

CABINET (LOCAL PLAN) COMMITTEE

30 March 2015

DRAFT WINCHESTER DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN PART 2: DEVELOPMENT
MANAGEMENT & SITE ALLOCATIONS – FEEDBACK ON CONSULTATION
RESPONSES

REPORT OF HEAD OF STRATEGIC PLANNING

Contact Officer: Jenny Nell Tel: (01962) 848278 jnell@winchester.gov.uk

RECENT REFERENCES

CAB2670 Draft Winchester District Local Plan Part 2: Development Management and Site Allocations, feedback on consultation responses 12 March 2015

CAB2656 Draft Winchester District Local Plan Part 2: Development Management and Site Allocations, update following consultation 9 February 2015

CAB2615 Draft Winchester District Local Plan Part 2: Development Management and Site Allocations, publication and consultation - 22 September 2014

[CAB2530\(LDF\)](#) Local Plan Part 2 Update Report – Cabinet (Local Plan) Committee 27 Nov 2013

[CAB2429\(LDF\)](#) Local Plan Part 2 Launch and Next Steps – Cabinet (LDF) Committee 17 December 2012

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Draft Local Plan Part 2 was subject of a six week consultation period from 24 October to 5 December 2014. As a result, over 1,100 individuals and organisations submitted comments to the draft Plan. Many of these made multiple comments on different policies, raising over 2000 representations. This Committee received a report on 12 March (CAB2670 refers), setting out feedback relating to the sections of the Plan on Colden Common, Kings Worthy, Swanmore, Waltham Chase, Wickham and South Hampshire Urban Areas.

This is the second meeting which examines the responses received on all other parts of the Plan, including the settlements of Winchester Town, Bishops Waltham, New Alresford, and Denmead, small rural villages and rural area, development management policies and any general representations relating to maps/appendices or other matters such as sustainability appraisal. These are appended in schedule

format to this report. The bulk of representations either raise matters of detail on policy wording or support/object to the sites being allocated for development, either on a point of principle or promoting an alternative site for consideration.

The schedules provide a comprehensive summary of the comments received with common issues being grouped together. All responses are available to view in full on the Council's website. The majority of representations raise issues relating to site selection and promoting alternative sites for consideration. It will be necessary to undertake further work to ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, or to consider the technical matters raised in some responses. Consequently, this report often recommends that there are matters which require further investigation and the results of this will be reported to a future meeting of this Committee.

It will also be necessary to liaise with the respective Parish Councils/Town Forum and undertake the required assessments to ensure that the sites that are allocated in the pre-submission version of LPP2 are the most sustainable.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- 1 That Members note the responses received to the draft plan and agree the 'recommended responses' proposed.

CABINET (LOCAL PLAN) COMMITTEE

30 MARCH 2015

DRAFT WINCHESTER DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN PART 2: DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT & SITE ALLOCATIONS – FEEDBACK ON CONSULTATION RESPONSES

DETAIL

1. Introduction

- 1.1 Members received an update report and initial feedback on matters raised during the consultation on the draft Local Plan Part 2 at a meeting of this Committee on 9 February 2015 (CAB2656(LP)) refers. At its meeting on 12 March (CAB 2670(LP)), responses received in relation to Colden Common, Kings worthy, Swanmore, Waltham Chase, Wickham and South Hampshire Urban Areas were considered.
- 1.2 Appended to this report are schedules for the following settlements/topics. Each schedule lists the representations received, which have been sorted according to the paragraph/policy referred to, and by whether it is an objection, support or comment. All representations have been summarised and those making common points have been grouped together. The final column includes a recommended officer response to the issue being raised, if it is appropriate to do so at this stage, and if relevant includes a recommended change to the draft Plan.

Appendix 1 Bishops Waltham

Appendix 2 New Alresford

Appendix 3 Denmead

Appendix 4 Smaller villages and rural area

Appendix 5 Development Management Policies

Appendix 6 Chapter 1 & 2, general comments, maps, appendices, sustainability appraisal

Appendix 7 Winchester Town

Appendix 8 Implementation and Monitoring (to follow)

- 1.3 An index was circulated with report CAB2670(LP) which lists all representations by respondent number with the name of the individual or organisation making the representation. Representations can be searched alphabetically by respondent name from the web site:

<http://documents.winchester.gov.uk/LPP2/Default.aspx>

- 1.4 Many representations relate to site allocations, suggest alternative sites for development/changes to settlement boundaries, or raise issues with the proposed allocations or policy wording. These comments typically refer to various matters and will require further work and checking of information before a recommendation can be brought back. There will also be a need for sustainability appraisal. It will therefore be necessary to assess the matters raised in detail and seek further advice as necessary, hence the 'recommended responses' in relation to site allocations and policy wording are normally to undertake further work and report back to future meetings, the first of which has been set for 1 June 2015. Recommended responses are made in relation to various other matters raised and it is recommended that these be agreed as a basis for developing the next version of the Plan (subject to any changes arising from the further work mentioned above and meetings suggested below).
- 1.5 Given the participative nature of the preparation of LPP2, officers are in the process of arranging follow up meetings with Town/Parish Councils and the Winchester Town Forum prior to making more detailed recommendations about site allocations. Each site that is proposed for development will also have to undergo a sustainability appraisal and assessment with regard to the Habitats Regulations and strategic environmental assessment, prior to final allocation.

2 Summary of key matters raised:

- 2.1 **Winchester Town** – numerous representations were received to this section of the Plan, raising points of both detail and principle. The bulk of representations relate to the proposals around Station Approach. The Council is currently carrying out both resident and stakeholder consultation as to the potential for this area. There are also various sites promoted for development adjacent to the Town boundary, on the basis that sites within the built area will not deliver the quantum of development required to meet Winchester's objectively assessed needs.
- 2.2 **Bishops Waltham** – the representations focus on the allocation of sites for development, particularly in terms of access to these, individually and collectively, given that most require access via existing residential streets. There is also concern about the capacity of Winchester Road to accommodate more traffic. Landscape impact is raised by many given the distribution of sites along the southern edge of Bishops Waltham, together with impact on open space and wildlife sites. Some refer to the lack of supporting infrastructure to accommodate more development.
- 2.3 **New Alresford** – most of the representations make comment on the development strategy proposed for Alresford by the draft Local Plan, either in total or on a policy-by-policy basis. During the consultation on the draft Local Plan there was also consultation by the 'Alresford Professional Group' on an alternative plan, hence many comments also refer to this. There are many objections to the Plan's proposals although the level of support is also significant. Due to an error being discovered in the population projections that had been supplied to the various 'Needs Groups' set up by Alresford Town

Council, the Needs Groups were reconvened and their [update](#) reports have been placed on the City Council's website.

- 2.4 **Denmead** – only a few representations were submitted in relation to Denmead, primarily relating to alternative sites for development. However, land allocations for development are covered by the Denmead Neighbourhood Plan which received a favourable outcome at referendum on 5 March 2015. This will soon become part of the statutory development plan and be used to determine planning applications, once it is formally 'made' by Winchester City Council (recommended to Council on 1 April 2015).
 - 2.5 **Smaller villages and rural area** – these representations covered various matters ranging from the promotion of sites for development and questioning the lack of review of settlement boundaries to allow more development in some locations. Representations requesting the inclusion of Botley Bypass in LPP2 are included in this section.
 - 2.6 **Development Management policies** – the plan includes 34 development management policies, covering a variety of matters relating to the development and use of land. Whilst many representations have been received to this part of the plan, some support the proposed policies or simply make comment on the detailed expression. Objections tend to focus on the detailed policy wording and justification for the matters referred to.
 - 2.7 **Chapters 1 & 2, general comments, maps, appendices and sustainability appraisal** – this section includes under general comments, and those representations that do not fit neatly into any of the chapters covered above or in report CAB2670(LP). The representations therefore, include comments on the evidence base, housing supply and reference to a five year land supply, site selection methodology and settlement boundaries with particular reference to the need to allocate additional sites for development. The consultation process also received a number of representations, and a few representations were received raising issue with the maps and appendices, most of which are matters easily resolved through updating/correction. Comments on the sustainability appraisal and habitats regulation assessment have been forwarded to the Council's consultants, Enfusion, for technical feedback, so the schedule only includes a general response.
- 3 Next Steps
 - 3.1 Further meetings will be held in early June (next meeting scheduled for 1 June 2015), to recommend and agree final changes to the draft Plan, which will include the confirmation of sites to be allocated for development.
 - 3.2 The Local Development Scheme refers to pre-submission version of LPP2 being published in June 2015. This is unlikely to be achieved given the need for additional meetings. It may, however, still be feasible to take a revised plan to Cabinet in June and Council in July, prior to publication over the summer. Therefore, a revised Local Development Scheme will need to be produced.

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

4. COMMUNITY STRATEGY AND PORTFOLIO PLANS (RELEVANCE TO)

- 4.1 The Local Plan is a key corporate priority and will contribute to achieving the Community Strategy and implementing several aspects of Portfolio Plans.

5. RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS

- 5.1 The key resources for undertaking work on LPP2 have been approved as part of the budget process, consisting primarily of an annual sum of £36,700 and an earmarked reserve which stood at £172,759 at 1 April 2014 and is forecast to end 2014/15 with a balance of £116,759. This budget and earmarked reserve are used for ongoing consultancy requirements, ensuring resources are available to deal with major expenditure at key stages, e.g. examination. This funding is expected to be adequate for the foreseeable future, subject to progress with LPP2, any changes in government requirements and the need to review plans.

6. BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

- 6.1 Representations received to consultation on draft Local Plan Part 2.

7. APPENDICES

Appendix 1 Bishops Waltham

Appendix 2 New Alresford

Appendix 3 Denmead

Appendix 4 Smaller villages and rural area

Appendix 5 Development Management Policies

Appendix 6 Chapter 1 & 2, general comments, maps, appendices, sustainability appraisal

Appendix 7 Winchester Town

Appendix 8 Implementation and Monitoring

Appendix 1

Bishops Waltham - Responses to Draft Local Plan Part 2 Consultation

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment/ Recommended Response
	4.2.1 – 4.2.20		Introductory Paragraphs	
50342	4.1.2	Object	The numbers given include those villages now in the SDNP area. see also 4.1.7	<p>Para 4.1.2 refers to the overall housing requirement established in LPP1 under Policy MTRA2 for between 250 and 500 new homes in the named settlements. None of these settlements fall in the South Downs National Park. Those villages listed in MTRA3 may fall in the South Downs National Park and whilst housing development will contribute to the overall housing provision no allocations are included in LPP2.</p> <p>Recommended Response: No change required.</p>
50039 (Upham PC)	4.2	Comment	Request that consideration is given to the provision of a cyclepath/footpath from BW to Upham along the existing footpath which could be widened, this would link the two communities.	<p>This suggestion could potentially be considered through the allocation of any CIL funds coming forward from the proposed developments.</p> <p>Recommended Response: No change required.</p>
51096	4.2	Object	The proposed Bishops Waltham settlement boundary excludes the line of properties along Wintershill. This forms a continuous line of housing, under Bishops Waltham for planning and services and should be included within BW and allocated for housing. Or the area should fall within Durley's control.	<p>The settlement boundary around BW was examined in detail as part of the preparation of LPP2. At the outset it was determined that boundaries would exclude loose-knit groups of buildings on the edge of settlements, hence the boundary has been drawn tightly around the allocation under Policy BW5 in this location.</p> <p>Recommended Response: No change required.</p>
50084 (English Heritage)	4.2.1	Support	Welcome reference to history and historic character of BW.	Support welcomed.

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment/ Recommended Response
50232	4.2.2	Object	The Local Plan has not been prepared in line with the Council's Adopted Statement of Community Involvement. Plan makers will need to consider the time it will take to commence development on site and build out rates within the LPP2 document or within the evidence base, this has not been provided. No summary of the consultation results have been included. The latest 2013 update SHLAA does not assess sites outside of the settlement boundaries to inform the LPP2 therefore a full site assessment has not been undertaken of the LPP2 proposed allocation sites. Paragraph 1.9 of SHLAA highlights the assessment of sites outside the settlement boundaries.	There are numerous documents published on the Councils website that support the publication of LPP2. Each settlement has a designated section on the planning policy pages, which provides details of the data collated, including exhibition boards; sites submitted for consideration and initial sustainability appraisal results to ensure that all potential sites have been considered through the site selection process. The Consultation Statement 2014 sets out details of the consultation undertaken and further details are available on relevant parish council websites. Recommended Response: No change required
51135	4.2.4	Object	Object to the implication that 120 houses is a development of appropriate scale. This is larger than almost all other developments within Bishops Waltham and therefore out of keeping and could affect the nature of the town. More suitable size is 50.	Para 4.2.4 refers in general to the need to ensure development is of an appropriate scale given the need to allocate land for 500 dwellings in BW. The site proposing 120 new homes reflects the level of development needed and capacity of the site. It also includes a substantial amount of open space in conjunction with the scheme, which may not be achieved if the development is for a lesser number of dwellings. The development strategy for BW is for a number of sites to be allocated for development to ensure that the settlement's identity is retained. Recommended Response: No change required
50284	4.2.5	Comment	Reliance on SHLAA sites seems optimistic; need to plan for upper end of about 500 to 550 during the plan period. If it is assumed that around 100 of the identified commitments come forward and around 50 windfalls could be delivered then having regard to the opportunities that have been identified, it would be positive and pragmatic to aim for these allocations to deliver around 400 dwellings, subject to the requirement that sites should be delivered in accordance with the principles of sustainable development. This would	SHLAA sites within the settlement boundary have been included if confirmed by owners as deliverable within the Plan period. LPP1 requires provision of 'about' 500 dwellings. This is not precise or a ceiling and gives some flexibility. There is no need at this stage of the plan period to plan to exceed this amount. Recommended Response: No change required

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment/ Recommended Response
			provide a positive approach to planning for housing, rather than relying on all sites being delivered in full to meet the minimum requirement, and hoping that unidentified sites come forward to boost supply.	
51096	4.2.10	Object	Jefferies Yard is not suitable for a travellers' site due to access; the land is contaminated and there are derelict buildings and a deep pond on the site. LPP2 must make clear the Jefferies Yard was considered as a travellers' site but this was dismissed so that the site is not considered for this use in the future.	LPP2 does not include an allocation for a traveller's site in Bishops Waltham and the reference to it relates to its inclusion in an earlier consultation. The Council's website includes a note to the effect that as of 20 February 2014 "the owner of the Jeffries Yard site has since indicated that the site is not available for traveller use". The results of the traveller site assessment are awaited and could require an allocation to be made. Recommended Response: No change required
50284, 51617	4.2.10	Object	The quantum of development allocated to each site should be adjusted to provide a more robust strategy to deliver up to the 400 dwellings required. Suggest the totals for each site are adjusted to Coppice Hill (approx 60); Martin Street (approx. 60); The Vineyard (approx. 160) Albany Farm (approx. 120), with limited housing on Tollgate Mill to facilitate restoration of the mill. The sites are poorly thought through. Request that sites adj to The Vineyard be moved to the open space adj to Albany Farm;	LPP1 requires provision of 'about' 500 dwellings to be provided in BW. This is not precise or a ceiling and gives some flexibility. There is no need at this stage of the plan period to plan to exceed this amount. The sites to be allocated for development have been determined through a robust site selection process, sustainability appraisal and community consultation. A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations or suggest sites for development, either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
50232	4.2.12	Object	The District Council states that the Steering Group was satisfied that the development strategy had the broad support of Bishop's Waltham residents. This is a misleading statement and this is highlighted within the	The statement refers to the strategy as a whole. Individual sites were selected on the basis of planning criteria as well as taking account of community views. Recommended Response : To ensure that the most

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment/ Recommended Response
			evidence base of the LPP2 under Regulation 18 Consultation Statement. Paragraph 3.15 on page 10 highlights that 'Albany Farm attracted the most positive comments whilst The Vineyard attracted the most negative comments'. But the Steering Group look to underutilise BW4 - Albany Farm in favour of BW3 - The Vineyard contrary to the consultation responses received by the Steering Group. Statement made at Paragraph 4.2.12 is an inaccurate reflection of the views expressed by the residents of Bishop's Waltham.	appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
50232	4.2.13	Object	The District Council has stated that the owners of the preferred sites have confirmed that all are available for development within the plan period. Whilst this statement may be true it is also misleading. The implication in the statement made by the District Council is that all owners are supportive of the strategy being taken, which is not the case. Southcott Homes has never endorsed the underutilisation of land at Albany Farm and in particular the arbitrary settlement boundary line drawn by the District Council which has little regard for the landscape context and urban form of the settlement.	A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations or suggest sites for development, either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
50161	4.2.14	Object	Insufficient provision has been made for non-retail space, eg small office/light industrial units, to at least the same degree as lost at Abbey Mill. With good access on to a B road further provision could be made at Botley Road. Poor policy to provide more housing and not the infrastructure to provide local workplaces, and thus encourage people to get in their cars and commute, causing further congestion on local roads.	Para 4.2.14 refers to the need to provide an additional 200-250 jobs and that this will be achieved through the implementation of the site allocated under Policy BW5 and the retention of existing sites, with additional employment provision encouraged in suitable locations in the built up area. Recommended Response: No change required.
50232, 51617	4.2.15	Object	The planning permission for the large food store has not been delivered within three years of the date of being granted, the planning permission expired on the 1st December 2014 and therefore the LPP2 needs to reflect this or allocate the land for future employment use.	The status of the development proposed by Sainsbury's is that the conditions attached to the planning permission have been discharged and the development has been commenced. The consent has not, therefore, expired and the Council understands that a decision is expected during the

