS has been produced following a series of consultations and local input to its development. This has included open days and a local questionnaire to assist in developing the content of the VDS.
- 2.2 The Commonview website has been used to communicate and co-ordinate progress and quarterly newsletters have been distributed. The VDS has been through several drafts, has been subject to informal consultation through the measures described above, and has also received input from City Council planning officers. The VDS was published for a period of formal consultation in August/September 2012.
- 2.3 The draft VDS describes the characteristics of specific areas of the settlement and identifies features that developments should maintain or enhance. The

draft VDS includes a series of 'Planning Guidance' which takes the form of design principles and guidelines which are intended to be adopted as SPD by the City Council. The guidance generally accords with and supplements the policies of the statutory Winchester District Local Plan Review 2006, cross-referring to its policies where appropriate. The draft VDS is also consistent with the emerging Winchester District Local Plan Part 1 – Joint Core Strategy and reflects government policy in regard to localism, having been developed by the local community.

- 2.4 It accords with paragraph 153 of the National Planning Policy Framework in that it provides information that will help applicants make successful applications, containing guidance on what is sought within the VDS area in design terms. The draft VDS meets the various requirements for the preparation of Supplementary Planning Documents, for example through the involvement of the community. A Sustainability Appraisal has not been undertaken as the 2012 Regulations no longer include this as a requirement.
- 2.5 The Planning Guidance within the draft Colden Common VDS satisfies the criteria for SPD, supplementing the WDLPR 2006. It further satisfies the 2012 Regulations in regard to its preparation process. Accordingly, it is recommended that Planning Guidance of the draft Colden Common VDS is adopted as SPD.

3 Summary of Representations and Changes Proposed

- 3.1 The consultation period ran from 6 August – 17 September 2012 and 17 responses were received. All of the comments received are available to view on the Council's web site: [Colden Common Village Design Statement \(comments on draft VDS\)](#). These included comments from the Environment Agency, Natural England, Hampshire County Council and various residents or landowners. The Village Design Statement group (Commonview) has considered the representations received and has agreed recommended responses to them with officers in the Strategic Planning Team.
- 3.2 As a result of the consultation and subsequent updating, several changes are proposed to the draft VDS. Appendix 1 contains a summary of the representations made, together with the response and – in the final column – the changes that are recommended as a result. The proposed changes are mainly to make various improvements in relation to education, rights of way, transport provision, drainage and the character of the village, particularly to meet the suggestions of the statutory consultees.
- 3.3 Several of the responses make reference to potential future development in the village and refer in particular to land to the west of the village, off Upper Moors Road, which has been promoted as a potential development site by its owner. These comments often oppose future development in this area, or in the village as a whole, or seek to include guidance in the VDS to secure the protection of the area. Some suggest that more information should be included in the VDS on matters such as ecology, drainage, etc and provide information to assist this.

- 3.4 However, the Village Design Statement is concerned with guiding the design of future development, rather than establishing whether and where future development should be. Whilst the VDS could include details of matters such as ecology, landscape and drainage, its guidance should relate to the whole area covered by the VDS, not just to one site. In any event, the detailed information which some respondents wish to see included in the VDS is publicly available from other sources and would be taken into account where it is relevant to future land allocations or planning applications.
- 3.5 The main changes proposed are as follows:
- Update references to education provision and the fact that the Education Authority is seeking developer contributions towards improved school provision;
 - Add more detailed references regarding rights of way and access to the South Downs National Park, including reference to the Countryside Access Plan for the South Downs;
 - Add new Planning Guidance relating to transport assessments and developer contributions;
 - Improve references to drainage and flooding matters, including Planning Guidance on the need for Sustainable Drainage Systems (SUDS);
 - Clarify references to the setting of the village.
 - In addition, section 1 of the VDS, which forms the consultation statement, will need to be updated to refer to the formal consultation on the draft VDS, the comments received and how they have been taken into account.
- 3.6 The VDS has not yet been updated and reproduced to include the changes proposed in the Appendix, as these are relatively modest and self-explanatory (the draft VDS document can be viewed at [‘Draft Colden Common Village Design Statement’](#)).