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment/ Recommended Response
				Spring as to whether the scheme will proceed. Recommended Response: No change required.
50342	4.2.16	Object	The demographic profile shows a need for accommodation of a size, design, location & serviced suitable for the active elderly that with increasing frailty will also enable them to remain in their own home as long as possible. Proposed change Add new bullet "Housing for the active & increasingly frail elderly".	The BW data set published in August 2013 recognises the need for sheltered housing near the town centre. Consent has recently been granted for such a development at Coppice Hill. Recommended Response: No change required.
50232, 51187	4.2.16 – 17	Object	The Plan does not state how improved facilities will be provided. There is acknowledgement that Swanmore College will need to expand but only contributions from development in Swanmore sought, rather than from those areas that will access this facility. What happens if the new doctors does not get built where will this facility be provided.	Policies BW1-BW4 all refer under 'infrastructure' to the need to contribute to the expansion of Bishop's Waltham Infants and Junior Schools and other infrastructure needed. This reference therefore establishes that other contributions may be required from these developments, if justified, and together with CIL these could be used as suggested by these representations. Response: No change required.
51096, 51617, 51824	4.2.19	Object	There has been no proper assessment of the traffic impacts of the development proposed around BW. The road through Wintershill – Durley – Hedge End is too narrow to cope with additional traffic. Botley bypass should be included. Request consideration given to changes to junction Winchester Road, Wintershill and Ashton Lane	Para 4.2.19 acknowledges concern about traffic impact, but states that transport assessments were undertaken as part of the formulation of LPP1, which indicated that both the scale of development in BW and cumulatively in the wider area could be accommodated. Para 4.2.20 refers to the individual traffic requirements detailed under each policy allocating land for development. Botley bypass is referred to at paragraphs 4.10.6 – 4.10.8 (small settlements). Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment/ Recommended Response
	BW1 –BW5		All Bishops Waltham Policies	
51766	BW1-BW5	Support	Support the plan as the public have had the opportunity to express their views. Worth protecting the High Street.	Support welcomed.
51462	BW1	Support	Support the allocation of the Coppice Hill site. The site is capable of delivering about 80 dwellings together with the required infrastructure provision, without an adverse impact upon the Gap. With the respect to improved footpath requirements along the B2177 have no objection to this, providing that the land required for the improvements is within Highway land. Also willing to explore the site's relationship with Shore Lane but it should be noted that new development is not expected to rectify existing deficiencies in local infrastructure. The preferred access strategy to the site will be dictated by the need to achieve appropriate visibility splays etc.	Support welcomed and comments noted.
50084 (English Heritage)	BW1	Object	Careful consideration is needed to the conservation and enhancement of the Park Lug, which may be considered of national significance and should be assessed in line with para 139 of the NPPF. The impact of development on the setting of the Palace needs to be carefully considered. BW1 should have an additional criteria to refer to the Heritage of and include reference to avoid unacceptable impacts on the historic significance of the Bishops Palace, Park Lug and Palace Deer Park.	A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
50085 (Natural England)	BW1	Object	There is a risk that development in this location may result in hydrological impacts on the SSSI. In the absence of evidence to the contrary, the plan is not consistent with NPPF para 118. This site borders a public right of way on southern edge. Development at this location is liable to degrade the quality of this public right of way due to its urbanising influences. The development specification should require no net degradation to the public right of way and informal recreation network either	A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment/ Recommended Response
			through onsite landscaping and access measures, or if this is not possible, through offsite measures nearby so as to be consistent with LPP1 policy CP15, and NPPF 75.	
50232, 50284, 51718	BW1	Object	Concern about the capacity as the site is situated within the Strategic Gap. The site also affects Park Lug and the role of the openness of the fields has on this has not been recognised and assessed. Also the site may not deliver due to its proximity to a listed building and the potential for historic features on the site to be protected. Also the land is higher than its surroundings which will require substantial engineering works which may impact on viability. Policy BW1 allocation should be reduced to address the technical constraints identified. B2177 is already congested more housing will make this worse.	A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting
50342	BW1-BW2	Object	No provision has been made for the needs identified at 4.2.16. Due to their proximity to the town centre BW1 & BW2 are prime locations within which such provision should be made. Proposed change to BW1 & BW2 :- "A combined masterplan including provision for a new GP surgery & 60% of the dwellings suitable for the active and increasing frailty of the elderly should be produced and agreed in advance of permission being granted for components of the allocation. Proposals should be designed in accordance with the masterplan, including providing open space and other facilities (including affordable housing) at the appropriate stage".	A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations. Recommended Response : To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
51187	BW1	Comment	There is an inconsistency between BW1 and the remaining BW policies in terms of the wording about access. Whilst the other policies specify improvements to access, BW1 merely requires an access "taking into consideration the Shore Lane junction and visibility on Coppice Hill".It is considered that an additional access onto the B2177 on the other side of the road will increase delays and the risk of accidents at this junction unless an	A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations. Recommended Response : To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment/ Recommended Response
			improvement to the junction is specified.	
50105 (South Downs National Park) 50225	BW1 -BW5	Comment	Pleased to see the allocations lie on the side of the settlement furthest from the national park and therefore less likely to have a detrimental effect on the spatial qualities of the park.	Comment noted. Recommended Response: No change required.
51718, 51719	BW1-BW5	Comment	Concern about traffic impact from the developments onto the main road. This could be alleviated by the introduction of mini roundabouts which will help the flow of traffic and access to the residential areas.	A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
51002, 51052, 51595, 51827, 51821, 51486	BW1-BW5	Object	Perfectly good site is available in the centre of BW owned by Sainsbury's which could be used for housing. If Sainsbury's goes ahead further congestion and traffic issues will occur.	The Abbey Mill site has an extant consent for a foodstore and this development has been commenced. The future of the Abbey Mill site needs to be secured, although it is not of sufficient size to accommodate all the development requirements of BW as suggested by some representations. Recommended Response: No change required.
50084 (English Heritage)	BW2	Object	Consideration needs to be given to the protection and enhancement of Park Lug. Further archaeological investigation is required to assess the significance of the site. BW2 should have two specific development requirements under a heritage heading :-avoid unacceptable impacts on the historic significance of the Bishops Palace, Park Lug and Palace Deer Park" and "preparation of a comprehensive archaeological assessment to define the extent and significance of any archaeological remains and provide for their preservation or recording as appropriate."	A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting
50085 (Natural England)	BW2	Object	It is not clear why the Local Nature Reserve is not marked as "important Open Space"	The Bishops Waltham branch line which lies adjacent to BW2, was designated as a Local Nature Reserve in 2009. It will therefore be necessary to update the

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment/ Recommended Response
				<p>proposals map and show this as an important open space and protected under Policy DM5</p> <p>Recommended Response: To amend the proposals map and accompanying text to Policy BW2 to show the Bishops Waltham branch line as a local nature reserve and protected under Policy DM5.</p>
50090 (Southern Water)	BW2	Object	<p>SW have undertaken an assessment of our infrastructure and its ability to meet the forecast demand for the proposed development. That assessment reveals that whilst there is currently sufficient capacity in the sewerage network to accommodate the proposed development, there is an underground sewer that needs to be taken into account when designing the proposed development. An easement width of 6 metres would be required, which may affect the site layout or require diversion. This easement should be clear of all proposed buildings and substantial tree planting. proposed amendment under infrastructure add : - provide future access to the existing sewerage infrastructure for maintenance and upsizing purposes.</p>	<p>A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations.</p> <p>Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting</p>
50232, 51478	BW2	Object	<p>The landscape sensitivity of this site has been underestimated so the site will not deliver as many houses as anticipated. Unless ownership of the access arrangements can be demonstrated there can be no guarantee that access is achievable and so delivery of an access to this site has to be highly questionable. The requirements for surface water attenuation features and an onsite foul pumping station will further eat into land take and place further stress on housing numbers.</p> <p>A larger green corridor is required between the existing residential properties and the site; question where the small car park to provided will be sited</p>	<p>A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations or suggest sites for development, either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition.</p> <p>Recommended Response : To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.</p>

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment/ Recommended Response
50284	BW2	Comment	Development of the site would result in the loss of part of Priory Park. There is already an identified deficiency in the supply of parks in Bishops Waltham. The site is adjacent to the Bishops Waltham Branch Line Local Nature Reserve and the WCC SA suggests there could be negative indirect effects through noise, light and surface water pollution both in the short and long term if the site were developed. Access to the site is severely constrained. Links to existing facilities and services from the site is considered poor in the Council's Transport Assessment of Potential Allocations. Therefore the number of dwellings from this site is optimistic.	See above comments in relation to Local Nature Reserve. Recommended Response : To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
50313	BW2	Object	Object to the reference to other infrastructure in the policy as this is covered by other guidance.	The phrase 'other infrastructure' is included in all the site allocation policies. This is aimed to cover matters not specified in the policy to ensure that the development is acceptable in planning terms. Recommended Response: No change required.
50313	BW2	Object	Support the principle of the housing allocation including the proposal that approximately 60 dwellings should be developed on the land. But object to the provisions of the policy. The provision of a Multi Use Games Area on site and a proposal to provide a small car park and coach space near to the site access should not be a requirement. The contribution towards the cost of expanding schools should also be removed from BW2 and provided in a section describing the requirements for Bishops Waltham.	The policy includes reference to provision of a MUGA to compliment facilities at Priory Park. Reference to the need to contribute to schools provision reflects the findings set out in para 4.2.16 and is consistent with the requirements of the other BW site allocations. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
50342	BW2	Object	Add requirement for BW1 & BW2 for a combined masterplan including provision for a new GP surgery & 60% of the dwellings suitable for the active and increasing frailty of the elderly should be produced and agreed in advance of permission being granted for	The assessment of local needs has not identified a requirement for these facilities to be provided. A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations or suggest sites for development, either as an alternative to those

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment/ Recommended Response
			components of the allocation. Proposals should be designed in accordance with the masterplan, including providing open space and other facilities (including affordable housing) at the appropriate stage. (Modelled on BW4)	allocated in the draft plan or in addition. Recommended Response : To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
51705, 51823	BW2	Object	Concern that surface water runoff from the road will flood local houses. The site is also subject to flooding with two springs. Landscaping proposed is not adequate and should be made wider, policy should refer to "provide and strengthen landscaping on the southern, eastern and northern boundaries". There should also be a green area between the existing and planned houses. Also concern about impact of the development on local facilities - schools, doctors etc. Where will the small car park and coach space will be provided? .	A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations or suggest sites for development, either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition. Recommended Response : To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
51485, 51767, 51716, 51705, 51821, 51486	BW2	Object	Access via Martin Street is unsuitable and disagree with the results of the transport assessment. Have concerns about pedestrian safety; road capacity and congestion due to resident parking.	A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations or suggest sites for development, either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition. Recommended Response : To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
51029	BW2-BW5	Comment	Policies BW2, BW3 and BW4 all allow for a pedestrian/cycle link across the respective sites. When linked with the intervening Parish Council land of Priory Park and the allotments, the sections would then provide a continuous link from the far west of the settlement at Albany Farm to Station Roundabout near the town centre. Mention of this complete link is currently only within policy BW5 and paragraph 4.2.28. Request the	A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations or suggest sites for development, either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition. Recommended Response : To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment/ Recommended Response
			following is inserted 4.2.20 : “There is an opportunity to achieve a valuable pedestrian and cycle route along the southern edge of Bishop’s Waltham, linking the three western sites through the allotments and Priory Park to the Former Bishop’s Waltham to Botley railway trail”	appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
50284	BW3	Comment	The work and evidence presented to the Council to date has demonstrated that a 200 dwelling scheme with supporting open space, arranged across the whole of the site could be delivered. The site performs better in relation to sustainability criteria than the current assessment indicates, supporting the case for more dwellings to be allocated to the site. The supporting text to draft Policy BW3 is not accurate and the following sentence should be removed. “The potential to use Tangier Lane as an alternative for one or both of these [The Avenue and Albany Road] has been considered, but it is not possible to improve it to an adequate standard given the variety of land ownerships involved” to make the development acceptable in planning terms.	A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations or suggest sites for development, either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition. Recommended Response : To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
50085 (Natural England)	BW3	Object	Development is likely to degrade the value of the public right of way network through urbanising a previously rural section. The field as a whole appears to be used for recreation to judge by air photos. The development specification should require no net degradation to the public right of way and informal recreation network either through onsite landscaping and access measures, or if this is not possible, through offsite measures nearby so as to be consistent with LPP1 policy CP15, and NPPF 75. Planning policies should protect and enhance public rights of way and access.	A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations. Recommended Response : To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
50090 (Southern Water)	BW3	Object	SW have undertaken an assessment of our infrastructure and its ability to meet the forecast demand for the proposed development. That assessment reveals that whilst there is currently sufficient capacity in the sewerage network to accommodate the proposed	A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations. Recommended Response : To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment/ Recommended Response
			<p>development, there is a foul sewer and a surface water sewer crossing the site that need to be taken into account when designing the proposed development. An easement width of 6 metres would be required for this infrastructure, which may affect the site layout or require diversion. This easement should be clear of all proposed buildings and substantial tree planting. Proposed amendment to infrastructure part of policy add : provide future access to the existing sewerage infrastructure for maintenance and upsizing purposes.</p>	<p>raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.</p>
<p>(29 comments) 50161, 50232, 50991, 50996 50999, 50258 51002, 51008, 51015, 51103, 51133, 51135, 51169, 51359, 51383, 51395, 51421, 51485, 51486, 51498, 51595, 51647, 51672, 51714, 51804 51822, 51826, 51827, 51728,</p> <p>50004 (BWPC)</p>	<p>BW3</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>Object to policy BW3 for one or more of the following reasons:</p> <p><u>Access</u> – (12 representations relate to this matter) Object to the access via The Avenue or Albany Road. Delivery vehicles, emergency services and refuse collection lorries already face challenges with access at certain times of the day, due to on street parking. Site is not suitable for development due to access. . If the Tangier Lane development were to go ahead, then widening of the existing Tangier Lane (which has no existing houses along it) would provide a much safer access to the site. The other alternative would be to provide access from Albany Farm either from the Durley Road or from the BW4 development. Also concerned about impact on Winchester Road junction and loss of amenity to existing residents due to access constraints. The potential to connect to Albany Drive and The Avenue is questionable and would result in a housing layout that appears disconnected with the existing urban edge of Bishops Waltham</p> <p>Are aware that one of the land owners onto Tangiers Lane is willing to sell and another to move to allow access to the site, access to this site needs to be revisited.</p>	<p>A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations or suggest sites for development, either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition.</p> <p>Recommended Response : To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.</p>

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment/ Recommended Response
			<p>Paragraph 4.2.25 emphasises that the traffic management measures have to be developed before the site can be developed. The traffic management measures are an essential pre-requisite to any grant of planning permission.</p> <p><u>Impact on natural environment</u> – (5 representations relate to this matter) Should be a statement regarding a Masterplan for Nature and Phasing similar to BW4; retain trees along boundaries and create a wildlife corridor. Reduce scale of development to 50 units. This development will project built development into open countryside, having a detrimental impact on the setting of BW.</p> <p><u>Infrastructure</u> – (4 representations relate to this matter) this development will create pressure on local services.</p>	
50085 (Natural England)	BW3	Object	<p>The site lies adjacent to a local wildlife site which could suffer from : impact from more public access; changes to management of the site; severance from the wider countryside. The policy requires the development to “minimise the impact of the access points on the Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC) and Priory Park, and improve/manage the SINC as a Natural Green Space”, it is not clear whether this can be done whilst at the same time providing a net gain for biodiversity onsite. It is not clear whether the SINC will become Public Open Space, and how this can be reconciled with the best management of the site as grazing. Request the following wording is added to the policy: “ensure no net detriment to biodiversity (including habitat isolation and fragmentation) through onsite and, if necessary, offsite</p>	<p>A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations or suggest sites for development, either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition.</p> <p>Recommended Response : To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.</p>

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment/ Recommended Response
			measures.”	
51209, 50991	BW3 - BW4	Object	Object to the access routes, Albany Road is not a suitable access road, further traffic assessments should be undertaken. The Avenue is also not a suitable as traffic volumes are too high. BW4 and BW3 together comprise far too many houses in a small part of the town.. BW4 on its own, without BW3 would be fine, no objection to BW4 if the total number of houses was reduced slightly to 120 plus another 30 if demand is there in the future.	A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations or suggest sites for development, either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition. Recommended Response : To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
50004 (BW PC)	BW3-BW4	Comment	The present oak tree boundaries along the north edge of BW3 and the south-east side of BW4 will provide insufficient screening of the new developments. There is the opportunity to create a wider landscaped screening that would become a “wildlife corridor”. The Policy paragraphs on Landscape in both Policies should include “enhance and widen the boundaries with the existing housing sites”.	A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations or suggest sites for development, either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition. Recommended Response : To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
51096	BW4	Support	Support the provision of a footpath/cycleway to link development area BW5 through to the Botley Railway trail	Support welcomed.
50232	BW4	Support	Land at Albany Farm has clear capacity for at least the minimum of 200 dwellings with substantial onsite open space. This would enable a comprehensive development and would also reduce the pressure on some of the other proposed allocation sites, which are more constrained and may therefore fail to deliver at the level currently anticipated. In addition, the provision of at least 200 dwellings on the site would enable the District Council to plan proactively by including a flexibility allowance within the LPP2 thereby reducing the risk of under delivery during the plan period. A planning application for the first	Support welcomed. A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations. Recommended Response : To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment/ Recommended Response
			phase of 150 dwellings will be submitted early 2015. All the appraisal work for the pending application has been undertaken on 200 dwellings.	
50004 (BWPC)	BW4	Comment	The south western boundary of this development of 120 dwellings will be the line of the new settlement boundary any proposals to extend the sites south west of the proposed settlement boundary will be rejected.	Comment noted. Recommended Response: No change required.
50090 (Southern Water)	BW4	Object	SW have undertaken an assessment of our infrastructure and its ability to meet the forecast demand for the proposed development. That assessment reveals that additional local sewerage infrastructure would be required to accommodate the proposed development, involving making a connection to the local sewerage network at the nearest point of adequate capacity. SW is not fully funded to provide local sewerage infrastructure, as Ofwat, expects the company to recover new development and growth costs from developers. SW assessment also reveals that there is a foul water sewer and a surface water sewer that need to be taken into account when designing the proposed development. An easement width of 6 metres would be required, which may affect the site layout or require diversion. This easement should be clear of all proposed buildings and substantial tree planting. Proposed amendment to infrastructure add : provide a connection to the nearest point of adequate capacity in the sewerage network, in collaboration with the service provider. - provide future access to the existing sewerage infrastructure for maintenance and upsizing purposes.	A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
50143	BW4	Object	Object to number of dwellings proposed as the site could accommodate more if it includes land at Albany Farm House. Request BW4 is amended to refer to 200 dwellings. Albany Farm House has a new access to allow the construction of 15 dwellings on the site.	A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations or suggest sites for development, either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition. Recommended Response : To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment/ Recommended Response
				work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
50342	BW4	Object	<p>Suggest the following amendments</p> <p>1.The 1st bullet of "Access" should be part of the "Phasing of development" section.</p> <p>2. No provision for self build/custom build</p> <p>Amend policy to include " ... access point and linkages and provide 30% of all dwellings as self-build for the whole allocated area ..."</p>	<p>A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations or suggest sites for development, either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition.</p> <p>Recommended Response : To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.</p>
51052, 51103, 51128, 51383, 51392	BW4	Object	<p>Albany Road is not fit for purpose to accommodate additional traffic from a further 120 new homes, also concerned about access onto Winchester Road. How sustainable is the development of this site that requires residents to use a car to access everyday services</p>	<p>This response raises matters that require further investigation.</p> <p>Recommended Response : To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.</p>
51002, 51015, 51498, 51804	BW4	Object	<p>Development of this site will have a detrimental impact on the approach to BW. The developer is hoping to squeeze in 200 homes (150 in the first phase followed by another 50 in the second phase). This is too large for this site</p> <p>The approach to BW must be maintained with low density properties onto Winchester Road. A maximum of 120 dwellings should be allowed with the necessary infrastructure.</p> <p>The number of houses on BW4 together with BW3 would</p>	<p>A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations or suggest sites for development, either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition.</p> <p>Recommended Response : To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.</p>

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment/ Recommended Response
			have an impact on the character and appearance of the area and put pressure on the local services and amenities.	
50084 (English Heritage)	BW5	Object	Welcome reference to Park Lug in the policy but there needs to be careful consideration to its conservation and enhancement, as it may be of national significance, where it survives well. BW5 should have a specific heading Heritage and refer to Park Lug and the Palace deer park.	A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs to be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
50105 (South Downs National Park)	BW5	Comment	The boundary of this site abuts the SDNP and the policy should include a specific requirement to ensure that there is no detrimental impact on the quality of the SDNP.	A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs to be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
51825	BW5	Comment	<p>The proposed range of B1 (b/c –research and development / light industry) and B8 (storage and distribution) are welcomed along with the policy text permitting other business uses as ancillary elements. . However, whilst the northern part of the site sits close to the houses on Winters Hill uses, would need to be limited to B1 / B8 uses, there is no reason why B2 (general industrial) uses might not be permitted with other employment uses on the western most and southern part of the site.</p> <p>The promoters of the site consider that the site has capacity for a more sustainable mixed use allocation with a larger residential component. An area of between 0.6 – 1.0ha for new housing would enable the delivery of a</p>	<p>This response raises matters that require further investigation, to ensure that the right balance of uses is proposed. .</p> <p>Recommended Response : To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs to be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.</p>

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment/ Recommended Response
			robust strategy for the site.	
50015 (Durley PC), 51096, 51400, 51420, 51804, 51824,	BW5	Object	<p>Object to the development for one or more of the following reasons :-</p> <p><u>Access and junction with Winchester Road</u> – (4 representations raised this matter) concern about increased traffic and congestion onto Wintershill / Winchester Road junction; Access should be via a roundabout at Wintershill/Winchester Road. Should be restrictions on size of vehicles using Wintershill Road as it is very narrow.</p> <p><u>Range of Uses</u> - (3 representations raised this matter) have no objection to B1 use on the existing part of the site but object to the additional land being used; Development should be restricted to B1 due to proximity of site to residential areas; modern sheds will not be appropriate fronting Wintershill/Winchester Road. In order that the new employment site is achievable and viable it would be appropriate for the site to be allocated in a way that enables it to meet a wide range of local needs, generate local employment opportunities, sit satisfactorily with adjoining uses and operate as an effective entity.</p> <p><u>Amount of land for housing</u> - (2 representations raised this matter) properties in Wintershill should be included within the settlement boundary; designate Jefferies Yard as housing fronting the road as it is unsuitable for use as a storage/haulage yard and no longer required</p> <p>Durley PC have no objection to employment at Tollgate Sawmills but wish to see a house on the Jefferies Yard site.</p>	<p>A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations or suggest sites for development, either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition.</p> <p>Recommended Response : To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs to be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.</p>

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment/ Recommended Response
			<u>Suitability of the site for development</u> – the site is wet and has a lot of wildlife; there is no mains drainage;	
			Omission Site	
51096, 51824	BW OMISSION	Object	Include Jefferies yard within the settlement boundary of Bishops Waltham and allow a change of use of the land to residential and permit housing on a small scale, in keeping with properties along Wintershill; The yard is no longer required for employment purposes	A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations/settlement boundaries or suggest sites for development, either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
51885	DM5	Object	Object to inclusion of privately owned land at Station Road, Bishops Waltham under policy DM5. Amendment: The land is not a public open space and must be deleted from DM5 (map of site is included).	A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.

Appendix 2

New Alresford- Responses to Draft Local Plan Part 2 Consultation

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
	4.5.1 – 4.5.14		Introductory Paragraphs	
50967	4.5.1	Comment	New Alresford retail area has colourful Georgian architecture but, behind the main streets, the homes are mainly late twenty first century properties built alongside adopted roads and adjoining green spaces. There is an older area for industry on New Farm Road which serves its purpose as privately rented/owned for smaller businesses.	Noted. Recommended Response: No change required.
50025 (New Alresford TC)	4.5.2	Comment	NATC reserves the right to comment further in light of revised population figures when available.	Noted. Recommended Response: No change required.
50590, 51492,	4.5.4	Object	Paragraph 4.5.4 requires 'development should be of an appropriate scale but the scale of development proposed in one location does not satisfy this. Development should be dispersed across the town.	A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations or suggest sites for development, either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
50967	4.5.4	Object	The town is well served by buses and there is no need to include employment at Sun Lane to employ residents of Alresford 'locally', as they can access industrial areas to the east and west by service 64.	The Local Plan should seek to maintain and improve the town's employment role and improve the balance between housing, employment and services, as required by Local Plan Part 1 policy MTRA2. The proposed allocation of employment land was aimed at achieving this, but may need to be reviewed in the light of other comments. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2,

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
				further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
50705	4.5.5	Object	The assumption that all existing permissions will be implemented is too high as it assumes 100% implementation. More allocations are needed to meet the housing requirement.	<p>The Net Housing Requirement table under paragraph 4.5.5 will be updated in the next version of the Plan, although this is not expected to significantly change the remaining land to be allocated. A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations or suggest sites for development, either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition.</p> <p>Recommended Response: Update the Net Housing Requirement table as necessary (paragraph 4.5.5). To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.</p>
51492	4.5.5	Object	The table should include an allowance for windfall sites, which will often be brownfield sites and is preferable to greenfield development.	<p>Paragraph 48 of the NPPF states that, “Local planning authorities may make an allowance for windfall sites in the five-year supply if they have compelling evidence that such sites have consistently become available in the local area and will continue to provide a reliable source of supply.” The Council’s study did not find such compelling evidence to include any “windfall allowance” in the Net Housing Requirement table for Alresford. However it is intended to update the table to take account of any planning permissions or completions that have come forward.</p> <p>Recommended Response: Update the Net Housing Requirement table as necessary</p>

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
				(paragraph 4.5.5).
51114, 51414	4.5.8	Object	Object to no allowance being made for windfall sites which unnecessarily boosts the number to be allocated. Windfall sites come forward at a rate that is in line with the historical pattern / have come forward since the Windfall Study. Should assume that windfall sites will continue to come forward and plan accordingly, to avoid infrastructure being strained by 'unexpected' additional development.	See above. Recommended Response: Update the Net Housing Requirement table as necessary (paragraph 4.5.5).
51414	4.5.8	Object	In Alresford windfall dwellings come forward at a rate that is in line with the historical pattern. Allowing for no windfall provision, simply because potential sites haven't been identified from a desk-based exercise, seems flawed	See above. Recommended Response: Update the Net Housing Requirement table as necessary (paragraph 4.5.5).
51492	4.5.9	Object	Object to any conclusions being based on the Needs Group reports since they were given incorrect data.	The Needs Groups were invited to consider the implications of the corrections to estimated population projections and have re-convened to do this. New Alresford Town Council has forwarded the results to the City Council for consideration in future stages of the Local Plan. Recommended Response: No change required.
51114	4.5.9	Object	This paragraph claims to take account of the Needs Groups but the main need is to spread development around the town, which would reduce the strain on infrastructure. There has not been a collaborative approach and the Needs Groups were given erroneous data and should meet again. The evidence has been fitted to the plan which was in place before work started on Local Plan Part 2.	See above regarding the Needs Groups. Neither the Needs Groups nor the evidence base, from which the draft Local Plan was developed, suggest a requirement to spread development around the town. A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations or suggest sites for development, either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
				sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
51312, 51856	4.5.9	Object	The process was not representative of the full town.	See response to comments on consultation below. Recommended Response: No change required.
50631, 51114	4.5.10	Object	There is no justification for a new access to the Bypass and it would increase traffic / be dangerous. The evidence provided to the Needs Groups was flawed / the development needs are wrong. Businesses in The Dean do not wish to relocate. Spreading development would be a better solution.	A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations or suggest sites for development, either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
51020	4.5.11	Comment	Concerned that directing traffic from the Sun Hill development to the A31 will mean that the residents do not feel part of the town and have to drive a long way to Perins School or West Street. A link to the B3047 appears to have merit and further thought as to traffic management is needed.	See above. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
50590, 50631, 51114, 51492,	4.5.11	Object	Paragraph 4.5.11 states that 'the new access point onto the A31 is necessary and deliverable' but this is unsupported by facts / the Highway Authority. The proposed transport solution which will have a huge impact on nearby residents and has not been subject to an independent transport assessment / model.	See above. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
51114, 51312, 51856,	4.5.11	Object	This paragraph states there has been further work on transport issues but this is not substantiated / the Highway Authority has significant concerns about the A31 junction. Has the statement that traffic impacts can be accommodated been substantiated?	See above. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
				sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
51114	4.5.12	Object	The paragraph says the site is well related to facilities and services but it has no public transport link and the importance of public transport is not mentioned.	This statement is based on the Transport Assessment which shows the site as 'adequate' overall, when measured at the furthest point of the whole site. The northern part of the site has better access to facilities, schools and bus stops. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
50590	4.5.12	Object	The Needs Groups used incorrect data from WCC.	See response to comments on paragraph 4.5.9 above. Recommended Response: No change required.
51114	4.5.13	Object	This paragraph refers to parking but there is no mention of public transport. The error in the population projections casts doubt over whether further employment land is needed and there is no evidence of the types of businesses needed.	See above. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
51312, 51856	4.5.13	Object	Is there any evidence that businesses want to relocate?	See above. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
50631	4.5.13	Object	Object to any references to the Needs Groups' conclusions as the population projections were inflated.	See response to comments on paragraph 4.5.9 above. Recommended Response: No change required.

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
50967	4.5.14	Support	Support the principle of using the old railway line as a footpath and cycle way from Kings Worthy to Alresford. Approx 1 mile is open for this purpose at Itchen Abbas and this could be continued through the whole length. The SDNPA and HCC have agreed to carry out a feasibility study of this route in the 2015-16 financial year.	Support welcomed.
	NA1 – NA3		All New Alresford Policies	
51032, 51111, 51192, 51234, 51612	NA1-NA3	Support	Support the Local Plan strategy for Alresford and / or oppose the Alresford Professional Group alternative plan for one or more of the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • it is better to concentrate development / oppose piecemeal development or multiple sites; • the Local Plan strategy avoids traffic disruption throughout the town / the alternative would cause access and traffic problems, particularly in New Farm Road; • the Local Plan strategy provides housing for the elderly near the centre / the alternative plan would fail to provide this; • the Local Plan strategy has good access to the bypass for industry and construction / the alternative plan would fail to move industry out of The Dean; • the Local Plan strategy has minimal visual impact / the alternative plan would spoil areas of special beauty; • the Local Plan strategy would provide a major new recreation area / the alternative plan would not provide a new recreation area; • the alternative plan involves multiple ownerships / may not be deliverable / may not provide adequate houses. 	Support welcomed.
51384	NA1-NA3	Support	Support development being concentrated in one area, although there may be some scope for compromise with the ideas set out by the APG.	Support welcomed.

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
51646	NA1-NA3	Support	Support the Local Plan but concerned about the number of houses required. The A31 junction should be all moves and there should be a link to the Bishops Sutton Road. It would be a great benefit if the salad depot could be relocated to the industrial site. Oppose the APG alternative plan to scatter development, centred on New Farm Road, for environmental and traffic reasons.	Support welcomed and comments noted.
50683	NA1-NA3	Comment	Prefer the Local Plan strategy as the APG alternative plan has serious difficulties regarding the land west of New Farm Road and it is not clear whether the landowners of other sites agree with it. Prefer the new A31 junction to have 4-way access and landscaping of the industrial area pending each phase of it. Retail units should be limited to 1500sq ft and all new roads should be built to adoptable standards. There need to be careful highway measures to handle traffic, particularly in Nursery Road, Jacklyn's Lane and Sun Lane.	A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations or suggest sites for development, either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
51220	NA1-NA3	Comment	Have reconsidered previous response and, on balance, do not agree with the alternative plan as this uses more undeveloped land in too many points.	Comment noted. Recommended Response: No change required.
51024	NA1-NA3	Comment	Neither the Local Plan nor the APG alternative plan are ideal but the alternative seems more realistic. Issues which need to be considered are long term parking; traffic movement and a link to Bishops Sutton Road; whether compulsory purchase is needed to relocate businesses from The Dean; highway authority input on the new A31 access; increased infrastructure such as schools and doctors; and any care home should be part of the community.	A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations or suggest sites for development, either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
50105 (South Downs NP)	NA1-NA3	Comment	All the sites lie away from the National Park and are therefore unlikely to have an adverse impact on the landscape value of the National Park.	Comment noted. Recommended Response: No change required.
(10 comments)	NA1-NA3	Object	Object to the Local Plan strategy for Alresford and/or	A number of representations make comments on

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
50709, 50729, 51167, 51176, 51185, 51301, 51307, 51377, 51407, 51887			<p>support the Alresford Professional Group alternative plan for one or more of the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • object to a new access from the A31, a new junction is not needed, it will increase traffic and danger; • lack of a credible transport/highways plan; • construction of slip roads on the A31 and a junction for the industrial units will create unacceptable traffic noise • the proposals are not supported by improvements in public transport • any A31 bypass should have appropriate landscaping • failure to allocate any housing on the two SHLAA sites leaving them vulnerable to future development; • there is no reference to potential windfall sites; • the additional cemetery would be more sensibly located close to the existing burial area; • the assumption that commercial operators in the Dean will voluntarily re-locate is flawed; • there is no need to move or build new industrial units; • oppose one large housing estate, it would be more sympathetic to spread the housing around the town; • there should be a link to the Bishops Sutton Road; • the process has not been transparent and people were not consulted properly; • funding would be better spent to provide more open spaces; • the proposals are not suitable for a historic market town; • object to the impact on infrastructure /parking pressure in the town; 2 • the proposal will make existing flooding problems worse; 	<p>the proposed site allocations or suggest sites for development, either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition.</p> <p>Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.</p>
50633	NA1-NA3	Object	There are a number of flaws with the Local Plan and an alternative plan has been produced by the 'Alresford Professional Group' following extensive consultation with	A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations or suggest sites for development, either as an alternative to those

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
			<p>the community (map provided). This should be adopted in favour of the LPP2 proposals, can be delivered in a sustainable way, and makes use of existing infrastructure capacity by spreading housing around the town. The existing principal roads have capacity to accommodate significant additional traffic movements and the most logical approach is to distribute development around these roads. There should be adequate parking, with new provision at the Alresford Recreation Centre car park to achieve about 100 spaces and free up centrally located parking for customers and visitors. This would not displace existing businesses. A realistic figure for new jobs is 120-150 which could be provided by existing and proposed development and growth of existing businesses. Existing employment areas at The Dean and Prospect Road should be retained and refurbishment encouraged. There is substantial vacant commercial floorspace available in Alresford and the surrounding area, along with jobs at the proposed new care home. Sun Lane should be diverted to release land for the adjoining schools to provide pick-up facilities and a new playing field for the junior school, with the existing junior school playing field developed for housing. 25 hectares of open space are proposed, with about 22 hectares at the Sun Lane site and the remainder at New Farm Road. Housing should be spread across various sites in western, northern and eastern Alresford to meet the remaining requirement of 386 dwellings. These should be off Watercress Meadows/New Farm Road in the west; Bridge Road, Arlebury Park and The Dean in the north; and Sun Lane and Sun Hill school in the east, with a care home at the Sun Lane site.</p>	<p>allocated in the draft plan or in addition. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs to be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.</p>
50701	NA1-NA3	Object	<p>The inter-dependent nature of Policies NA1, NA2 and NA3 means the failure of any part results in the partial or total failure of them all. In such an event the town will be plan-less which constitutes unsound and unsustainable</p>	<p>It is agreed that a 'sound' Plan is essential and this is what the Council will aim to produce and submit for examination. An independent Inspector will assess whether the Plan is sound and can,</p>

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
			development planning.	therefore, be adopted. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
50599	NA1-NA3	Object	There is no control over when the 320 houses proposed could be built, which could be in as little as 2 years. The new A31 junction is necessitated by the large construction traffic impact not the housing so the developer will not fund all of it. The industrial site is proposed to fund the junction and the relocation of business from The Dean is proposed to make this viable. Few businesses want to relocate so the plan is flawed and unsound. There has not been meaningful consultation with inadequate publicity, no printed copies of the Plan or comment forms. There should be meaningful discussion with the APG about the alternative plan. The Needs Groups were biased and were supplied with incorrect data. Businesses will not relocate from The Dean as there is no reason or incentive. There is no need for the industrial site as there is vacant existing floorspace and the jobs will not be for local people. The site will not be developed for industry and there will be pressure for housing.	A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations or suggest sites for development, either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
51307	NA1-NA3	Object	Agree with the APG alternative plan overall, but no site should have over 25 dwellings per hectare. Housing on The Avenue should not be visible over the wall and there should be a larger car park and landscape buffer here.	A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations or suggest sites for development, either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
				be reported back to a future meeting.
	NA1		Car Park Provision	
(11 comments) 50557, 50575, 50646, 50725, 50734, 50744, 50967, 50992, 50993, 51608, 51816,	NA1	Support	Support policy NA1. Proper provision for parking is needed for residents and visitors. The car parks are not adequate for shoppers.	Support welcomed.
50577	NA1	Comment	Support the provision of additional parking but this would be best located next to Alresford Recreation Centre rather than The Dean.	A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations or suggest sites for development, either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
50641, 50653	NA1	Comment	Question the need for more parking, there are spaces available and the shops are within walking distance of most residents. Providing more car parks contradicts other policies trying to reduce car use into the town.	A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
(49 comments) 50561, 50576, 50623, 50648, 50661, 50669, 50701, 50733, 50745, 51094, 51121, 51132,	NA1	Object	The policy fails to provide enough car parking and there is nothing in the evidence base to suggest the impact of vehicles from additional housing has been taken into account. There is no reference to on-street parking or the District Parking Strategy. The proposed parking is reliant on redevelopment of The Dean which is subject to the	A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations or suggest sites for development, either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2,

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
51159, 51171, 51182, 51197, 51198, 51257, 51258, 51259, 51261, 51263, 51272, 51275, 51276, 51288, 51289, 51290, 51291, 51294, 51310, 51313, 51314, 51320, 51329, 51330, 51331, 51332, 51333, 51336, 51338, 51345, 51348, 51363, 51364, 51623, 51849, 51853, 51859			new A31 junction. It is not clear all the development proposed at The Dean will fit on the site. There should be a full review of car parking and proposals should not rely on other elements of the plan.	further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
50565, 50590, 50599, 51351, 51492	NA1	Object	Object to more parking and/or care home through the redevelopment of The Dean. The junction is already dangerous and this will create more traffic.	A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
51492	NA1	Object	Object to NA1 which will cause congestion at existing junctions; parking times should be restricted to one hour with no return within 2 hours; greater use should be made of the recreation centre car park; another car park should be provided at the western entrance to the recreation centre and this should be included in a revised policy.	A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
50599, 50654, 50700, 51492	NA1	Object	The alternative plan proposed by the professional group better supports parking provision in the town / is safer.	A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations. Recommended Response: To ensure that the

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
				most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
50647	NA1	Object	The policy and explanatory text is unclear whether about what is restricted until replacement employment land is provided. There are 3 public car parks, not 2 as referred to in the policy/text. Arlebury Park is the nearest car park to The Dean and is underused. There is no evidence of a need for 50-100 additional spaces or that The Dean is the best location, there should be a full review of car parking. If there is a need for additional parking, it should not be dependent on commercial properties at The Dean being sold. The proposal will increase traffic on the Jacklyn's Lane junction and the policy is unclear about whether improvements would be required.	A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations or suggest sites for development, either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
50693	NA1	Object	Policy NA1 should be deleted, there is no evidence that this is practical or can be financed. It would increase traffic on the already-congested Jacklyn's Lane junction. The existing Alresford Recreation Centre car park should be extended.	A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations or suggest sites for development, either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
50701	NA1	Object	Support for securing existing town centre parking but NA2 fails to address the wider parking needs of the town outside the town centre, which will be impacted by development on the allocated sites.	See above. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
51033	NA1	Object	Object to NA1 which establishes permanent land use and should be withdrawn. Perins Board of Governors is content with the long lease of the car park but educational use may be needed in the future and would have to be considered against the need for parking.	A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
51071	NA1	Object	Welcome the policy to protect existing parking but new spaces will not be delivered at The Dean as businesses do not want to relocate and the site is in multiple ownerships. The site is not large enough for the uses proposed.	See above. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
51348	NA1	Object	Allocating the land for residential use will increase the cost of providing a car park and is an inefficient use of public money.	See above. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
51475	NA1	Object	The Arlebury Park car park should also be protected and expanded. Additional parking should not be linked to development of The Dean.	See above. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
51661, 51817	NA1	Object	Nursery Road will not be improved as a result of the development proposals.	See above. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
				points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
50967	4.5.15-4.5.16	Support	Car parking provision remains a driver for the economic limit of the retail sector in the town. The need for evening buses should be explored long term with the provider.	Support welcomed and comments noted.
50631	4.5.16	Object	The proposed car park will increase danger at the Jacklyn's Lane junction where a child has already been killed by a lorry.	See above. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
	NA2 – NA3		New Alresford Housing & Mixed Use Allocations	
(11 comments) 50132, 50263, 50617, 51027, 51129, 51131, 51592, 51607, 51628, 51685, 51686	NA2-NA3	Support	Support the Local Plan strategy for Alresford and / or oppose the Alresford Professional Group alternative plan for one or more of the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the Local Plan will reduce traffic through the new A31 junction / 'piecemeal developments' will use existing roads and junctions which are at capacity / the alternative plan does not have proper assessments of traffic impact; the Local Plan strategy will provide more affordable housing; the Local Plan provides for business expansion and local jobs / the alternative plan makes no allowance for new industry; The Dean is ideal for the development of accommodation for the elderly; the Local Plan enables a reduction of lorry movements in the town; the (Sun Lane) site has low visual impact / the alternative plan does not have proper assessments of landscape impact; 	Support welcomed and comments noted.