4 CONCLUSION

- 4.1 It is recommended that the changes outlined in Appendix 1 be agreed and that the ‘Planning Guidance’ in the Colden Common VDS be adopted by the Council as SPD, inclusive of the alterations recommended in Appendix 1.

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS:

5 SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITY STRATEGY AND CORPORATE BUSINESS PLAN (RELEVANCE TO):

- 5.1 Although not specifically mentioned in the Community Strategy, the production of VDSs 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 Village and Neighbourhood Design Statements are eligible for funding from the Community Planning Budget. The Colden Common VDS has already received the £500 available from this fund as a contribution towards publication costs. This represents the limit of the Community Planning Budget and therefore there are no further resource implications for the City Council.

7 RISK MANAGEMENT ISSUES

- 7.1 None

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS:

Comments received in response to the publication of the draft Village Design Statement, which can be viewed at: [Colden Common Village Design Statement \(comments on draft VDS\)](#), under Planning Policy on the City Council's website.

APPENDICES:

Appendix 1: Colden Common Village Design Statement 2012 - Summary of Comments and Responses

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS ON COLDEN COMMON VILLAGE DESIGN STATEMENT 2012

RESPONDENT	RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS	COMMONVIEW RESPONSE	AMENDMENTS
1, Wendy Williams	Want to keep the Upper Moors meadows in Brambridge in their existing and original habitat. The description of a 'triangle' that includes the Brambridge meadows between Church Lane, Upper Moors and Spring Lane should be removed from the VDS as these areas are countryside outside of the established Colden Common settlement boundary. These meadows are of great environmental, historic and aesthetic value and need to be described as such in the VDS.	The term 'triangle' is used to refer to the roads which generally contain the village, which are a locally recognised geographical area. It is referred to in inverted commas so as to ensure that it is not interpreted as a settlement boundary or development limit. Such boundaries are defined in the statutory Local Plan and are supported by the VDS.	None
2 Caroline Muscat	Concerned about the recommendations for new housing developments in Colden Common. How is the local primary school going to be able to cope with more children when it is already full? There has been no mention of this fundamental problem in the statement.	The paragraph under the heading 'School' (VDS page 19) should be replaced to describe current situation.	<p>Replace the paragraph under the heading 'School' (VDS page 19) with:</p> <p>In recent years it has not been possible for places in the Primary School to be offered to all children who live in the Parish. This is a significant concern within the local community. Hampshire County Council, as the responsible Education Authority, has indicated that additional classrooms are required, and that contributions should be sought from housing developers who gain planning permission for future developments.</p>

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS ON COLDEN COMMON VILLAGE DESIGN STATEMENT 2012

3 Frank Glasspool	The VDS determines that, amongst others, the area west of the village is outside of the Colden Common settlement area. These fields, which form part of the Itchen Valley, are of environmental importance given the range of diverse ecosystems that are evident in that area. There should be a strong pronouncement in the Design statement to that effect.	The VDS does not allocate sites for development and neither can it pre-judge this process for specific sites. If it deals with the detail of ecology, landscape or other matters for one site it should do so for the whole VDS area. As this information is already contained and published in other sources it would not be appropriate for it to be included in the VDS.	None
4 Don Fielder	I can find no statement on the scope proposed for the development of the village and therefore I must object on the basis of the effect of any development on services, traffic congestion and provision of schooling.	It is not the function of the VDS to propose or comment on specific areas of potential development.	None
5 Michael Blackstaff	Re page 17 'General Planning guidance all character areas', paragraph 5 concerning footpaths and bridleways. Agree that existing footpaths and bridleways should be protected and maintained in the course of any new development, However, depending upon the size of the development there may be a strong argument for re-routing a path of bridleway in order to protect the privacy of existing householders. A specific example would be the bridleway running east to west between the B3354 Main Road and the B3335. Should those fields be built on, then the use of that path by the inhabitants of new dwellings would become unduly obtrusive and a potential nuisance. No doubt there are other paths in the village to which similar considerations may be applicable.	Generally agree with this comment, which could be relevant to other paths and relates to matters raised by Hampshire County Council (see below).	See item 9 (Hampshire County Council) below.
6 Patrick Curran	I am concerned that there will be additional flooding on the lower roads and that the school, which is	The VDS does not allocate sites for development and neither can it pre-	See item 2 above.

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS ON COLDEN COMMON VILLAGE DESIGN STATEMENT 2012

	oversubscribed at the moment to the point where children in the village have to go elsewhere, will not be able to cope, nor will the schools in the surrounding area	judge this process for specific sites. If it deals with the detail of flooding or other matters for one site it should do so for the whole VDS area. As this information is already contained and published in other sources it would not be appropriate for it to be included in the VDS. See Issue 2 above in relation to school provision.	
7 Environment Agency	Overall we are pleased with the general content of the document. We are pleased to see the inclusion of Section 3.0 The Natural Environment and welcome the reference to Policy DP4 of the Winchester District Plan Review 2006, specifically in relation to points vi and vii. We support the inclusion of Planning Guidance point 3 page 11, Open Spaces play an important role for the biodiversity of a local area. We support the inclusion of Planning Guidance – Area E point 3 page 16. Finally we are pleased with the principles set out within section 3 of General Planning Guidance All character areas page 17.	Comments welcomed and noted. No changes requested	None
8 Natural England	Natural England is grateful for the opportunity to advise on your consultation but has no comments to make.	Noted	None
9 Hampshire County Council	The County Council is concerned at the lack of any reference to rights of way or other forms of access to the countryside within this VDS. The Countryside Access Plan (CAP) for the South Downs (Hampshire) identifies the following issues affecting enjoyment of the countryside in this part of Hampshire: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High reliance on cars and availability of car 	CAP report checked. Very little of the South Downs National Park is within Colden Common and most of that is privately owned. It has been identified that a new footpath/bridleway access from Colden Common Park through the neighbouring farmland to pick up the existing footpaths at Park Farm	Replace the paragraph under the heading ‘Footpaths and bridleways’ (Page 18) with: Inside the settlement boundary, a network of footpaths is established which enable residents to walk

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS ON COLDEN COMMON VILLAGE DESIGN STATEMENT 2012

	<p>parking to access the Countryside in the South Downs area</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited supply of easily accessible, inviting routes • Countryside access users are forced to use or cross busy roads to link up off-road access routes • A need for more circular recreational routes • A need for better information about countryside access routes. <p>Recommend the inclusion of an additional policy which expresses the requirement that new development should preserve and where possible enhance access to countryside, in line with the priorities outlined in the Countryside Access Plan (CAP) for Hampshire.</p>	<p>would be a popular route. See also Michael Blackstaff suggestions (5). The paragraph under the heading 'Footpaths and bridleways' (Page 18) should be replaced to describe and update the current situation, with new Planning Guidance added.</p>	<p>through the village avoiding roads and traffic. These have sometimes also become important wildlife corridors and supplement a pattern of historic pathways and bridleways. These generally do not enter the South Downs National Park (SDNP) other than to the east of the Parish, where footpaths and bridleways continue east into the SDNP. These footpaths and bridleways run predominantly east to west across the Parish, with breaks in continuity across the B3335 and B3354.</p> <p>The Countryside Access Plan for the South Downs has identified the following issues affecting enjoyment of the countryside in this part of Hampshire.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ High reliance on cars and availability of car parking to access the countryside in the South Downs area ▪ Limited supply of easily accessible. Inviting routes ▪ Countryside access users are forced to use or cross
--	--	---	---

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS ON COLDEN COMMON VILLAGE DESIGN STATEMENT 2012

	<p>The County Council would be concerned about any proposed development individually or cumulatively that would result in demonstrable harm being caused to its highway network. Consequently, the VDS should require that any proposed</p>	<p>Agree with the aims of this comment but it does not refer to the County Council's transport contributions policy. Following discussion with County Council officers, new Planning</p>	<p>busy roads to link up off-road access routes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A need for more circular recreational routes ▪ A need for better information about countryside access routes. <p>Add new Planning Guidance (page 18): New development within the Parish should preserve and, where possible, enhance access to the countryside, in line with the priorities outlined in the Countryside Access Plan (CAP) for Hampshire. This should be taken into account where new development takes place, subject to the need to protect the privacy of existing and new householders, and improve access to the South Downs National Park (Supplements Local Plan Policy RT9).</p> <p>Add new Planning Guidance (page 18): Any proposed development should be supported by a transport assessment or</p>
--	---	--	--