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the (Sun Lane) land is in single ownership; the Local Plan strategy would have least impact on the town; the Local Plan would provide open space and a burial ground; there is the opportunity for environmental initiatives and energy from waste to supply the town; the alternative plan would require all of the sites to come forward / the alternative plan is unworkable, undeliverable; there is nothing in the alternative plan which has not already been considered and rejected. 	
51025	NA2-NA3	Support	Generally support development at Sun Lane and The Dean, particularly if it reduces lorry movements in the town. Would be concerned if there is not a link with the A31 although this should include an eastbound exit and be built first. Do not support piecemeal development which would not have a link to the A31.	Support welcomed and comments noted.
51712	NA2-NA3	Support	Support the proposals. The removal of industry from The Dean and development close to the A31 would be beneficial and provide jobs, and the area is ideal for elderly persons housing. Suggest a new roundabout on Sun Lane and closure south of Nursery Road. A link to the B3047 would give flexibility but is not essential. The APG alternative plan for piecemeal development would cause environmental and traffic problems, especially on New Farm Road. Services are more easily provided to one large site.	Support welcomed and comments noted.
51762	NA2-NA3	Support	Generally support the plan, especially housing for the elderly in The Dean, but the issue of traffic has not been dealt with satisfactorily.	Support welcomed and comments noted.
50630	NA2-NA3	Comment	There is no guarantee that businesses will move to the new site. Concern HGV's will use residential streets to existing businesses in The Dean and New Farm Road.	A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations or suggest sites for development, either as an alternative to those

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
			Need more discussions on how to minimise impact of development on residential streets. Restricting access from the Sun Lane site to only the bypass is unworkable. Development should be spread around. Opportunities to improve footpaths should be explored.	allocated in the draft plan or in addition. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
(18 comments) 50607, 50614, 50625, 50749, 51138, 51193, 51260, 51271, 51274, 51350, 51468, 51469, 51487, 51644, 51756, 51774, 51802, 51842,	NA2-NA3	Object	<p>Object to the Local Plan strategy for Alresford and / or support the Alresford Professional Group alternative plan for one or more of the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • traffic impact (especially on Nursery Road, Sun Lane, or Tichborne Down), inadequate transport plan, impact on infrastructure (comment by 12 respondents); • housing should not be concentrated on one site / the alternative plan is more balanced, or spreads development more sensitively (comment by 12 respondents); • the A31 junction is inadequate (not all-moves), unnecessary, dangerous, or expensive (comment by 11 respondents); • there is no need for additional industry / the population projections used were inaccurate (comment by 10 respondents); • object to moving businesses from The Dean / businesses don't want to move (comment by 6 respondents); • Sun Lane is an unsuitable location / poorly suited for modern businesses (comment by 5 respondents); • the Plan would harm the character of Alresford (comment by 4 respondents); • visual impact, loss of an attractive site / farmland (comment by 4 respondents); • there should be link (from Sun Lane site) to Bishops 	<p>A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations or suggest sites for development, either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition.</p> <p>Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.</p>

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
			<p>Sutton Road (comment by 2 respondents);</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • windfall sites / sites in surrounding villages should be used (comment by 2 respondents); • there is public opposition / lack of support for the Plan (comment by 2 respondents); • impact on schools – noise, etc (comment by 1 respondent); • there should be fewer houses on Sun Lane (comment by 1 respondent); • concern about the impact on Bishops Sutton and threat of joining with Alresford (comment by 1 respondent); • concern about flooding and environmental problems (comment by 1 respondent); • there is a need for a nursing home at Sun Lane (comment by 1 respondent). 	
50597	NA2-NA3	Object	<p>Tichborne Down is already a rat run without the additional lorries. The A31 junction would draw traffic out of the town so shops would not benefit. The Dean is perfect for industry and there is plenty of empty space. Schools will not be able to cope.</p>	<p>A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations or suggest sites for development, either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition.</p> <p>Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs to be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.</p>
51132	NA2-NA3	Object	<p>Any benefits of policy NA2 are outweighed by the potential loss of local employment, which would harm the town's economy. The new junction proposed by NA3 is dangerous, unproven and only 3-way. The employment area is close to housing and has the potential to cause more problems than The Dean. Access to the local road network and the size of housing site would cause traffic,</p>	<p>See above.</p> <p>Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs to be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.</p>

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
			noise and light pollution problems. Housing should be spread around the town.	
51855	NA2-NA3	Object	Object to major development on greenfield land which will not provide affordable housing for people to work in Alresford. Alresford's needs have not been looked at and there are discrepancies in the population figures. Businesses do not want to move from The Dean. Do not support the APG alternative plan either, there is not a need for more housing.	See above. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
51580	NA2-NA3	Object	Question the soundness of the development strategy based on a single site, the requirement to find employment land, and access via a new junction to the A31. The evidence base has been acknowledged to be flawed so the strategy cannot be said to be the most appropriate. The SA is incorrect in referring to site 2552 as a future recreation space, but correctly acknowledges the good accessibility of the site. Site 2552 will not impact on historic parkland and includes a caravan park. The site has no greater landscape impact than other sites and can provide housing that reflects the character of Alresford. Question the deliverability of the new A31 access, reliance on landowners at The Dean, and the marketability of the employment land.	See above. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
	NA2		The Dean Housing Allocation	
(12 comments) 50132, 50263, 50557, 50573, 50641, 50682, 50684, 50730, 50744, 50992, 50993, 51616	NA2	Support	Support policy NA2 and / or oppose the Alresford Professional Group alternative plan for one or more of the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the Local Plan is the best overall plan for Alresford; the Plan will reduce lorries / traffic through relocation / the new A31 junction; the Plan will provide more housing / affordable housing; 	Support welcomed and comments noted.

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • support the development of accommodation for the elderly close to the town centre and facilities; • support the relocation of industry from The Dean and the provision of local jobs / the alternative plan excludes industrial development so is not sound; • the Plan proposes a sustainable package to fully meet development needs; • support the proposed additional parking; • the alternative plan is unworkable / undeliverable. 	
51608	NA2	Support	Nursery Road will not be improved as a result of the development and it will cause traffic problems. The A31 junction will increase traffic on Nursery Road. The commercial area will have a positive effect. Concerned about traffic, parking, impact on schools and doctors surgery and loss of countryside.	Support welcomed and comments noted.
50280	NA2	Comment	Support the draft allocation for housing but this should not be dependent on development outside the control of the landowners and planning authority. This is the only site other than Sun Lane allocated for housing and is in several ownerships, which may prejudice its deliverability. The restriction on housing being developed until land at Sun Lane is available should be removed and is restricting the use of the site. As the site is in several ownerships it may be better to accept a financial contribution for open space in some cases. Agree that any office or car park development should be to the south of the site.	A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
50577	NA2	Comment	Support a mix of housing and business at The Dean. Warwicks should relocate voluntarily, allowing for housing, but not a care home. Relocation should not be used to justify industry at Sun Lane and the restriction on development until this is provided should be removed. There should be negotiation with Warwicks to allow The Dean to evolve for a mix of business and housing. There	A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations or suggest sites for development, either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
			should be a new car park at Alresford Recreation Centre.	points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
50967	NA2	Comment	Although the community aspires to older persons' accommodation at the Dean so that the residents can access the shops, there is little evidence of people doing this once they are in residential accommodation. There is no clear view of the likelihood of release of this industrial land for housing. The availability of the site may be hampered by recent expensive broadband infrastructure.	See above. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
50025 (New Alresford TC)	NA2	Comment	It is not clear how all the proposed site recommendations will fit into the total land area of 2.1 hectares. A caveat is required to allow for any revisions by the Employment Needs Group when the implications of the revised population figures have been accounted for.	See above. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
(43 comments) 50576, 50623, 50648, 50661, 50669, 50701, 50733, 50745, 51094, 51121, 51132, 51159, 51171, 51182, 51198, 51258, 51259, 51261, 51263, 51272, 51275, 51276, 51289, 51290, 51291, 51294, 51313, 51314, 51320, 51329, 51330, 51331, 51332, 51333, 51336, 51338, 51345, 51363, 51364, 51411,	NA2	Object	The proposed policy for The Dean relies on existing businesses relocating from this location, but they cannot be forced to move to another location. There is a considerable risk that this policy will lead to a loss of employment. There does not appear to have been a comprehensive survey of local employers and their future needs, unlike the Alresford Professional Group's extensive survey. The majority of businesses at The Dean confirm that the Sun Lane site would be unsuitable for them, leading to a loss of employment. The site is likely to be contaminated, which will increase costs, this not referred to in the Sustainability Appraisal and is contrary to the NPPF. The development is unlikely to be viable and would increase traffic on the Jacklyns Lane junction. The Plan should not be conditional on developments in other parts of the town, should safeguard existing businesses and consider actual employment needs. Out of date and inaccurate	A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations or suggest sites for development, either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
51623, 51853, 51861			population data has been used, affecting the conclusions of the Needs Groups and reducing the need for employment land. The needs of the town should be established by the Needs Groups.	
(44 comments) 50567, 50579, 50590, 50637, 50647, 50654, 50693, 50696, 50700, 50701, 50742, 50988, 50989, 51071, 51197, 51204, 51208, 51215, 51257, 51269, 51278, 51310, 51335, 51348, 51351, 51375, 51376, 51379, 51394, 51457, 51475, 51492, 51513, 51527, 51557, 51580, 51614, 51655, 51657, 51706, 51758, 51795, 51799, 51849	NA2	Object	<p>Object to policy NA2 for one or more of the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • businesses may not want to relocate from The Dean and cannot / should not be forced to do so. There is the risk of a loss of jobs / businesses (comment by 31 respondents); • there is no need for more industrial / office / business sites. There is already vacant floorspace in / around Alresford. Employment needs should be established by the Needs Groups (comment by 20 respondents); • concerned about traffic generation / congestion / the impact on Jacklyn's Lane junction. There will be a need for a suitable transport management plan (comment by 15 respondents); • there is a lack of parking in the town (comment by 6 respondents); • the site is likely to be contaminated. This needs to be assessed / was not included in the SA, and may affect viability (comment by 6 respondents); • a care home is not needed / does not need to be near the centre / should be at Sun Lane instead (comment by 6 respondents); • support the Alresford Professional Group alternative plan (comment by 6 respondents); • the proposal should not be dependent on other development / a new junction / employment land at Sun Lane (comment by 5 respondents); • it is difficult to see how the proposed uses can be accommodated on the area proposed (comment by 4 respondents); • there has been a lack of consultation about youth 	<p>A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations or suggest sites for development, either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition.</p> <p>Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs to be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.</p>

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
			<p>requirements (comment by 4 respondents);</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • office development should not take precedence over housing (comment by 2 respondents); • the site is in multiple ownerships and is not deliverable (comment by 1 respondent); • any sheltered housing should be a local authority scheme (comment by 1 respondent); • new parking should be at the Recreation Centre (comment by 1 respondent). 	
(7 comments) 50575, 50646, 50725, 50734, 51661, 51816, 51817	NA2	Object	Nursery Road will not be improved as a result of the development and it will cause traffic problems. The A31 junction will increase traffic on Nursery Road and the commercial area will not have a positive effect.	<p>A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations or suggest sites for development, either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition.</p> <p>Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.</p>
50633	NA2	Object	The policy depends on support from all the landowners to achieve the range and mix of uses proposed. The various uses require a significant area of land and there is no evidence that these elements can be accommodated or delivered. The land is unlikely to come forward as a single entity and the Plan would disrupt a vital part of the town's economy. Additional parking is needed but would be dependent on businesses relocating. It would not seem viable to provide an elderly persons' housing scheme with care facilities given the size of site required and the existing businesses occupying the area.	<p>A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations or suggest sites for development, either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition.</p> <p>Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.</p>
50653	NA2	Object	Object to NA2 as it provides no clear guidance about what is intended and how it will be implemented, with no details of how relocation may be promoted or the type of employment planned. The proposed car park will	<p>See above.</p> <p>Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various</p>

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
			increase turning movements into The Dean.	points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
50705	NA2	Object	The strategy focuses development on two sites and presumes that The Dean will be available for housing. There is uncertainty about this and the 65 units allocated at The Dean are dependent on land being made available at another allocation, Sun Lane. The 65 dwellings should be allocated elsewhere and land at Arlebury Park could contribute to this.	See above. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
51696	NA2	Object	This has historically been an industrial area, don't destroy its character and turn it into a bland suburban development.	See above. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
50090 (Southern Water)	NA2	Object	SW have undertaken an assessment of our infrastructure and its ability to meet the forecast demand for the proposed development. That assessment reveals that additional local sewerage and water supply infrastructure would be required to accommodate the proposed development, involving making a connection to the local sewerage and water distribution networks at the nearest points of adequate capacity. SW is not fully funded to provide local sewerage infrastructure, as Ofwat expects the company to recover new development and growth costs from developers. In addition, the development area is located within a groundwater Source Protection Zone. This signifies that the area requires a high level of protection to safeguard public water supplies. Development should therefore only be permitted if adequate mitigation measures can be implemented, to the satisfaction of the Environment Agency. Such measures must ensure that the vulnerability of the	A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
			<p>groundwater source to contamination is not increased, and that public health and the quantity of water supplies are protected. Proposed an amendment to the policy under infrastructure: 'provide a connection to the nearest points of adequate capacity in the water distribution and sewerage network, in collaboration with the service provider.</p> <p>- must ensure the groundwater sources are protected, to the satisfaction of the Environment Agency.'</p>	
51114	4.5.17	Object	<p>This paragraph is about protecting a small area at the expense of residential areas. It reflects the views of the Alresford Society which has been given undue influence and represents a small proportion of the town.</p>	<p>See above.</p> <p>Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.</p>
51071	4.5.18	Object	<p>Businesses do not wish to relocate to Sun Lane and there is existing vacant floorspace. There is not demand for the proposed commercial area.</p>	<p>See above.</p> <p>Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.</p>
51114	4.5.18	Object	<p>This section is about employment space but there is no consideration of the town's employment needs. Commercial considerations have been ignored and there is no vision for high-tech industries, home working, etc.</p>	<p>See above.</p> <p>Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.</p>
51492	4.5.19	Object	<p>The use of the term 'elderly' is too vague. Elderly people in care homes rarely come out of their rooms so they don't need to be near a town centre. Specialist accommodation for the elderly will generate too much</p>	<p>See above.</p> <p>Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various</p>

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
			traffic (visitors and workers) and should not be in the town centre, it would be better located on the NA3 site.	points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
51071	4.5.21	Object	Have not witnessed significant lorry movements or problems at The Dean.	See above. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
	NA3		Sun Lane Mixed Use Allocation	
(166 comments) 50132, 50558, 50573, 50584, 50615, 50641, 50675, 50682, 50684, 50730, 50979, 50986, 50987, 50992, 50993, 51013, 51026, 51042, 51051, 51061, 51108, 51129, 51131, 51134, 51137, 51188, 51189, 51191, 51195, 51196, 51201, 51206, 51210, 51222, 51225, 51226, 51228, 51229, 51235, 51286, 51298, 51308, 51309, 51319, 51324, 51346, 51362, 51367,	NA3	Support	Support policy NA3 and / or oppose the (Alresford Professional Group) alternative plan for one or more of the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the Plan will have least impact or disruption on the town and avoid harm to Alresford's character / piecemeal development would impact on existing properties and increase traffic, landscape, etc impacts; the Plan is the best or only viable option to provide for all of Alresford's needs / the alternative plan is not viable or deliverable and would not provide for identified housing, employment, open space, etc needs; the Plan provides opportunities for (affordable) housing / the alternative plan would not provide sufficient (affordable) housing; the Plan provides for the relocation of industry, the regeneration of The Dean and jobs for existing and new residents / the alternative plan fails to provide additional employment and jobs; the Plan provides housing for the elderly or sheltered 	Support welcomed and comments noted.

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
51368, 51385, 51389, 51426, 51430, 51447, 51484, 51507, 51525, 51528, 51536, 51563, 51564, 51566, 51586, 51589, 51590, 51591, 51594, 51598, 51600, 51601, 51604, 51616, 51622, 51629, 51630, 51631, 51632, 51634, 51635, 51636, 51637, 51638, 51639, 51640, 51641, 51642, 51649, 51652, 51653, 51654, 51656, 51658, 51660, 51662, 51666, 51668, 51670, 51671, 51675, 51676, 51677, 51679, 51687, 51688, 51690, 51694, 51697, 51702, 51707, 51708, 51709, 51713, 51724, 51725, 51726, 51727, 51729, 51730, 51732, 51733, 51734, 51737, 51738, 51739, 51740, 51741, 51743, 51744, 51745, 51746, 51747, 51748, 51749, 51750, 51752, 51754,			<p>housing near to town centre facilities and services / the alternative plan does not have well-located housing for the elderly ;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the Plan provides for additional parking close to the centre / the alternative plan has a lack of additional parking; • the Plan provides a large area of open space, recreation, burial ground and land for a school drop-off area / the alternative plan does not provide well-located open space; • the proposed A31 will help to reduce traffic congestion and should be a pre-requisite of development or designed for lorry use / the alternative plan will increase pressure on existing roads, particularly New Farm Road, The Avenue and Bridge Street; • development to the east would help balance Alresford, as most existing development is to the south and west; • the Sun Lane site is within easy walking distance of the school, facilities and town centre / the alternative plan will encourage car use for accessing the school and facilities; • it will be important to manage traffic / should consider a link to the Bishops Sutton Road; • The Plan allows for phased development / it is not realistic to phase piecemeal development; • The Plan will provide improved infrastructure such as drainage and school extension and will support existing facilities; • The Sun Lane site has least landscape impact and is well contained by field boundaries and the solar farm / the alternative plan will have a harmful landscape and wildlife impact, particularly on the Arle, Itchen and water meadows; • links to exiting roads should not be prevented; 	

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
51757, 51761, 51765, 51768, 51773, 51776, 51778, 51779, 51780, 51781, 51782, 51783, 51784, 51785, 51786, 51787, 51788, 51790, 51796, 51819, 51841, 51844, 51845, 51846, 51566, 51857, 51858, 51860, 51862, 51863			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • would encourage footpaths and cycleways to link to nearby settlements; • is there space for the cemetery at St John's? • provision should be made for recycling, public transport and habitat creation; • would like to see a commitment to sustainability and high energy standards, including investigation of CHP and ground-source heating; • the employment area provides an opportunity to move the salad packing plant; • need for high quality / sympathetic design; • there has been public consultation, is public support, and the Plan is supported by the Town Council. 	
50263	NA3	Support	Support the wording and details contained in policy NA3 without amendment. The land at Sun Lane is the most sustainable and only development option which meets the needs of Alresford and the policy. It meets the site assessment and selection criteria outlined in the NPPF and PPG. It has been found to be suitable, following rigorous assessment, is available for the uses proposed and achievable as a viable package. It can provide land for the diversion of Sun Lane to support the school and is in single ownership and can be phased. The site provides an opportunity for environmental and traffic improvements in the town. The option put forward by the Alresford Professional Group appears not to have addressed and does not meet the PPG and LPP2 site selection criteria, the sites are not suitable or available and the proposal is not achievable or deliverable.	Support welcomed and comments noted.
50025 (New Alresford TC)	NA3	Comment	References to 5 hectares of employment land should be replaced with 1.5 to 3 hectares (excluding the junction). Clarification is needed on the meaning of the terms 'serviced land' and 'made available'. Need clarification on whether serviced employment land is required before commencement or completion of housing units. Add text	A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations or suggest sites for development, either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2,

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
			to the end of bullet point 4 regarding access: "taking into account views of local residents who are in close proximity to the development." Add a new bullet point regarding landscape: "a 50m wildlife corridor to be included along the length of the eastern boundary."	further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
51852	NA3	Comment	The Plan will make a major difference to Alresford and provide much-needed housing. This should be a balance of private and Council housing, with some offered to local people, public transport, and keeping the site tidy.	Comment noted. Recommended Response: No change required.
51792	NA3	Comment	WCC should give direction to potential developers on transport and infrastructure. There are no plans for essential transport facilities, routes into the town, parking, or the salad factory.	A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations or suggest sites for development, either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
51682	NA3	Comment	Do not object to development but the infrastructure is not there and concerned about an industrial site. Not sure a traveller site is needed.	See above. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
51049	NA3	Comment	The Plan should have provision for self-builders. The Sun Lane site is an excellent example where serviced plots could be provided. Self building should be regarded as a form of affordable housing and a proportion of serviced plots for self builders should be offered, allowing local people to decide what sort of house they want.	See above. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting
50974	NA3	Comment	Generally in favour of the Sun Lane site but need to	See above.

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
			consider the impact on surrounding communities. There should be extensive consultation with Petersfield Council and surrounding communities, as stressed by the NPPF. The Itchen Valley is an SSSI so there should be thorough discussion with local and national conservation bodies. Plans should be designed to improve the status quo and avoid further harm.	Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting
50582	NA3	Comment	Access is the biggest problem and there are no details of the proposed new A31 access. Access to the town centre will impact on Nursery Road and Sun Lane. The western side of the town has better links to the A31 and bypass and sites here should be considered.	See above. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting
50978	NA3	Comment	There is a need for new housing which should be a flagship development and improve the environment by exceeding the requirements of the Building Regulations and by facilitating walking and cycling including, with the main access being from the A31.	See above. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting
51283	NA3	Comment	Generally support the Sun Lane development but elements of the APG alternative plan could improve it, such as moving playing fields to the other side of Sun Lane, no industrial site or A31 junction, possible new access to Bishops Sutton Road, no care home at The Dean (support housing, parking and offices following relocation of industry), and no development north of The Avenue.	See above. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting
51425	NA3	Comment	Broadly support development east of Sun Lane and object to the APG alternative plan proposals for west of Alresford, but the alternative plan's ideas for the area around the school should be considered and would help to reduce the impact. The employment figures should be	See above. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
			reappraised to take account of population errors.	sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting
51441	NA3	Comment	The Sun Lane development must have access from the B3047 and off the A31 bypass in both directions.	See above. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting
51602	NA3	Comment	Need to sort out traffic and housing at the same time. Build some housing at Sun Lane and The Dean, but also New Farm Road. Move Alresford salads to the new employment area. Support the link to the A31 bypass but there should also be a link to Bishops Sutton Road.	See above. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting
51689	NA3	Comment	If there has to be this number of houses the Sun Lane proposal is the only one that addresses traffic problems, with the new access to the A31.	See above. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting
51759	NA3	Comment	The Sun Lane plan is the least worst option.	See above. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting
(47 comments) 50576, 50623, 50633, 50647, 50648, 50661,	NA3	Object	Parts of the site are 'most sensitive' in landscape terms and it is not possible to accommodate 10 hectares of housing without affecting this. The Plan offers inadequate	A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations or suggest sites for development, either as an alternative to those

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
50669, 50701, 50733, 50745, 51094, 51121, 51132, 51159, 51182, 51197, 51198, 51257, 51258, 51259, 51261, 51263, 51269, 51272, 51275, 51276, 51289, 51290, 51291, 51294, 51310, 51313, 51314, 51320, 51329, 51330, 51331, 51332, 51333, 51336, 51338, 51363, 51364, 51411, 51623, 51853, 51861			protection and the APG plan should be adopted. There is no justification for a new commercial area, which would not be used and be vulnerable to retail use. It is based on an over-estimate of employment requirements and failure to acknowledge home working trends. There is a lack of demand for new employment premises and a need to establish the employment needs of the town and capacity within existing businesses. The proposals for 15 hectares of open space have been driven by erroneous projections and actual open space requirements should be established. There has been inadequate transport assessment and the views of the highway authority should be sought. The proposed new A31 junction will make traffic worse in the town. There is support for the APG alternative plan and alternatives have not been properly considered by WCC or NATC. The Needs Groups findings should be reconsidered and there should be more emphasis on public transport.	allocated in the draft plan or in addition. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
(258 comments) 50556, 50559, 50560, 50561, 50575, 50562, 50565, 50567, 50572, 50576, 50577, 50579, 50590, 50593, 50595, 50596, 50599, 50603, 50609, 50622, 50625, 50626, 50629, 50631, 50634, 50635, 50637, 50639, 50640, 50642,	NA3	Object	Object to policy NA3 and/or support the (Alresford Professional Group) alternative plan for one or more of the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • traffic generation, congestion, pressure on existing roads and infrastructure, road safety/danger for the school and cyclists, particular impact on Nursery Road, Sun Lane, Tichborne Down, Whitehill Lane and Jacklyn's Lane; more traffic through Bishop's Sutton; development at Sun Lane will be expensive, unworkable and cause traffic chaos; the increase in traffic will be a danger to cyclists who won't visit the village any more, adversely affecting viability (comment by 144 respondents); • development should be spread around the town (as suggested by the APG alternative plan); development should not be concentrated in one location; 	A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations or suggest sites for development, either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
50646, 50647, 50650, 50651, 50654, 50657, 50659, 50662, 50668, 50673, 50676, 50679, 50691, 50692, 50693, 50694, 50696, 50700, 50701, 50703, 50705, 50708, 50711, 50713, 50718, 50719, 50737, 50742, 50743, 50744, 50750, 50967, 50975, 50978, 50980, 50981, 50983, 50983, 50988, 50989, 51036, 51050, 51071, 51086, 51099, 51114, 51115, 51116, 51117,51118, 51119, 51120, 51123, 51125, 51132, 51136, 51141, 51148, 51149, 51150, 51151, 51152, 51153, 51154, 51155, 51156, 51157, 51158, 51160, 51161, 51162, 51163, 51164, 51165, 51166, 51122, 51168, 51170, 51171, 51173, 51174, 51175,			<p>development should be accommodated over a 10/20 year period (comment by 122 respondents);</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the employment /industrial area is not needed; need for employment uses has been overestimated and is based on out-of-date information; there are already vacant employment/commercial uses in the area; businesses do not want to move there, not viable, site unsuitable for industrial development; the site will be used for a supermarket (comment by 108 respondents); • the proposed A31 junction is unacceptable in transport terms, expensive/unviable; need is not proven; dangerous/will not work/will lead to rapid large scale development; impact on effectiveness of A31 bypass; no confidence that the developer would provide the new A31 junction; HCC does not support the new A31 junction (comment by 77 respondents); • the Plan will harm/change Alresford's character; development near Sun Lane would damage the Conservation Area; general negative effect on the area (comment by 35 respondents); • the 'alternative plan' is fairer/better/more sensible/well researched/more sustainable/has more benefits/is more imaginative/has a better mix of uses/has less drawbacks/has more support (comment by 34 respondents); • increased pressure on local services/infrastructure such as doctors, health, recreation, education/schools and youth facilities (comment by 26 respondents); • inadequate transport assessment, modelling, management (comment by 21 respondents); • housing/development is located on the area defined as most sensitive in landscape terms (comment by 17 	

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
51177, 51178, 51179, 51180, 51181, 51183, 51184, 51190, 51194, 51200, 51202, 51203, 51204, 51208, 51211, 51212, 51213, 51214, 51217, 51218, 51219, 51221, 51223, 51224, 51227, 51230, 51231, 51232, 51236, 51238, 51239, 51240, 51241, 51244, 51245, 51246, 51247, 51248, 51249, 51250, 51251, 51252, 51253, 51254, 51255, 51256, 51262, 51264, 51266, 51267, 51270, 51278, 51279, 51280, 51284, 51295, 51296, 51297, 51300, 51302, 51303, 51305, 51306, 51312, 51315, 51316, 51317, 51334, 51341, 51342, 51345, 51347, 51348, 51349, 51351, 51366,			<p>respondents);</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • inadequate consultation/does not take account of public opposition/some groups have had undue influence on the proposals; local opposition to the Sun Lane site has been ignored; the site selection methodology has not been transparent; the site sieve process is incomplete; the proposal is unpopular with the majority of local residents (comment by 16 respondents); • the 'alternative plan' will preserve the character of the town (comment by 15 respondents); • lack of references to public transport/lack of public transport to support new development (comment by 15 respondents); • population growth has been overstated/over-estimated/flawed data (comment by 14 respondents); • the pressure for/on parking will increase (comment by 13 respondents); • development will cause flooding in the area/make existing flooding worse (comment by 8 respondents); • there must be access to the B3047; if development takes place, access should be provided via Bishop's Sutton Road (comment by 8 respondents); • too much housing/objection to housing (comment by 6 respondents); • the strategy promotes greenfield over brownfield contrary to the NPPF/brownfield sites should be developed before greenfield sites/farmland will be lost (comment by 8 respondents); • A31 junction will destroy the buffer between the bypass and town/a new junction should incorporate adequate landscape/buffers (comment made by 6 respondents); • more open space should be included; open space 	

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
51375, 51376, 51396, 51397, 51398, 51401, 51404, 51405, 51406, 51409, 51410, 51413, 51415, 51417, 51418, 51422, 51427, 51428, 51439, 51457, 51492, 51506, 51513, 51514, 51520, 51522, 51527, 51547, 51557, 51580, 51583, 51609, 51614, 51624, 51625, 51627, 51633, 51655, 51657, 51665, 51667, 51681, 51691, 51692, 51701, 51706, 51711, 51735, 51751, 51755, 51758, 51759, 51760, 51763, 51764, 51770, 51775, 51791, 51795, 51797, 51799, 51803, 51843, 51847, 51848, 51849, 51851, 51853, 51854, 51856, 51859, 51492,			<p>requirements have been driven by erroneous projections (comment by 5 respondents);</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a care home should be part of the development (comment by 5 respondents); • Sun Lane should be made a cul-de-sac (comment by 4 respondents); • object to proposed traveller site; travellers site should be located on a disused farm (comment by 4 respondents); • inadequate pedestrian/cycle access/no scope to improve these (comment by 4 respondents); • the proposed landscape buffer will be ineffective; proposals must incorporate sufficient screening to protect against noise (comment by 4 respondents); • the density of housing is too high (comment by 3 respondents); • there will be no affordable housing; where is the really affordable housing (comment by 2 respondents); • more land should be provided for the Sun Lane Schools; education facilities should be relocated onto the site (comment made by 2 respondents); • there are concerns that the development is undeliverable (comment by 2 respondents); • other green and brownfield sites should be considered (White and Etherington, The Avenue, Vernal Farm) (comment by 2 respondents); • the impact of the proposed development on Bishop's Sutton has not been considered (comment by 2 respondents); • the site is outside the settlement boundary (comment made by 1 respondent); • general disruption for people in the east of Alresford 	

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
			<p>(comment made by 1 respondent);</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the proposals for Alresford are ill-conceived and unworkable (comment made by 1 respondent); • the proposed site has the most difficult access (comment made by 1 respondent); • a new town should be developed at Micheldever or elsewhere instead of development in Alresford (comment made by 1 respondent); • the policy does not allow the phasing of development to be controlled (comment made by 1 respondent); • the closure of Whitehill Lane is not appropriate (comment made by 1 respondent); • there should be no access to Sun Lane (comment made by 1 respondent); • housing on Sun Lane should have a 4-way access onto the A31 (comment made by 1 respondent); • no consideration of archaeological features (comment made by 1 respondent); • no provision for schools to expand (comment made by 1 respondent); • underground car-parks should be provided (comment made by 1 respondent); • the proposal to make Sun Lane one way should be removed (comment made by 1 respondent); • negative impact on tourism; (comment made by 1 respondent); • all the “social levy” should be used to enhance local facilities (comment made by 1 respondent); • no development on the north of the site, including a care home (comment made by 1 respondent); • development should be located south of Alresford (comment made by 1 respondent); 	

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • impact on wildlife (comment made by 1 respondent); • the policy should clarify the area of land dedicated to employment, roundabout, slip roads and serviced property (comment made by 1 respondent); • the policy must state that landscape buffers are essential to screen the employment site from the existing residents on Sun Lane (comment made by 1 respondent); • lack of footpaths into Alresford (comment made by 1 respondent); • no need for additional open space/open space unsuitable as area is sensitive in landscape terms (comment made by 1 respondent). 	
(10 comments) 50557, 50575, 50646, 50725, 50734, 50744, 51661, 51816, 51817, 51818,	NA3	Object	Nursery Road will not be improved as a result of the development and it will cause traffic problems. The A31 junction will increase traffic on Nursery Road. The commercial area will have a positive effect on Nursery Road. Development will make flooding problems in Nursery Road worse / there should be a link to the Bishops Sutton Road if development goes ahead.	See above. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting
50600, 50670, 51334, 51684,			Object to the proposal for 320 houses, industrial estate and new A31 access at Sun Lane. There has been inadequate consultation and population projections have been over estimated. There is no need for industry as there are existing vacant premises and businesses do not want to move, and the site is not suited to modern business so would be at risk from a supermarket. The site is on high ground and development would be intrusive. There will be increased pressure on parking, transport, schools and other infrastructure, with no mention of public transport. The plan is unduly influenced by the Alresford Society. Support the APG alternative plan which spreads development around the town to avoid excessive traffic flows.	See above. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
50003 (Bishop's Sutton Parish Council)	NA3	Object	Object to the proposed block of housing and industrial site on Sun Lane, there has been no consideration of the impact on Bishops Sutton. Whitehill Lane is in the Parish and the site borders it. The proposed development is too big for the East end of Alresford. Support smaller developments around Alresford to minimise impact. If the site is developed priority should be given to building the A31 junction to prevent existing roads being affected.	See above. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
50084 (English Heritage)	NA3	Object	The site lies within an area of archaeological potential relating to bronze age barrow sites or settlement. New development criteria should be added under the heading of 'heritage' or 'archaeology' to read "preparation of a comprehensive archaeological assessment to define the extent and significance of any archaeological remains and provide for their preservation or recording, as appropriate".	See above. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
50085 (Natural England)	NA3	Object	A public Right of Way runs along the northern edge of the site. Development at this location is liable to degrade the quality of this public right of way due to its urbanising influences. The development specification should require no net degradation to the public right of way network either through onsite landscaping and access measures, or if this is not possible, through offsite measures nearby so as to be consistent with LPP1 policy CP15, and NPPF 75.	See above. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
50090(Southern Water)	NA3	Object	Southern Water have undertaken an assessment of our infrastructure and its ability to meet the forecast demand for the proposed development. That assessment reveals that additional local sewerage infrastructure would be required to accommodate the proposed development, involving making a connection to the local sewerage network at the nearest point of adequate capacity. SW is not fully funded to provide local sewerage infrastructure, as Ofwat, the water industry's economic regulator, expects the company to recover new development and	A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations or suggest sites for development, either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
			growth costs from developers. Proposed amendment to infrastructure part of policy : provide a connection to the nearest point of adequate capacity in the sewerage network, in collaboration with the service provider.	
50172	NA3	Object	The proposal for a burial ground is in a ground water protection zone and a phosphate protection zone. Any development will need to ensure that these are not impacted upon. This policy should also refer to the protection of ground water as per CP17.	See above. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
50225	NA3	Object	This site will be visible from the national park and have a direct impact on the special quality of the park, therefore question its scale, location and general arrangement. If this allocation is taken forward then generous landscaping should be included within and around any development in order to minimise visual impact on the park. Links should be provided to the park for those on foot, horse or bicycle.	See above. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
50590	4.5.22	Object	The jobs requirement is greatly inflated which undermines the need for development and the A31 junction.	See above. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
51071	4.5.22	Object	Part of the housing area is 'most sensitive' in landscape terms and it is not possible to accommodate 320 houses without intruding onto the ridgeline. Spreading housing across multiple sites would avoid 'most sensitive' areas, as proposed by the APG alternative plan.	See above. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
51492	4.5.22	Object	The statement that the site performed well against the assessment criteria is not the whole story - the disadvantages were not set out. The statement that the southern part of the site is the only part of Alresford where it is considered substantial business development could take place is incorrect. The whole premise that additional employment is required is wrong because; other sites are already available nearby, the need for employment provision has been overestimated, businesses will prefer to move to a site nearer to the M3/M4 corridor, there is plenty of vacant business accommodation between Winchester and Basingstoke which cannot be let, sufficient commercial space already exists in Alresford to meet the genuine 2030 requirements.	See above. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
	OMISSION		New Alresford Site/Policy Omissions	
51580	OMISSION	Object	Land at Arlebury Park should be allocated for housing and open space. It is free from constraints, can provide for an extension of the adjoining public car park and is deliverable. It could accommodate about 64 dwellings of which 20 would be for the over-55 market, with 40% of the remainder being affordable.	A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations or suggest sites for development, either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
50631	Consultation	Object	There has not been genuine consultation with Alresford residents. The Town Council has not engaged openly or objectively. The City Council's January 2014 consultation showed people opposed the Plan and the views of residents have been ignored. People without internet access have not had access to the Plan or comment form.	There has been extensive involvement of the local community, both through work with the Town Council, Needs Groups and through consultation exercises at key stages. There have been 4 public meetings about the emerging Local Plan, including a major consultation on the proposed development strategy in early 2014. This involved an exhibition which was very well attended and the consultation resulted in a large number of written responses. A

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
				<p>report was published on the outcome of the consultation. It is true that the majority of those responding did not support the proposed strategy, however alternatives had been considered, and were consulted on again. It was concluded that there was no better alternative, despite the opposition to the proposed strategy.</p> <p>This work formed part of the 'front-loading' process prior to the more formal consultation on a draft Plan. It is not accepted that the process was not transparent or sound. There has since been consultation on the draft Local Plan and there will be future formal consultation on subsequent versions of the Plan. The large number of comments received suggests there was wide knowledge of the Local Plan consultation, and the comments express a variety of views in support of, as well as opposition to, the Plan.</p> <p>Recommended Response: Learning points from the consultation process will be used in efforts to make consultation more accessible and understandable in future.</p>
50637, 51623	Consultation	Comment	Why didn't everyone in Alresford receive the Plan and why is it so complex, elderly people without computers will not be able to respond; why haven't local residents received the Local Plan and why is it so complicated ?	<p>The Local Plan is a 200+ pages document which it is not practical or necessary to distribute to all residents (of Alresford or the whole District). Planning for future development is a complex matter, which the consultation exercise and Local Plan sought to explain as simply as possible.</p> <p>Recommended Response: Learning points from the consultation process will be used in efforts to make consultation more accessible and understandable in future.</p>
50743	Consultation	Comment	Disappointed by the Alresford Local Plan exhibition. There was a lack of detail and answers from both the	See above.

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
			Council and developer representatives at the exhibition. This contrasts with the alternative plan exhibition where detailed maps were shown and answers given.	Recommended Response: Learning points from the consultation process will be used in efforts to make consultation more accessible and understandable in future.
51071	Consultation	Object	It is misleading to say there has been further assessment of alternative sites as they were not fully assessed. The APG alternative plan has support for these sites.	A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations or suggest sites for development, either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
51208	Consultation	Comment	The consultation in BW was much more comprehensive than that in Alresford.	See above. Recommended Response: Learning points from the consultation process will be used in efforts to make consultation more accessible and understandable in future.
51492	Consultation	Object	The provision in the policy for 15 Ha of open space on the site is made with no clear definition of what the current and future needs of the town are in terms of open space. Consultees did not have the necessary information in order to make informed views on this matter. There were errors in the data provided by the Council and there is now a very clear requirement for corrections to be provided and for local residents to be given an opportunity to examine both current and future open space needs. We object to the notion that New Alresford Town Council engaged in any meaningful consultation with the residents of Alresford prior to and following its adoption of the current plan. There has been little consideration of and no consultation regarding the other SHLAA Sites from the start of 2013	A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations or suggest sites for development, either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
			which were dismissed by officials. It would have been preferable to have the additional development accommodated on a range of SHLAA sites rather than on one site with one developer.	
50701	Consultation	Comment	The information on population projections provided by Winchester City Council was wrong. This error is of such significance that the population projections of the town up to 2031 are now lower than originally calculated.	See response to comments on paragraph 4.5.9 above. Recommended Response: No change required.
50227, 51523	DM1 NA	Support	Support the inclusion of land to the rear of 58 The Dean within the revised settlement boundary. This is a brownfield site, is part of the urban fabric, has vehicular access from Arle Gardens, can be developed in the near future, and is in walking distance of the town centre. A significant element of housing will have to be provided on greenfield sites which will alter the character of New Alresford, so any provision on appropriate brownfield sites should be actively encouraged.	Support welcomed.
50653	DM1 NA	Object	Object to the Alresford settlement boundary is inconsistent as it does not include all of the Perins campus, whereas it does include all of Sun Hill School. It should include all of Perins and all of the NA3 allocation. The boundary is properly drawn to the west of Alresford and should not be breached. The settlement boundary should be drawn along The Avenue but not include sites to the north which would harm The Avenue and conservation area. Development south of the A31 is not acceptable so inclusion of land to the east of the town is necessary, including land between the railway and B3047.	A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations/settlement boundary or suggest sites for development, either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs to be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
50705	DM1 NA	Object	Land at Arlebury Park should be allocated for housing as there is uncertainty about the deliverability of the allocated sites. The site is deliverable and contains 1.2 hectares of previously developed land in single ownership. Some development should be on smaller sites and the land is well screened and related to the	See above. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs to be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
			settlement boundary, no longer of rural character, in a sustainable location, part of an existing housing development and has minimal constraints.	be reported back to a future meeting.
51033	DM1 NA	Object	It will be difficult for the school to respond to needs for teaching and learning under the current proposal. The whole of Perins campus should be shown as an educational site and there should be specific policies enabling future educational development .	See above. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
51035, 51470	DM1 NA	Object	Object to the inclusion of land at 58 The Dean within the extended settlement boundary. Its inclusion is inappropriate, inconsistent with the Settlement Boundary Review and it has been dismissed on appeal. Agree with the strategy of developing large sites, this site would have very limited capacity. There was no consultation prior to the boundary change, want assurances that due process has been followed; object to the inclusion of land at Arle Gardens within the settlement boundary. The land lies close to an SSSI and there should be consultation on the change.	See above. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
51071	4.5.22	Object	Part of the housing area is 'most sensitive' in landscape terms and it is not possible to accommodate 320 houses without intruding onto the ridgeline. Spreading housing across multiple sites would avoid 'most sensitive' areas, as proposed by the APG alternative plan.	See above. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
51492	4.5.22	Object	The statement that the site performed well against the assessment criteria is not the whole story - the disadvantages were not set out. The statement that the southern part of the site is the only part of Alresford where it is considered substantial business development could take place is incorrect. The whole premise that	See above. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
			additional employment is required is wrong because; other sites are already available nearby, the need for employment provision has been overestimated, businesses will prefer to move to a site nearer to the M3/M4 corridor, there is plenty of vacant business accommodation between Winchester and Basingstoke which cannot be let, sufficient commercial space already exists in Alresford to meet the genuine 2030 requirements.	be reported back to a future meeting.
50631	4.5.23	Object	Object to the suggestion in paragraph 4.5.23 that there is public opposition to alternative sites.	See above. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
50967	4.5.23	Support	The traveller site is of great public concern. Regrettably, anecdotal evidence from residents and businesses means that comments about the viability of placing traveller sites close to an industrial and residential area are well founded.	Support welcomed. The Plan does not propose a traveller site at Alresford.
51312, 51657, 51856,	4.5.23	Object	Not aware of the additional work referred to in this paragraph. The APG alternative plan shows that needs can be met by an alternative combination of sites; have not seen any alternatives to justify the statement that alternative sites would not provide for local needs; Not aware that further work has been done on transport issues. The APG alternative plan shows that other sites can be used and produces a better solution.	A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations or suggest sites for development, either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
51492, 50590	4.5.23	Object	It is not true that local concerns focussed on the traveller site during the consultation - there has been widespread local opposition to site NA3 throughout the consultation.;	See above. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2,

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
			this paragraph is a misrepresentation, the opposition was to the unsuitability of site 277 (Sun Lane) not the traveller site.	further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
51856	4.5.23	Object	Not aware that further work has been done on transport issues. The APG alternative plan shows that other sites can be used and produces a better solution.	See above. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
50590	4.5.24	Object	The A31 junction is being promoted before the Highway Authority has confirmed acceptance.	See above. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
50025	4.5.25	Comment	Additional text should be included at the end of the 3rd sentence: "and also provide additional playing fields for the expanded school population."	See above. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
51071	4.5.26	Object	More housing variety could be achieved by spreading housing around several sites as proposed by the APG alternative plan.	A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations or suggest sites for development, either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
				be reported back to a future meeting.
50025	4.5.27	Comment	In the last sentence of paragraph 4.5.27, replace 'should' to read: "It WILL be provided as the first stage..."	See above. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
50593	4.5.27	Comment	Suggest a new statement that the A31 junction will need to minimise impacts on residents and the landscape. There are listed buildings nearby and trees separate the bypass from housing. The slip road could affect the setting of listed buildings and cause vibration.	See above. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
50590	4.5.28	Object	Very few businesses are interested in relocating.	A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations or suggest sites for development, either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
51071	4.5.28	Object	The employment area will be too close to existing housing when account is taken of the land needed for the new junction and landscape edge.	See above. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
51657, 50590,	4.5.28	Object	Have not seen an expert analysis of the viability of the business area, there does not seem to be demand and	See above.