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS ON COLDEN COMMON VILLAGE DESIGN STATEMENT 2012

	<p>development would need to be supported by a transport assessment or transport statement that demonstrates the likely impact of the development's traffic on the local highway network along with any mitigation measures that may be required and a commitment that these will be funded in their entirety by the developer. The transport assessment should take into account development within Winchester District and Eastleigh Borough and the Highway Authority would identify the scope of the transport assessments.</p> <p>The County Council would like to see included in the VDS some recognition of issues related to energy efficiency and climate change. The context for this is set in National Planning Policy and local policies in the Winchester District Local Plan Part 1 – Joint Core Strategy. The VDS should demonstrate how it contributes towards adaptation to, and mitigation of, the impacts of climate change, sustainability, renewable energy and energy security and how district / community energy schemes might meet the village's energy needs in the future. In the section on "Infrastructure" on page 19 the County Council would like to see a reference to principles of sustainable drainage and the requirement included that any future development in the village should be served by Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) rather than traditional piped drainage solutions wherever this is technically feasible.</p>	<p>Guidance is proposed to reflect this comment.</p> <p>Energy efficiency and climate change matters will be covered in the District Local Plan Part 1 and are not issues that are appropriate for inclusion in a VDS. It is agreed that additional reference should be made to drainage and flooding issues by adding text under the heading of 'Drainage' (Page 19) to update the situation and two new Planning Guidance points (page 20).</p>	<p>transport statement that demonstrates the likely impact of the development's traffic on the local highway network, along with any mitigation measures that may be required, and be subject to the Highway Authority's Transport Contribution Policy or successor (Supplements Local Plan Policy T1).</p> <p>Add new text at the end of the paragraph headed 'Drainage' (Page 19): They are currently managed by a volunteer Pond Warden and local environmental group.</p> <p>Currently there is a flood issue on Main Road, north of the roundabout, in the vicinity of the underground stream which eventually flows into Church Pond.</p> <p>Add new Planning Guidance point (page 20): The Parish Council should establish a management plan for these Ponds to ensure they work efficiently thus</p>
--	--	---	--

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS ON COLDEN COMMON VILLAGE DESIGN STATEMENT 2012

			<p>preventing a risk of flooding (Supplements Local Plan Policy DP9).</p> <p>Add new Planning Guidance point (page 20): Future development in the village should be served by Sustainable Drainage Systems rather than traditional piped drainage where this is technically feasible (Supplements Local Plan Policy DP9).</p>
<p>10. Ian Taylor</p>	<p>The VDS lacks some information and supporting evidence to protect the village. The Environment Agency and Hampshire Biodiversity Information Centre have not been previously contacted. Footpaths and TPOs are missing from Map D and views missing from Map C. Downloading difficulties due to the size of the document. Developers will ride roughshod through VDS and Winchester District Local Plan 2006. The SHLAA mistakenly refers to Plot 1874 as 'previously developed' and this site is not covered in the VDS Planning Guidance Areas. The need for 250 houses over 20 years is not mentioned and the VDS was not publicised well.</p> <p>Important habitats near the proposed development not mentioned – bats, TPOs (detailed maps and schedules provided). The South Downs National Park is not adequately covered, nor some important</p>	<p>The VDS does not allocate sites for development and neither can it pre-judge this process for specific sites. If it deals with the detail of ecology, landscape or other matters for one site it should do so for the whole VDS area. As this information is already contained and published in other sources it would not be appropriate for it to be included in the VDS.</p> <p>The City Council has acknowledged the inaccuracy in the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) and will correct this in the next update. The housing target for the village is a matter for the District Local Plan Part 1, not the VDS.</p>	<p>None</p>