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
			there are vacant units available; there is a disregard for increased traffic in the already congested Sun Lane, Nursery Road and Tichborne Down.	Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
50025	4.5.29	Comment	NATC needs clarification on the implications of the proposed enlarged town centre boundary referred to in paragraph 4.5.29.	Noted. Recommended Response: No change required.
51657	4.5.30	Comment	Agree with the open space proposed but it will not be enhanced by its proximity to a large housing and industrial area.	See above. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
50590	4.5.30	Object	There is a huge discrepancy between the Needs Group report and the WCC Open Space Strategy. These and errors in projections mean that provision can be made on existing open spaces.	A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations or suggest sites for development, either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
50653	DM5 NA	Object	Object as the playing fields associated with Perins and Sun Hill schools should be shown within the schools' campus and have specific policies for education related development. They are shown as important for amenity, biodiversity, etc but should be shown as educational with a policy enabling educational development.	See above. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
50705	DM5 NA	Object	The frontage of Arlebury Park has been identified under	See above.

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
			policy DM5 but retention of a narrow frontage onto a road is not considered to fall within the intention of the policy and should be excluded from the designation.	Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
51033	DM5 NA	Object	Object to the application of DM5 to the Perins playing fields. The playing field is incorrectly shown as of important amenity; biodiversity, heritage or recreational value and the Perins Board of Governors manage the playing fields to meet the needs of the school rather than an amenity to the community.	See above. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
50084 (English Heritage)	DM16 NA	Support	Support this policy which will retain The Avenue / Arle Valley area unspoilt. The APG alternative plan would fail to respect the qualities of the area whereas the Local Plan retains a large area of green space at Sun Lane.	Support welcomed.
50573	DM16 NA	Support	Support the Plan as The Avenue / Arle Valley will be unchanged. The APG alternative plan would encourage piecemeal development that does not respect the character of the area, whereas the Plan would retain the ridgeline at Sun Lane to soften the intrusion of development.	Support welcomed.
50573, 50684	DM23 NA	Support	This policy will preserve The Avenue / Arle Valley area whereas the APG alternative plan will spoil this area and New Farm Road; support the Plan as it would maintain the character of The Avenue/Arle Valley. The APG alternative plan proposes high density development in this area and west of New Farm Road which would spoil the rural aspect of the town.	Support welcomed.
50573, 50684	DM25 NA	Support	Leaving The Avenue, Arlebury House and River Arle undeveloped complies with this policy and the APG alternative plan would be harmful to the character of the Park; leaving The Avenue / Arlebury Park / Arle Valley	Support welcomed.

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
			area undeveloped complies with this policy, whereas the APG alternative plan would be out of character and spoil the Park.	

Appendix 3

Denmead - Responses to Draft Local Plan Part 2 Consultation

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment/ Recommended Response
	4.9		Denmead Section	
50144	4.9.5	Support	Support the inclusion of land east of Kidmore Lane for development and the proposed changes to the settlement boundary	This comment supports the allocation included in the Denmead Neighbourhood Plan, which will provide the quantum of housing required by LPP1 Policy MTRA2. The Neighbourhood Plan is being progressed independently of the Local Plan Part 2.
50227	4.9	Object	Object that the Denmead Neighbourhood Plan has not reviewed the Denmead - Waterlooville Gap as required by LPP1, in accordance with the principles contained in the PUSH Policy Framework for Gaps. This document clearly establishes that the designation of a Gap does not preclude development.	<p>The Denmead Neighbourhood Plan defines the Denmead Gap in policy 1 and includes an appendix which not only refers to the PUSH Framework for Gaps but then describes the process undertaken which confirms the continued use of the existing gap boundaries. There is also reference to existing buildings which it is acknowledge will be allowed to make small alterations providing that they do not compromise the integrity and nature of the Gap. The Neighbourhood Plan has been subject to independent examination and was supported at a local referendum. It is expected to be 'made' shortly.</p> <p>The principle of a Gap between Denmead and Waterlooville is established in Local Plan Part 1 (policy CP18). The approach adopted by the Neighbourhood Plan to the Gap is consistent with that applied in the draft Local Plan Part 2 across the District, defining all the land between the respective built-up areas. The Gap is defined in the Neighbourhood Plan and there is no reason for the Local Plan to review the Gap.</p> <p>Recommended Response: Given the above references in the Denmead Neighbourhood Plan, there is no requirement for LPP2 to undertake any further review of the Denmead- Waterlooville gap as</p>

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment/ Recommended Response
				suggested by this representation.
51318	4.9.5	Object	Object to allocation of sites for development. Development should be spread around the village so that the infrastructure can cope. Land off Anmore Road already suffers from flooding and the development will make traffic congestion worse. The proposals will completely destroy the rural feel to the village. Object to the way the neighbourhood plan has been prepared and request that this is scrutinised.	The allocation of sites for development has been undertaken through the preparation and publication of the Denmead Neighbourhood Plan. A neighbourhood plan is tested to determine whether it complies with a number of 'basic conditions', one of which is that it must be in accordance with the strategic plan for the area, which in this case is LPP1. The Neighbourhood Plan has followed the necessary regulations and statutory advice and has been subject to independent examination. It also received a positive outcome at the referendum held on 5 March 2015. There is therefore no requirement for LPP2 to allocate sites for development in Denmead. Recommended Response: No change required.
	Map 4		Denmead Inset Map	
50013 (Denmead PC), 50984	Map 04	Object	The Policies Map for Denmead should be amended to include all the Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCS), open space areas (Policy DM5) and the burial ground.	It will be necessary to review inset Map 4 to ensure that it is consistent with the other inset maps in Local Plan Part 2, and to show all the necessary data accurately. This response raises matters that require further investigation. Recommended Response: To ensure that the policy map is appropriate, further work needs be undertaken on the points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
	OMISSION		Denmead Omission Sites	
51452	OMISSION	Object	Land off Inhams Lane/Hawthorn Road, Denmead should be allocated in the LPP2. This would represent a sustainable location to provide additional housing land to help meet the identified need. The site is considered to be deliverable, available and achievable and offers a	The Denmead Neighbourhood Plan has, in accordance with Policy MTRA2 of LPP1, identified sites to deliver the required amount of housing development. The neighbourhood plan allocates 4 sites for housing purposes and has followed the

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment/ Recommended Response
			<p>suitable location for development. Both the Council and Parish Council should give full regard to the need to promote additional sites through both the LPP2 and the DNP in order to deliver the scale of housing to meet the District's identified need.</p>	<p>necessary regulations and statutory advice and has been subject to independent examination. It also received a positive outcome at the referendum held on 5 March 2015. There is therefore no requirement for LPP2 to allocate sites for development in Denmead. Recommended Response: No change required.</p>

Appendix 4 : Smaller Villages and Rural Area - Responses to Draft Local Plan Part 2 Consultation

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
	4.10.1 – 4.10.10			
50033 (South Wonston PC), 50024 (Micheldever PC)	4.10.1 & 4.10.4	Support	Support for; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The absence of housing targets and boundary changes combined with the potential for appropriate and needed development within the settlement boundary. The requirement for evidence of community involvement in creating projects beneficial to the community. The approach which facilitates development that meets community need and has clear community support. The provision of much needed affordable housing and retirement homes, possibly on exception sites, would be possible under this policy. 	Support welcomed.
50033 (South Wonston PC)	4.10.10	Support	Commends the City Council's support for long distance rights of way using former railway lines.	Support welcomed.
51445	4.10.1 & 4.10.4	Object	The Settlement Boundary Review should include the smaller rural settlements (those set out in MTRA3) which are suitable for accommodating modest additional development. Such development would help to sustain the services and facilities. Opportunities for “rounding off” existing development should be taken.	A comprehensive review of all settlement boundaries was not considered necessary for the purposes of the Local Plan. Boundaries have been reviewed in the MTRA2 settlements, as necessary to accommodate planned growth and correct acknowledged anomalies. Paragraphs 2.30 -2.35 of Local Plan Part2 set out the Council’s position on this matter. Recommended Response: No change required.
50269	4.10.1 & 4.10.4	Object	Hursley is identified as a “smaller village” in the plan but is unusual in that it has a significant employment offering with a good range of services and facilities including options to travel by public transport. Whilst local communities have an opportunity to identify needs or aspirations which may require development outside of	The approach to development set out in LPP1 Policy MTRA3 and paragraphs 4.10.1 - 4.10.10 of LPP2 indicate that appropriate development should be accommodated within settlement boundaries. The particular characteristics of Hursley do not justify the inclusion of a change to the policy status

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
			the normal provisions of MTRA3, it is clear that this flexibility is limited to “modest levels of housing and other development”. Hursley should be identified as being able to accommodate some residential development beyond its existing settlement boundary.	of the settlement or reference in the Plan to the possibility of development beyond its settlement boundary. Recommended Response: No change required
50075 (Eastleigh Borough Council), 51096	Botley Bypass 4.10.6 - 4.10.8 4.10.7	Object	Concerned that the LPP2 does not include any proposals or policy relating to the Botley bypass and has abandoned any safeguarding of the proposed route. The Hampshire Local Transport Plan 2011–2031 refers to the safeguarding of routes and retains a proposal for a bypass as part of the strategy for south Hampshire. This should be reflected in the policies and proposals of the relevant local plans. WCC’s intention to review the position in the light of any outcome from the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan is not adequate. A bypass for Botley village is an essential element of highway infrastructure for a number of significant reasons and these do not appear to have been taken into account. The Botley bypass should be included in the plan and signage introduced to ensure vehicles use this to access Hedge End	A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations or suggest sites for development, either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
51585	4.10.8 & Deletion of saved Policy S7 and T12i	Object	The land at Hillsons Road has been allocated as an employment site for many years (see Policy S7 in the 2006 Local Plan). It has not been possible to develop the land until the detailed line of the Botley bypass has been agreed and the scheme is included in the highways programme. The site is exceptionally well-located, being next to Botley Railway Station and the A334 and opposite the A3051 which leads to Fareham and the M27. The land should be retained as an employment allocation in Local Plan 2. Proposed change: Policy S7 should continue to be saved and a positive reference about the need for the site to support the local economy should be included in Local Plan 2.	A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations or suggest sites for development, either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
			<p>By not carrying forward Policy T12(i) the Council is jeopardising the Botley bypass project. This shows a complete failure to co-operate with Eastleigh Borough Council on the provision of an important piece of infrastructure that will help develop the local economy of the area and considerably improve the environment of people living and working in Botley. Proposed change: Policy T12(i) should continue to be saved and a positive reference be made in Local Plan 2 about the importance of this route both for the economy of the wider area and for the improved living conditions it will bring to people in Botley and the surrounding area.</p>	
51462	4.10.8	Object	<p>Object to the omission of Hillsons Road Industrial Estate, Curdrige (saved policy S7) which will not be carried forward in LPP2 as it is dependent on the Botley bypass, which has also not been carried forward. The respondent also objects to the omission of the bypass from LPP2. The local area will see a significant increase in population over the Plan period and there are no strategic employment allocations in this part of the District. The employment site at Hillsons Road Industrial Estate would provide local employment opportunities. It should also be noted that the site lies in a highly accessible location in close proximity to Botley Train Station.</p> <p>The Winchester section of the Botley bypass was safeguarded in the Winchester District Local Plan Review 2006 and Policy T12 subsequently 'saved' pending adoption of the new Local Plan. The inspector who examined Local Plan Part 1 supported this approach. The draft LPP2) has not carried forward Policy T.12, although the Submission draft Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011–2029 continues to safeguard the bypass route within Eastleigh Borough. In accordance</p>	<p>A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations or suggest sites for development, either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition.</p> <p>Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs to be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.</p>

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
			with Winchester's duty to co-operate, the bypass should continue to be safeguarded in LPP2. The A334 through Botley village is a heavily used route carrying a high proportion of heavy goods vehicles. The road functions as a relief route for congestion on the M27. Many motorists also use the A334 and Winchester Road as an alternative to the M27 as a route northwards to Eastleigh, Winchester and the M3 motorway. Without a fully comprehensive Transport Assessment for the North Whiteley development and a full analysis of the cumulative impact of all strategic allocations in the area (including Welborne) it is impossible to make a fully informed decision on the need for the bypass.	
50105 (South Downs National Park Authority)	4.10.10	Comment	Watercress Way should be brought back into use. This forms the boundary between WCC and the national park. The two authorities would therefore need to work together to initiate this and this should be referred to in the plan.	Agree that the authorities should cooperate on this. Recommended Response: No change required.
50967	4.10.10	Comment	Renovation of the Worthys to Alresford railway line, from the A33 east towards Martyr Worthy to connect to the length already open at Itchen Abbas would be of significant community benefit. The SDNP authority intends to carry out a feasibility study of the whole route in 15/16.	Noted. Recommended Response: No change required.
	Maps			
51402, 51403	Map 03	Support	Strongly support the retention of existing settlement boundaries, specifically excluding site SHLAA site 285 from the boundary for Compton Down.	Support welcomed.
50029 (Otterbourne PC)	Map12 (DM5 notation)	Object	Protected open space areas designated DM5 are not correctly identified for Otterbourne. Four areas of public open space are missing and need adding, two areas of privately owned space have community value and could be identified; one area should be removed. [Corrections as detailed are annotated on Map 12 provided.]	A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs to be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
				sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
51438	Map12	Object	The Settlement Gap between Southdown and Otterbourne should be revised to exclude George Beckett Nurseries and The Old Police Cottage. This land does not meet any of the criteria set out in policy CP18 of the LPP1 and does not perform as a buffer to stop coalescence of the two settlements.	The principle of a Gap between Southdown and Otterbourne is established in Local Plan Part 1 (policy CP18). In defining the detailed boundaries of Gaps, the approach adopted consistently across the District is to define all the land between the respective built-up areas. This approach is continued in the draft LPP2, even if it may be possible to argue that not every parcel of land within the defined area contributes to the Gap. The land referred to in this objection is outside the built-up area of Southdown and no site allocations are necessary in this area. This Gap is also very narrow and the land referred to is considered to form an important part of the Gap. There is, therefore, no reason to review the Gap in this location or to depart from the consistent approach to defining Gaps, namely of making them contiguous with the built-up areas they separate. Recommended Response: No change required.
50033 (South Wonston PC)	Map13 (DM5 notation)	Object	The Parish Council notes the addition of a Protected Open Area (DM5) on a temporary allotment site near West Hill Rd North/Alresford Drove. This area is not included in the South Wonston listings of the Open Space Strategy (where inadequate provision for allotments is indicated), nor does it appear in the Village Design Statement included among the SPDs.	A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs to be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
51438	Map14	Object	The area of CP18 (settlement gap) between Southdown and Otterbourne should be revised to exclude George Beckett Nurseries and The Old Police Cottage as this land does not meet any of the criteria set out in policy CP18 of LPP1 and does not perform as a buffer to stop coalescence of the two settlements. The Nursery does	See response to Map 12 above. Recommended Response: No change required.