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS ON COLDEN COMMON VILLAGE DESIGN STATEMENT 2012

	views. There is not enough emphasis on the importance of the area for flora and fauna and the VDS needs to make reference to the wider importance of the Itchen and water courses, including groundwater protection (maps provided).		
11 Pam Glasspool	<p>The VDS does not offer sufficient protection from development for areas of existing woodland, grassland and open spaces which provide habitats or eco systems. No emphasis has been given to the comments of residents which, in keeping with the ethos of the NPPF, should override those of developers in planning decisions. Various amendments suggested as follows:</p> <p>Page 2 – amend to emphasise rural character and environment and that emphasis will be given to localism and the comments of residents will have priority over those of developers in any planning decisions.</p> <p>Page 7 Hamlets - refer to the grassland meadows wets of the village which residents wish to protect.</p> <p>Page 8 last paragraph – delete reference to the ‘triangle’ formed by existing roads.</p> <p>Page 9 - add views from Upper Moors hay meadows.</p> <p>Page 10 - remove reference to the ‘triangle’.</p> <p>Page 11 - add references to recreational value of Upper Moors Meadows.</p> <p>Page 17, Planning Guidance 3 - remove ‘where possible’.</p> <p>Page 18 Highways and Traffic 2nd para - remove reference to B3335 forming a boundary to Colden Common and add a new para to refer to traffic and access issues.</p>	<p>The VDS does not allocate sites for development and neither can it pre-judge this process for specific sites. If it deals with the detail of ecology, landscape or other matters for one site it should do so for the whole VDS area. As this information is already contained and published in other sources it would not be appropriate for it to be included in the VDS.</p> <p>It is not possible or appropriate to give the views of one group of respondents priority over another when dealing with planning applications, as proposed in these changes. It is a legal requirement that decisions on planning applications must be reached in accordance with the Development Plan, having regard to material planning considerations.</p> <p>The VDS deals equally with all parts of the area and should not be used to highlight the merits of one particular part of the village/Parish.</p>	None

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS ON COLDEN COMMON VILLAGE DESIGN STATEMENT 2012

	<p>Other comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Dark shaded background difficult to read 2. Suggest village environment map 3. Please confirm acceptance of suggestions. 		
12 Barbara and Adrian Kelly	<p>A development of the size proposed by Welbeck Developments for the Upper Moors meadows will ruin the character of the village. It would be like putting another estate the size of St. Vigor Way on the western side of the village; would bring massive problems with our infrastructure (the school wouldn't be big enough, the shops wouldn't suffice, a new medical centre would be required and so on); traffic through the village is bad enough now (Main Road and particularly Church Lane which acts as a rat run for the employees of IBM in Hursley); and it would deprive us of an area of great environmental and aesthetic value.</p> <p>This kind of development would ruin the character of the area, which we would like to remain as a village.</p>	<p>The VDS does not allocate sites for development and neither can it pre-judge this process for specific sites. If it deals with the detail of ecology, landscape or other matters for one site it should do so for the whole VDS area. As this information is already contained and published in other sources it would not be appropriate for it to be included in the VDS. Issues relating to education and transport are addressed above.</p>	None
13 Ian King	<p>The open space sandwiched between Upper Moors Road, Highbridge Road and Spring Lane is the only parcel of land left to squeeze a substantial number of dwellings into. Further, we also know from a recent unprepared development proposal that this area is under scrutiny. Therefore surprised not to see some references to the protection of this specific area and photographs to support this. The photographs are of areas where there is unlikely to be any interest in large scale development. If development is to happen, a maximum number and type of dwellings should be set out - not the</p>	<p>The VDS does not allocate sites for development and neither can it pre-judge this process for specific sites. If it deals with the detail of ecology, landscape or other matters for one site it should do so for the whole VDS area. As this information is already contained and published in other sources it would not be appropriate for it to be included in the VDS.</p>	None