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
			not perform an important role in defining the settlement character and separating the settlements either visually or physically as it is already developed land. It does not have an open or rural character. Its inclusion within the settlement boundary (DM1) for Southdown will not cause coalescence.	
51448	Map 24	Object	The Review of the settlement boundaries should not merely focus on accommodating new development, but also consider historic development that for some reason has previously been overlooked. E.g. to the south of the village of Littleton is a significant close concentration of around 30 properties in and around Kennel Lane & Chestnut Avenue that are outside the current settlement boundary, but to any visitor approaching from Winchester represent the edge of the built form to the village. The Littleton settlement boundary should be amended to accommodate these properties. This will not diminish or significantly impact on Littleton Local Gap.	A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations/settlement boundaries or suggest sites for development either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting
51864	Map 24	Object	Littleton settlement policy boundary (DM1) should be amended to include the former nursery at Littleton. The site is PDL (Certificate of Lawfulness issued in 2008 for B8 use) and could accommodate mixed use scheme comprising a range of dwelling types and sizes (including affordable housing), employment, open space and landscaping. Littleton is a thriving community of about 1400 inhabitants with a good range of local services and facilities (church, village hall, public house, sports and recreation ground, pre-school group) and is linked to services and facilities in Winchester by a high frequency bus service. The redevelopment of PDL on the edge of a highly accessible village is clearly a form of sustainable development and consistent with the NPPF.	A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations/settlement boundaries or suggest sites for development either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting
	Omissions			
51445	OMISSION	Object	The Settlement Boundary Review should include the smaller rural settlements (those set out in MTRA3) which	A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations/settlement boundaries

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
			are suitable for accommodating modest additional development. Opportunities for “rounding off” existing development should be taken, for example in Knowle. The proposed site is bounded on three sides by the existing settlement boundary and can be accessed directly off the road at Dean Villas and is not of any landscape significance. This land should be included within the Knowle settlement boundary and would allow for a modest amount of additional development without unacceptably harm to the settlement pattern or character of the area.	or suggest sites for development, either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
51462	OMISSION	Object	Objection to the omission of land at Sherecroft Farm (adjoining the route of the Botley bypass) as a care village. Neither the Local Plan Part 1 nor 2 identify specific locations for care facilities. It is proposed that, along with the safeguarding of the Botley bypass route and the allocation for employment land to the north a new care village is developed to the south of the proposed Botley bypass, comprising a 60-bed care home, assisted living units, independent living units and some key working housing. The care village should be allocated in a separate policy in the Local Plan Part 2, so as to provide sufficient retirement and care home opportunities for the District in the plan period.	A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations/settlement boundaries or suggest sites for development, either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
51603	OMISSION	Object	Carousel Park should be considered for a permanent traveller's site as it is far enough away from anywhere to not impact negatively on any local communities.	A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations/settlement boundaries or suggest sites for development, either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
51436	OMISSION	Object	<p>Travelling Showpeople, have occupied land at The Nurseries, Shedfield for a period in excess of 20 years. Some plots have temporary planning consent - ref. respondent's family plot granted on appeal until May 2016 - pending needs of the family and the other local Travelling Showpeople to be met as part of the Local Plan Review process. Notwithstanding the accommodation needs of Travelling Showpeople identified in the 2013 GTAA no such allocation is proposed to meet this longstanding identified need therefore LPP2 as presently drafted fails to meet the test of 'soundness'.</p>	<p>A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations/settlement boundaries or suggest sites for development, either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition.</p> <p>Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.</p>

Appendix 5 : Development Management - Reponses to Draft Local Plan Part 2 Consultation

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
	6.2.1		Introductory paragraph	
51501	6.2.1	Object	Provision of 40% affordable dwellings should be a requirement not expectation and on Council land should be promoted.	Policy CP3 of Local Plan Part 1 seeks the provision of 40% affordable housing on all new housing developments (including those on council land), subject to viability. It would be unreasonable and contrary to government guidance for the policy not to have flexibility in relation to viability. Recommended Response: No change required.
	DM1		Location of New Development	
50018 (Hursley Parish Council)	DM1	Support	Hursley PC considers the policy and principles in 6.22, will protect rural areas from inappropriate development and must be observed when considering the area between Winchester and Pitt.	Support welcomed and comment noted.
50024 (Micheldever Parish Council)	DM1	Support	Existing settlement boundaries in Micheldever and Micheldever Station are providing a safeguard for the character of these communities. However there are some anomalies and paragraph 2.33 gives a measure of flexibility in the future following a process of consultation. Other villages in the parish are classified as countryside.	Support welcomed and comment noted.
50227	DM1	Support	Support the principle of directing development to brownfield sites within settlement boundaries, as set out in policy DM1. This helps to maintain and enhance local communities and provide housing in sustainable locations with minimal impact.	Support welcomed and comment noted.
51505, 51386	DM1	Comment	It is not clear what is meant by the reference to outside of “these areas’ in the final paragraph of DM. The policy is confusing. The text of DM1 is inconsistent with the supporting text at paragraph 6.2.2 in regard to allowing development outside settlement boundaries where there is a particular need for it.	These respondents raise issues relating to the detailed wording of DM1 and the supporting text.. The reference to need in paragraph 6.22, refers to the need for a particular development to meet a specific requirement, in a location where development is not normally permitted. Recommended Response: Draft Policy DM1 and

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
				the supporting text will be re-examined to see if clarification is required. The results of this consideration and any resulting changes will be reported back to a future meeting.
50146, 50147, 51321, 51386	DM1	Object	There is an under-supply of housing land (evidence provided) and there is a need for additional land to be released for development to comply with paragraph 47 NPPF (housing supply and under-delivery and housing trajectory). DM1 should be amended/new policy drafted to allow for development adjoining settlement boundaries where there is a particular need for it.	<p>The level of housing required over the plan period has been set as part of Local Plan Part 1 and the delivery of housing and other development is monitored and reported on at least annually. The latest published Annual Monitoring Report (2014) includes information on the delivery of housing together with revised housing trajectories for the period up to 2031 and an assessment of the Council's position on five-year land supply. At the present time a 5 year supply (with 'buffer') can be demonstrated and the purpose of bringing forward the allocations set out in the LPP2 is to ensure that this remains the case. No additional land is required at this time.</p> <p>Assessment of the annual monitoring information may trigger a review of the Plan in the future, if it is demonstrated that additional land is required.</p> <p>Recommended Response: No change required.</p>
51386, 51452, 51864	DM1	Object	<p>Settlement boundaries should not restrict otherwise suitably located and sustainable development. This policy is contrary to the presumption in favour of sustainable development set out in paragraph 14 of the NPPF.</p> <p>One respondent suggested amended policy wording as below:</p> <p>"In addition, the redevelopment of brownfield sites adjoining the above settlements will also be permitted where it accords with other relevant policies".</p>	<p>As sufficient land has been identified to accommodate development required over the Plan period, there is no need to identify additional land. Settlement boundaries are an established and widely-used means of defining where development may take place in principle, and protecting the integrity of the countryside from unnecessary development. This accords with the principles of sustainable development as outlined in the adopted strategy for development in the District in Policy DS1 of Local Plan Part 1 and there is no conflict with the NPPF.</p> <p>Recommended Response: No change required.</p>

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
50138, 51438	Settlement Boundary Review (DM1)	Object	The pressure for more housing requires all areas to be re-examined. The Settlement Boundary Review only relates to boundaries where there are housing proposals in LPP2. This is not justified. The boundaries of all settlements should be brought up to date. This would ensure that land that is sustainably located and suitable could contribute towards any shortfalls in land (such as brownfield land or as specified under the circumstances allowed for in DM5). This would provide greater flexibility over the plan period as set out in paragraph 5.25 of LPP1	See above. A comprehensive review of all settlement boundaries was not considered necessary for the purposes of the Local Plan. Boundaries have been reviewed in the MTRA2 settlements, as necessary to accommodate planned growth and correct acknowledged anomalies. Paragraphs 2.30 -2.35 of Local Plan Part2 set out the Council's position on this matter. Recommended Response: No change required.
51445	Settlement Boundary Review (DM1)	Object	The Settlement Boundary Review has taken an inconsistent approach in that not all settlements within the MTRA's have been subject to the review i.e.MTRA2s have but not MTRA3s have not. There's no reason why the approach should not be extended to include the other settlements which are suitable for accommodating modest additional development. Such development would help to sustain the services and facilities. Where opportunities for small scale "rounding off" (less than 0.3ha) are apparent in these settlements, these should be taken.	See response on Settlement Boundary Review above. Recommended Response: No change required.
51448	Settlement Boundary Review (DM1)	Object	The review of the settlement boundaries should not merely focus of accommodating new development, but also consider historic development that for some reason has previously been overlooked, in order to define a logical boundary between built up areas an countryside and encouraging consolidation within this.	See response on Settlement Boundary Review above. The purpose of settlement boundaries is to define the area where development is, in principle, permissible rather than necessarily to include all built development. Recommended Response: No change required.
51448	Settlement Gap Review	Object	Policy CP18 indicates that a review of the boundaries of Local Gaps will be undertaken. However, no such review appears to have been carried out. The current Littleton Gap is illogical and takes no account of the significant development that has already occurred. Gaps are under pressure for restricting economic growth and therefore need to be only used where the boundaries are clear, logical and perform a critical purpose over and above	See response on Settlement Boundary Review above. The principle of a Gap between Winchester and Littleton is established in Local Plan Part 1 (policy CP18). In defining the detailed boundaries of Gaps, the approach adopted consistently across the District is to define all the land between the respective built-up areas. This approach is continued in the draft LPP2, even if it may be

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
			countryside policies.	possible to argue that not every parcel of land within the defined area contributes to the Gap. No site allocations are necessary in Littleton (nor on greenfield sites in Winchester) and there is, therefore no reason to review the Gap in this location or to depart from the consistent approach to defining Gaps, namely of making them contiguous with the built-up areas they separate. Recommended Response: No change required.
	DM2		Dwelling Sizes	
50919	DM2	Support	With reference to a recent re-development site at Misingford Lane, Swanmore permitted for very expensive houses - smaller places would be beneficial to first time buyers and would allow older people wishing to downsize but remain in the locality. One or two people living in 4-bed houses are blocking the market for families wishing to move to larger houses.	Support welcomed and comment noted.
50653	DM2	Comment	The policy should reflect the need for 'living space' which is more important than providing small units.	A number of respondents raise detailed issues regarding the justification for Draft Policy DM2 and regarding the detailed requirements of that policy. These issues require further consideration and the results will be reported back to a future meeting. Recommended Response: Draft Policy DM2 and the supporting text will be re-examined in the light of the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
50013 (Denmead Parish Council)	DM2	Object	Object to the maximum sizes for new dwellings proposed in this policy. Dwellings should be built within the context of the area in which they are situated: some may need to be large two/three bedroomed. The policy will conflict with the requirement to build homes for life where such items as space for storage of equipment (i.e. 'scooters') and wheelchair turning circles will conflict with a minimum standard. The restrictions will remove the potential for any new bungalows to be built.	
50269	DM2	Object	Whilst it is reasonable seeking to ensure housing provision meets need in terms of the housing mix, it is overly restrictive to restrict unit sizes in a blanket manner. Other policies encourage development to address local distinctiveness and this is not always consistent with the proscriptive nature of DM2	

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
			It is not clear if such restricted unit sizes also indicate the Council's approach to testing the capacity of sites within the City which have led to the conclusion that there is no need to amend the development boundary.	
51386	DM2	Object	The requirement of Policy DM2 for size limits to two and three bedroom dwellings is overly prescriptive and inflexible. These provisions are unsound as they are not justified and are inconsistent with LPP1.	
51452	DM2	Object	Policy is not necessary or justified and should be removed from the LPP2.	
51579, 51580	DM2	Object	<p>The Policy and its associated paragraphs conflict with the background paper that underpins Policy CP2 and the evidence presented to the LPP1 Inspector.</p> <p>Simply because a property is smaller, it is wrong to assume that it is more affordable as this ignores many aspects of the housing market. Evidence is provided that shows this assumption not to be correct.</p> <p>It is a flawed assumption that a property with more bedrooms will result in a higher value. Evidence is presented to support this.</p> <p>Once the DCLG Housing Standards Review minimum space standards are taken into account, when combined with Policy DM2, it would result in a very narrow window within which each and every 2 and 3 bedroom property would need to be constructed, which conflicts with the flexibility sought within Policy CP2.</p> <p>The Policy is not supported by evidence, and thus cannot be considered to be justified as per the NPPF, and thus should be removed.</p>	
51505	DM2	Object	There is no rationale for the floorspaces quoted of 100 and 150m. There is also no rational link between these floor areas and those in DM3, nor is this explained. DM2 will allow new 3 bedroom dwellings up to 150m ² , but DM3 is likely to resist smaller dwellings being extended up to this size (a dwelling already 120m ² would be	

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
			allowed to extend to a maximum of 144m2).	
	DM3		Small Dwellings in the Countryside	
50028 (OBPC) 51435	DM3	Support	Support the policy so that the extension and replacement of existing smaller dwellings in the countryside will be limited to as to retain the stock of such dwellings in the countryside	Support welcomed
51505	DM3	Object	As the policy is written, some houses, if replaced, would need to be built smaller than the existing. There is no justification for this.	This comment raises detailed issues regarding the draft policy, explanatory text or requirements. These issues require further consideration and the results will be reported back to a future meeting. Recommended Response: Draft Policy DM3 and the supporting text will be re-examined in the light of the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
51501	6.2.3	Object	Higher densities should be sought as they increase viability of public transport, encourage people to walk through reducing car parking requirement.	Local Plan Policy CP14 sets out a character-led approach to densities, where the design of a scheme is considered in relation to the general character of the area. CP14 encourages higher densities on sites that have good access to facilities and public transport. Recommended Response: No change required.
	DM4		Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpersons	
50919	DM4	Comment	With reference to existing travellers' site located at The Lakes, Swanmore, which may not have planning consent, question whether the policy will be effective in ensuring that planning laws will be properly enforced and amenities (sewage and electricity) provided.	This comment relates to the details of planning permissions and their enforcement and is not relevant to Draft Local Plan Part 2 Policy DM4. Recommended Response: No change required.
51436	DM4	Object	Whilst the policy acknowledges the identified need for 11 travelling Showpeople's pitches over the Plan period, the Council seems content to continue to rely on criteria-based Policy CP5 of LPP1 as an alternative to an allocation. In failing to meet the identified needs of the	Policy CP5 of Local Plan Part 1, along with Government policy, requires adequate provision to be made for traveller sites. Draft policy DM4 sets out a target for traveller and travelling showpersons' sites and commits the Council to identifying and

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
			City Council's Showmen residents, this fails to meet the test of 'soundness'.	
50967	DM4	Object	The provision of traveller sites has been placed into the plan without reference to Parish Councils.	granting permission for adequate sites, based on the recommendations of the Travellers Accommodation Assessment for Hampshire (2013). The intention is to include site allocations within the Local Plan Part 2, or a separate Development Plan Document, and a site assessment study has been commissioned by the City Council, East Hampshire District Council and the South Downs National Park Authority. When this is completed, the outcome of which will be reported to a future meeting.
51436	6.2.17	Object	This paragraph refers to the Council commissioning consultants to assess other potential sites for traveller accommodation, the results being subject to consultation and that sites will be allocated as necessary in this Plan However the LPP2 as presently drafted contains no such potential sites to be consulted upon.	Separately, due to a change of ownership, the site at Ashbrook Stables, Colden Common is no longer available for travellers' pitches. Therefore the allocation would not be deliverable, and would therefore not meet the requirements for 'soundness', and should be removed from the Plan. The specific allocation at CC2 has already been agreed for removal from the plan at the previous Cabinet (Local Plan) meeting of 12 th March 2015 (CAB 2670(LP) refers) and it is proposed that the reference to this site is now also deleted from DM4. Recommended Response: A number of representations make comments on the proposed policy or site allocations or refer to sites. Further work would need to be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, with the results of this reported back to a future meeting. In view of the change to the availability of the site, it is recommended that policy DM4 be amended as follows: “, including a specific allocation for approximately 8 pitches at land adjoining Ashbrook Stables, Colden Common (Policy CC2).” Recommended that paragraph 6.2.17 be amended

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
				as follows: “Work on site assessment within the larger settlements has identified a site at Colden Common which is suitable for allocation as a traveller site. The City Council has, also jointly with East Hampshire District Council and the South Downs National Park Authority, commissioned consultants to assess other potential sites for traveller accommodation...”
	DM5 – DM6		Open Space policies	
50009 (Compton & Shawford PC)	DM5-DM6	Support	PC supports policies to protect open green spaces.	Support welcomed
	DM5		Protecting Open Areas	
50194	DM5	Support	Support the designation of land in the National Trust's ownership under policy DM5.	Support welcomed
50084 (English Heritage)	DM5	Support	Support policy and 6.2.24 but query reference to 'heritage value' needing to be 'recognised'.	A number of comments have been made on the open space policies DM5 and DM6. These raise various issues relating to the methodology of the open space strategy, the definition of open space, detailed policy wording and the designation of particular spaces under DM5. Recommended Response: The various issues relating to policies DM5 and DM6, and open space matters, merit further detailed consideration and responses on these matters will be reported back to a future meeting.
50269	DM5	Support Comment	Recreational uses such as golf courses should be identified on the Policies Map and protected under the provisions of policy DM5.	See response to DM5 above. Recommended Response: The various issues relating to policies DM5 and DM6, and open space matters, merit further detailed consideration and

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
				responses on these matters will be reported back to a future meeting.
50041 (Whiteley Town Council)	DM5	Comment	There are significant landscaped areas with balancing ponds within the Whiteley business park that could be added to the green infrastructure DM5 areas	See response to DM5 above. Recommended Response: The various issues relating to policies DM5 and DM6, and open space matters, merit further detailed consideration and responses on these matters will be reported back to a future meeting.
50175 (Sport England)	DM5	Comment	Sport England do not consider the Open Space Strategy to be a robust piece of work and advise WCC to undertake a specific assessment of sports needs. A playing pitch strategy and open space study can make reference to standards, but should only be used as benchmarking. Standards should not be used to formulate policy. An action plan for a playing pitch strategy should link future provision to strategic housing allocations. KKP undertook a built facilities assessment in December 2013. The assessment is not a strategy and does not make recommendations or provide an action plan, therefore it is unclear how sports needs will be provided for. Further detailed analysis of sports assessment provided in representation.	See response to DM5 above. Recommended Response: The various issues relating to policies DM5 and DM6, and open space matters, merit further detailed consideration and responses on these matters will be reported back to a future meeting.
50175 (Sport England)	DM5	Comment	The policy should be amended to reflect para 74 of the NPPF. The NPPF protects all open space not only open areas with an important amenity, biodiversity, heritage or recreational value.	See response to DM5 above. Recommended Response: The various issues relating to policies DM5 and DM6, and open space matters, merit further detailed consideration and responses on these matters will be reported back to a future meeting.
50762	DM5	Object	Policy DM5 should be amended to allow for appropriate development which doesn't fall under 'ancillary' and to apply to open areas which have more than one function. Suggested amendment:- "... ancillary or related to the	See response to DM5 above. Recommended Response: The various issues relating to policies DM5 and DM6, and open space matters, merit further detailed consideration and

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
			function or functions of the open space.”. Further amendment proposed to clarify that final part of DM5 relates to proposals for complete loss of facility:- “Development involving the complete loss of the whole or significant part of an open area may exceptionally ...”.	responses on these matters will be reported back to a future meeting.
50105 (SDNPA)	DM5	Object	This policy includes reference to a site in the national park this designation should be deleted.	See response to DM5 above. Recommended Response: The various issues relating to policies DM5 and DM6, and open space matters, merit further detailed consideration and responses on these matters will be reported back to a future meeting.
50148	DM5	Object	Object to the inclusion of the sports facilities of Winchester College under a general policy of protecting open areas. The majority of the College’s sites identified are private sports grounds and for school use only and should be seen as an integral part of the wider College campus . The draft policy has extended the boundaries covered by current local plan saved policies RT1 and RT2 without any analysis or consultation with the school. Winchester College request that draft Policy DM5 is amended to exclude sites owned by the school and to which the public has no access. The College also requests that it is notified of changes to policy, which affects its landholdings or where policy designations are extended to include land within the College’s ownership.	See response to DM5 above. Recommended Response: The various issues relating to policies DM5 and DM6, and open space matters, merit further detailed consideration and responses on these matters will be reported back to a future meeting.
51452	DM5	Object	This policy attempts to add additional level of constraint to the countryside policies contained in the Plan. The Open Space Strategy which provides the evidence base to this policy does not contain any reference to heritage or biodiversity. It remains unclear how the Open Space Strategy can provide robust evidence to support these designations.	See response to DM5 above. Recommended Response: The various issues relating to policies DM5 and DM6, and open space matters, merit further detailed consideration and responses on these matters will be reported back to a future meeting.
51885	DM5	Object	Inconsistency of wording in policy DM5 and para 6.2.20.	See response to DM5 above.

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
			Strongly support last sentence in para 6.2.20 referring to 'public open space'; wording of policy DM5 should be amended to also refer to public open space. Proposed new wording: 'Public open space areas with an important...'	Recommended Response: The various issues relating to policies DM5 and DM6, and open space matters, merit further detailed consideration and responses on these matters will be reported back to a future meeting.
50009 (Compton & Shawford PC)	6.2.22	Support	Support retention of settlement boundaries and protection of open space	Support welcomed.
50175 (Sport England)	6.2.22	Object	Sport England do not support a standards based policy approach. This does not reflect paragraph 204 of the NPPF which refers to limited use of planning obligations when required and CIL. The Plan should be clear on which developments will be expected to provide onsite sports provision/payment in kind, make off-site financial contribution under S106 or provide a CIL contribution .	See response to DM5 above. Recommended Response: The various issues relating to policies DM5 and DM6, and open space matters, merit further detailed consideration and responses on these matters will be reported back to a future meeting.
50168	6.2.22	Object	The Open Space Strategy omits a number of matters important to new developments:-It does not identify areas in need of protection, the existing open spaces, the accessible surrounding countryside and important connecting paths; The provision of safe and attractive walking routes to existing spaces and the creation of a network of paths with safe crossing points to roads; Where there is existing open space consideration should be given to providing safe access to this. Developers could be asked to finance any improvements required to that space this could be of greater value than providing small new bits of open space.	See response to DM5 above Recommended Response: The various issues relating to policies DM5 and DM6, and open space matters, merit further detailed consideration and responses on these matters will be reported back to a future meeting.
	DM6		Open Space Provision for New Developments	
50967	DM6	Support	The provision of open space on the site is welcomed, but must be maintained. All open spaces if they are truly public spaces, should provide a public role, within the public realm.	Support welcomed and comments noted.
50168	DM6	Object	The wording of policy DM6 should be amended to take	See response to DM5 above.