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS ON COLDEN COMMON VILLAGE DESIGN STATEMENT 2012

	450/500 that the developers had in mind.		
14 Geoff Naylor	Concerned that the draft proposals do not offer explicit protection from development for those areas of existing woodland, grassland and open spaces in the Parish which provide habitat for a wide range of flora and fauna and/or which add aesthetic or green amenity to the community. These areas should be carefully preserved and not destroyed or diminished by any form of development.	The VDS does not allocate sites for development and neither can it pre-judge this process for specific sites. If it deals with the detail of ecology, landscape or other matters for one site it should do so for the whole VDS area. As this information is already contained and published in other sources it would not be appropriate for it to be included in the VDS.	None
15 Carolyn Matthews	The description of a Colden Common ;triangle; that includes the Brambridge meadows between Church Lane, Upper Moors and Spring Lane should be removed from the VDS, since these areas are officially countryside outside of the established Colden Common settlement boundary and should be very clearly defined as that. These meadows are of great environmental, historic and aesthetic value and need to be described as such in the VDS.	The term 'triangle' is used to refer to the roads which generally contain the village, which are a locally recognised geographical area. It is referred to in inverted commas so as to ensure that it is not interpreted as a settlement boundary or development limit. Such boundaries are defined in the statutory Local Plan and are supported by the VDS.	None
16 Jane Robertson	The protection from development for environmentally sensitive areas of the village needs to be enhanced and strengthened. There have been some moves on the part of a landowner/developer to build opposite the School's main entrance on Tees Farm Road. Extremely concerned about the effect of increased access on what is already a busy road at a point which drivers seem to increase their speed despite clearly being in a built up area and near a school. Any further development in this area would	The VDS does not allocate sites for development and neither can it pre-judge this process for specific sites. If it deals with the detail of ecology, landscape or other matters for one site it should do so for the whole VDS area. As this information is already contained and published in other sources it would not be appropriate for it to be included in the VDS. Issues relating to education and transport are addressed above.	None

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS ON COLDEN COMMON VILLAGE DESIGN STATEMENT 2012

	<p>inevitability lead to a substantial increase in traffic particularly at peak times. The current road layout already presents a 5-way interference junction, if you add in the turn off to Upper Moors Road. Children at a Primary School are too young to be able to cope with these traffic complications and the potential for a serious accident cannot be underestimated. Furthermore the hedges along this stretch of road are protected.</p> <p>A number of elderly residents are also regular users of the pavement along Tees Farm Road, to access the Coop and the Community Centre. This pavement already suffers from problems where a large oak tree has uplifted the pavement and narrowed the area to walk, tilting the surface into the road. The field that the landowners wish to develop has been in use recreationally for a number of years and there are also suspected to be a number of rare species of insects on this land, as it has been left uncultivated for many years.</p>	<p>Traffic issues are acknowledged in the VDS and the authorities would consider detailed transport and access matters if a planning application is received.</p>	
<p>17 Will Thompson CGMS</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Page 2 – support the aspiration to manage change not prevent it 2) Page 9 – agree with the statement that the avenue of lime trees leading from Brambridge House to the B3335 is a key landscape feature 3) Page 9 – support the aspiration to protect the four key landscape features listed on page 9 4) Page 11 - Should Map 8 referred to at point 1 of the planning guidance be map C? Point 3 refers to an un-named map XX? 5) Page 13 - the statement that 'few houses are to be found along the length of the B3335 within 	<p>The support is welcomed. The references to development on the B3335 should be amended to refer to existing housing, whilst maintaining the point that trees, hedges and fields are the dominant feature. The reference to gardens describes a characteristic feature which should be recognised and supported in new development. The guidance uses the word 'normally' and is 'subject to the characteristics of the area', providing</p>	<p>Replace the 3rd bullet point on page 10 with: Few houses are to be found along the length of the B3335 at the western edge of the village. While some housing is visible to the east of the B3335, trees and hedges edging open fields are the dominant features, enhanced by the proximity of the Itchen Flood Plain and Brambridge</p>

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS ON COLDEN COMMON VILLAGE DESIGN STATEMENT 2012

	<p>the Parish boundary' is unclear. Whilst trees and hedges are dominant characteristics of the landscape, the built form of housing is readily apparent from the B3335.</p> <p>6) Page 17 – support residential density of at least 30 dwellings per hectare, which is in accordance with Governments objective of boosting housing supply (NPPF).</p> <p>7) Page 17 - Whilst the provision of suitable residential amenity space for households is supported, a disproportionate amount of amenity space might be counter effective in terms of development viability and delivering a sufficient amount of housing. This statement (point 2 of general planning guidance) might prevent the ability to deliver 30 dpha, as might the provision of space for expansion (point 4).</p> <p>8) It is recommended that these aspects of the VDS are changed so that point 2 supports inclusion of gardens for houses (not specifically front and rear) and so that point 4 supports provision of a wide choice of homes, but without a requirement for space for expansion on individual plots.</p>	<p>an appropriate level of flexibility.</p>	<p>Park, for which the B3335 provides the eastern boundary.</p>
--	---	---	---