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
			account of obtaining access to existing spaces and securing any necessary improvements to that space Proposed additional wording to the first sentence: “where there are private gardens the need for further on site provision may well not be required, especially if there is close proximity to existing public open spaces and paths leading into the countryside; what is important is to ensure that there is safe and easy access for people of all ages and abilities to those spaces on foot. Similarly it is more important to ensure that nearby facilities are attractive, useable and in good condition before providing new on site”.	Recommended Response: The various issues relating to policies DM5 and DM6, and open space matters, merit further detailed consideration and responses on these matters will be reported back to a future meeting.
50174	DM6	Object	Policy is too focused on numbers and fails to quantify qualities and potential use or highlight issues connected to access, in particular the need for provision of safe and attractive walking routes to existing open spaces, the creation of a network of paths with safe crossing points at all junctions with roads. Similarly if fails to build in the need to improve poor performing open space and to provide safe access.	See response to DM5 above. Recommended Response: The various issues relating to policies DM5 and DM6, and open space matters, merit further detailed consideration and responses on these matters will be reported back to a future meeting.
50175 (Sport England)	DM6	Object	This policy again applies the quality standards in Policy CP7 which Sport England does not support as it is derived from the open space study. Therefore Sport England does not support the first part of the policy and its application of standards but does support the more flexible approach in the second part of the policy which relates to housing site of less than 15 dwellings and other forms of development such as business parks or residential care homes.	See response to DM5 above. Recommended Response: The various issues relating to policies DM5 and DM6, and open space matters, merit further detailed consideration and responses on these matters will be reported back to a future meeting.
51452	DM6	Object	The policy wording should be amended to reflect the wording of LPP1 Policy CP7,	See response to DM5 above. Recommended Response: The various issues relating to policies DM5 and DM6, and open space matters, merit further detailed consideration and responses on these matters will be reported back to

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
				a future meeting.
51505	DM6	Object	The requirement for developments of 15 dwellings or more to have “adequate amenity space” provides no definition or indication of what this is or how much. Paragraph 6.2.28 says “sufficient on site amenity open space”. This is vague and confusing.	See response to DM5 above. Recommended Response: The various issues relating to policies DM5 and DM6, and open space matters, merit further detailed consideration and responses on these matters will be reported back to a future meeting.
50084 (English Heritage)	6.2.28	Comment	Amend final sentence to read “.....incorporating existing natural vegetation and natural or historic features”.	See response to DM5 above. Recommended Response: The various issues relating to policies DM5 and DM6, and open space matters, merit further detailed consideration and responses on these matters will be reported back to a future meeting.
51505	6.2.31	Object	If public open space is to be provided by developers and then transferred to Parish Councils, it must be on the basis that such land will be retained as POS in perpetuity, or at least for the life of the development concerned.	See response to DM5 above. Recommended Response: The various issues relating to policies DM5 and DM6, and open space matters, merit further detailed consideration and responses on these matters will be reported back to a future meeting.
	DM7		Town, District and Local Centres	
50170	DM7	Object	The Policy needs to be amended to include theatres, which are classed Sui Generis (and not D2). The accompanying text notes that cultural uses are an appropriate town centre use, such as the Theatre Royal on Jewry Street and the policy should reflect that existing use.	This comment raises detailed issues regarding the draft policy, explanatory text or requirements. These issues require further consideration and the results will be reported back to a future meeting. Recommended Response: The various issues relating to policy DM7 require further detailed consideration and responses on these matters will be reported back to a future meeting.
50243	DM7	Object	Object to reference to 'special justification' in policy DM7. This is inconsistent with NPPF which requires sequential test and impact test where relevant. Amendment: remove requirement for 'special justification'.	This comment raises detailed issues regarding the draft policy, explanatory text or requirements. These issues require further consideration and the results will be reported back to a future meeting. Recommended Response: The various issues

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
				relating to policy DM7 require further detailed consideration and responses on these matters will be reported back to a future meeting.
51505	DM7	Object	DM7 fails to adequately define 'Town Centre uses' some of which may belong both in town centres and in more local parades and out of centre locations eg many local 'corner' shops and other businesses; and fails to give guidance on the redevelopment of existing town centre uses that are in out- of-centre or even countryside locations, such as out of town leisure centres, leisure facilities at golf courses etc that may still have a large membership. The 3rd paragraph says that TC and residential uses will be permitted on upper floors if they are 'suitable for such uses' implying they will be refused where they are not. In the absence of any defined criteria, the addition of this paragraph does not provide any helpful guidance.	This comment raises detailed issues regarding the draft policy, explanatory text or requirements. These issues require further consideration and the results will be reported back to a future meeting. Recommended Response: The various issues relating to policy DM7 require further detailed consideration and responses on these matters will be reported back to a future meeting.
	DM10		Essential Facilities and Services in the Countryside	
50084 (English Heritage)	DM10	Support	Welcomes reference to 'sense of place'.	Support welcomed
51452	DM10	Object	Recommend that the policy refer to MTRA4 rather than the supporting text. This policy is subject to policy DM1 'outside of these areas, countryside policies will apply' however MTRA 4 of the LPP1 states that land outside the built up areas of Winchester, Whiteley, Waterlooville and the settlements covered by the MTRA 2 and 3 will be allowed. The application of this policy is misleading in its approach.	This comment raises detailed issues regarding the draft policy, explanatory text or requirements. These issues require further consideration and the results will be reported back to a future meeting. Recommended Response: The various issues relating to policy DM10 require further detailed consideration and responses on these matters will be reported back to a future meeting.
	DM11		Housing for Essential Rural Workers	
50033 (South Wonston PC)	DM11	Support	The Parish Council notes with approval occupancy restrictions on residential accommodation in association with equestrian development and the requirement for three-year established activity and evidence of sound	Support welcomed

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
			financial basis.	
50084 (English Heritage)	DM11	Support	Welcomes reference to local distinctiveness.	Support welcomed
50967	DM11	Object	This policy relates to the provision of dwellings tied to livelihoods, in many cases, landlords have upgraded previously agricultural tied properties to homes for high rents or for sale. Request an amendment whereby creation of properties by this policy should have some enduring legacy of tenure which cannot be reneged upon for many decades, unless the business goes bankrupt.	This comment raises detailed issues regarding the draft policy, explanatory text or requirements. These issues require further consideration and the results will be reported back to a future meeting. Recommended Response: The various issues relating to policy DM11 require further detailed consideration and responses on these matters will be reported back to a future meeting.
51452	DM11	Object	Policy DM11 repeats and goes beyond the requirements of paragraph 55 of NPPF by placing a series of restrictions on development within the countryside. The approach taken is fundamentally flawed, is distinctly anti-growth and inconsistent with the policies contained within the Framework, specifically paragraph 47 which seeks to boost significantly the supply of housing.	This comment raises detailed issues regarding the draft policy, explanatory text or requirements. These issues require further consideration and the results will be reported back to a future meeting.. Recommended Response: The various issues relating to policy DM11 require further detailed consideration and responses on these matters will be reported back to a future meeting.
51505	DM11	Object	The criteria in the policy run contrary to government policy which seeks to reduce restrictions on development. The High Court has ruled that such guidance is no longer valid. In relation to removal of occupancy conditions, the policy requires that there is no continuing need in the surrounding area. It does not limit this to an unmet need and does not consider whether the dwelling is actually suitable to meet any unsatisfied local need. (Example provided). The last paragraph of DM11 is confusing in that it states that applications for equestrian-related dwellings will be refused but also that if they are made, they will be subject to the tests and requirements of the policy. The tests relate to agricultural activities which an equestrian need could never satisfy.	This comment raises detailed issues regarding the draft policy, explanatory text or requirements. These issues require further consideration and the results will be reported back to a future meeting. Recommended Response: The various issues relating to policy DM11 require further detailed consideration and responses on these matters will be reported back to a future meeting.

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
			The policy is not clear.	
51505	DM11	Object	The size limits set out in criterion vi) and para 6.3.27 do not match up with those in DM2 or DM3. These need to be reviewed.	This comment raises detailed issues regarding the draft policy, explanatory text or requirements. These issues require further consideration and the results will be reported back to a future meeting. Recommended Response: The various issues relating to policy DM11 require further detailed consideration and responses on these matters will be reported back to a future meeting.
	DM12		Equestrian Development	
51505	DM12	Object	DM12 is imprecise and misleading. It prohibits the erection of new buildings, hard standings, parking etc. However, all of these features are likely to be essential and cause 'harm' to the surrounding landscape. The policy should instead require landscaping and other works to minimise and potentially enhance the landscape impact. If there is a presumption against new residential development (serving an equestrian business) then it would be preferable for this to be included within DM12, rather than a reference back to DM11.	This comment raises detailed issues regarding the draft policy, explanatory text or requirements. These issues require further consideration and the results will be reported back to a future meeting. Recommended Response: The various issues relating to policy DM12 require further detailed consideration and responses on these matters will be reported back to a future meeting.
	DM13		Leisure and Recreation in the Countryside	
50084 (English Heritage)	DM13	Support	Support reference to heritage assets.	Support welcomed
50175 (Sport England)	DM13	Comment	This policy should apply to all forms of recreational activity. The policy should be amended to permit leisure and recreational facilities in the countryside which accord with other relevant policies	This comment raises detailed issues regarding the draft policy, explanatory text or requirements. These issues require further consideration and the results will be reported back to a future meeting. Recommended Response: The various issues relating to policy DM13 require further detailed consideration and responses on these matters will be reported back to a future meeting.
50967	DM13	Comment	Artificial lighting in the countryside is not to be	This comment raises detailed issues regarding the

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
			encouraged. Clear conditions should be placed on development of this type, with a presumption to support dark skies policy	draft policy, explanatory text or requirements. These issues require further consideration and the results will be reported back to a future meeting. Recommended Response: The various issues relating to policy DM13 require further detailed consideration and responses on these matters will be reported back to a future meeting.
50194	DM13	Object	DM13 does not reflect positive stance of NPPF para 28 in respect of sustainable tourism and leisure development. The EIA process would assess cumulative impacts where necessary, criteria i) of policy DM13 should be removed. Concern regarding linkage between DM5 and DM13 in relation to National Trust land.	This comment raises detailed issues regarding the draft policy, explanatory text or requirements. These issues require further consideration and the results will be reported back to a future meeting. Recommended Response: The various issues relating to policy DM13 require further detailed consideration and responses on these matters will be reported back to a future meeting.
51505	DM13	Object	DM13 is potentially in conflict with Policy DM7 eg hotels (C1), sports centres (D2).	This comment raises detailed issues regarding the draft policy, explanatory text or requirements. These issues require further consideration and the results will be reported back to a future meeting. Recommended Response: The various issues relating to policy DM13 require further detailed consideration and responses on these matters will be reported back to a future meeting.
	DM14		Masterplans for Large Landholdings	
50084 (English Heritage)	DM14	Support	Support Policy DM14	Support welcomed
50148	DM14	Object	Winchester College welcomes the general aim of draft policy DM14 in encouraging landowners of large sites to prepare Master plans, however, further explanation as to the process required and how this will be implemented by the city council, is needed to give the landowner a degree of certainty over future development. Despite having an updated Master plan, that the draft policies of	This comment raises detailed issues regarding the draft policy, explanatory text or requirements. These issues require further consideration and the results will be reported back to a future meeting. Recommended Response: The various issues relating to policy DM14 require further detailed consideration and responses on these matters will

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
			LPP2 fail to recognise the College campus as one community and one entity and continue to identify individual areas around the campus as requiring separate planning policies.	be reported back to a future meeting.
50243	DM14	Object	The requirement for Masterplans is ambiguous. It does not clearly indicate to applicants if it is required and is contrary to NPPF para 154. It is unjustified, ineffective and could place unnecessary barriers to economic development. Amendment:- Remove or amend to define specific circumstance when Masterplan would be required.	This comment raises detailed issues regarding the draft policy, explanatory text or requirements. These issues require further consideration and the results will be reported back to a future meeting. Recommended Response: The various issues relating to policy DM14 require further detailed consideration and responses on these matters will be reported back to a future meeting.
51452	DM14	Object	This policy remains unclear as it does not suggest what is deemed as a 'large land holding.'	This comment raises detailed issues regarding the draft policy, explanatory text or requirements. These issues require further consideration and the results will be reported back to a future meeting. Recommended Response: The various issues relating to policy DM14 require further detailed consideration and responses on these matters will be reported back to a future meeting.
51505	DM14	Object	DM14 fails to define 'significant development' so is confusing. There is no reason why certain development, permissible under countryside and other policies, should need to be part of the masterplan. It potentially places an unfair burden on land owned by larger landowners that does not apply to smaller parcels. Many large landholdings include areas that are tenanted and tenants have their own development requirements. It is unreasonable to require these proposals to be part of a masterplan.	This comment raises detailed issues regarding the draft policy, explanatory text or requirements. These issues require further consideration and the results will be reported back to a future meeting. Recommended Response: The various issues relating to policy DM14 require further detailed consideration and responses on these matters will be reported back to a future meeting.
	DM15 – DM17		Site Design and Development Principles policies	
51452	DM15 - DM17	Object	These policies are too prescriptive relying on a multitude of design guidance to support their case and also repeat	This comment raises detailed issues regarding the draft policy, explanatory text or requirements.

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
			each other. Design policies should not be overly prescriptive, nor should they place a constraint on sustainable development coming forward.	These issues require further consideration and the results will be reported back to a future meeting. Recommended Response: The various issues relating to these policies require further detailed consideration and responses on these matters will be reported back to a future meeting.
	DM15		Local Distinctiveness	
50024 (Micheldever Parish Council)	DM15	Support	This policy reflects the emphasis we would wish to see in maintaining the distinctive character of our settlements.	Support welcomed.
51402	DM15	Support	Strongly support the reference to SPGs, i.e. the Compton Down LDS and Compton and Shawford VDS.	Support welcomed.
51403	DM15	Support	Strongly supports reference to local distinctiveness and supplementary guidance in the form of Local Design Statements and Village Design Statements. These should be retained and referred to where necessary.	Support welcomed and comments noted.
50084 (English Heritage)	DM15	Support	Welcomes policy in particular clauses ii and iv. Term heritage landscapes is not a recognised term and is not defined in the local plan, suggest this is replaced with 'Historic (including designed) landscapes'.	This comment raises detailed issues regarding the draft policy, explanatory text or requirements. These issues require further consideration and the results will be reported back to a future meeting. Recommended Response: The various issues relating to policy DM15 require further detailed consideration and responses on these matters will be reported back to a future meeting.
50269	DM15	Support	Whilst the spirit of policy supported, it should not be used to exclude development that endorses high levels of sustainability or innovation as per paragraph 65 of NPPF.	This comment raises detailed issues regarding the draft policy, explanatory text or requirements. These issues require further consideration and the results will be reported back to a future meeting. Recommended Response: The various issues relating to policy DM15 require further detailed consideration and responses on these matters will be reported back to a future meeting.

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
51505	DM15	Object	Policy DM15 requires all development to 'conserve and enhance', the same tests that normally apply to conservation areas. It is unreasonable to require all development to meet these tests.	This comment raises detailed issues regarding the draft policy, explanatory text or requirements. These issues require further consideration and the results will be reported back to a future meeting. Recommended Response: The various issues relating to policy DM15 require further detailed consideration and responses on these matters will be reported back to a future meeting.
50084 (English Heritage)	6.4.11	Support	English Heritage welcomes and supports this paragraph as part of a positive strategy for the historic environment as required by the NPPF.	Support welcomed
50084 (English Heritage)	6.4.13	Support	English Heritage welcomes and supports this paragraph as part of a positive strategy for the historic environment as required by the NPPF. The reference to the Winchester City and its Setting document should include its status and date. It should also be referenced in WIN3 or its supporting text..	This comment raises detailed issues regarding the draft policy, explanatory text or requirements. These issues require further consideration and the results will be reported back to a future meeting. Recommended Response: The various issues relating to policy DM15 require further detailed consideration and responses on these matters will be reported back to a future meeting.
50084 (English Heritage)	6.4.13	Support	English Heritage welcomes and supports this paragraph as part of a positive strategy for the historic environment as required by the NPPF.	Support welcomed.
50084 (English Heritage)	6.4.14	Support	Support text	Support welcomed.
	DM16		Site Design Criteria	
50084 (English Heritage)	DM16	Support	Support policy but request that criteria i is amended to read "...appearance, variety and any historic significance..."	This comment raises detailed issues regarding the draft policy, explanatory text or requirements. These issues require further consideration and the results will be reported back to a future meeting. Recommended Response: The various issues relating to policy DM16 require further detailed consideration and responses on these matters will

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
				be reported back to a future meeting.
50967	DM16	Object	Request that all new houses are built on roads that are then adopted to ensure all residents have access to footways, streetlights and grit bins, rather than heavy maintenance bills in years to come.	This comment raises detailed issues regarding the draft policy, explanatory text or requirements. These issues require further consideration and the results will be reported back to a future meeting. Recommended Response: The various issues relating to policy DM16 require further detailed consideration and responses on these matters will be reported back to a future meeting.
51505	DM16	Object	Policy DM16 is too generic. Such restrictions would be inappropriate in the following types of development; applications for existing employment sites, possibly for new service areas, or for secure compounds on an industrial estate; small scale development such as single (replacement) dwellings; park and ride car parks.	This comment raises detailed issues regarding the draft policy, explanatory text or requirements. These issues require further consideration and the results will be reported back to a future meeting. Recommended Response: The various issues relating to policy DM16 require further detailed consideration and responses on these matters will be reported back to a future meeting.
50084 (English Heritage)	6.4.21	Comment	Request final sentence is amended to read "in the case of small dwellings in the countryside (see Policy DM3; Small Dwellings in the Countryside Policy) and historic dwellings (see Policy DM29 – Alterations to Heritage Assets)".	This comment raises detailed issues regarding the draft policy, explanatory text or requirements. These issues require further consideration and the results will be reported back to a future meeting. Recommended Response: The various issues relating to policy DM16 require further detailed consideration and responses on these matters will be reported back to a future meeting.
51326	6.4.22	Object	The final sentence of this sentence should be put more positively and reference made to the City Council's strategies for cycling and for walking. Suggested rewording: 'The City Council has approved strategies for developing walking and cycling. It is keen to promote walking and cycling as the normal form of transport for shorter journeys. In every new development the best possible provision should be made for pedestrians and cyclists including the development of safe and attractive	This comment raises detailed issues regarding the draft policy, explanatory text or requirements. These issues require further consideration and the results will be reported back to a future meeting. Recommended Response: The various issues relating to policy DM16 require further detailed consideration and responses on these matters will be reported back to a future meeting.

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
			routes both to local centres and to the City Centre'.	
50084 (English Heritage)	6.4.23	Comment	Support the positive stance towards conservation areas set out in this paragraph, however the word 'conserve' rather than 'preserve' is more consistent with the framework. Amend third sentence to read "...to conserve, enhance or better reveal the significance of the area or building."	This comment raises detailed issues regarding the draft policy, explanatory text or requirements. These issues require further consideration and the results will be reported back to a future meeting. Recommended Response: The various issues relating to policy DM16 require further detailed consideration and responses on these matters will be reported back to a future meeting.
50342	6.4.23	Object	Scope of "developments" not sufficiently well & widely defined. Amend to read "Developments, including any garages, cycle racks & waste recycling storage or similar areas, need to have a satisfactory visual appearance."	This comment raises detailed issues regarding the draft policy, explanatory text or requirements. These issues require further consideration and the results will be reported back to a future meeting. Recommended Response: The various issues relating to policy DM16 require further detailed consideration and responses on these matters will be reported back to a future meeting.
	DM17		Site Development Principles	
50083 (Environment Agency)	DM17	Support	Support point iii this is particularly important in Winchester District where some villages have no mains sewers available.	Support welcomed.
50084 (English Heritage)	DM17	Support	Support criterion ii, but this could be reworded to state "...key townscape and landscape sensitivities or heritage assets".	This comment raises detailed issues regarding the draft policy, explanatory text or requirements. These issues require further consideration and the results will be reported back to a future meeting. Recommended Response: The various issues relating to policy DM17 require further detailed consideration and responses on these matters will be reported back to a future meeting.
50967	DM17	Comment	Request all applications should be assessed by team of disabled people for access and suitability.	This comment raises detailed issues regarding the draft policy, explanatory text or requirements. These issues require further consideration and the results will be reported back to a future meeting.

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
				Recommended Response: The various issues relating to policy DM17 require further detailed consideration and responses on these matters will be reported back to a future meeting.
50967	DM17	Object	All new development, if in an area where there is not mains drainage, should ensure that the drainage systems are fit for purpose	This comment raises detailed issues regarding the draft policy, explanatory text or requirements. These issues require further consideration and the results will be reported back to a future meeting. Recommended Response: The various issues relating to policy DM17 require further detailed consideration and responses on these matters will be reported back to a future meeting.
51505	DM17	Object	Policy DM17 is too generic. Such restrictions would be inappropriate in the following types of development; applications for existing employment sites, possibly for new service areas, or for secure compounds on an industrial estate; small scale development such as single (replacement) dwellings; park and ride car parks.	This comment raises detailed issues regarding the draft policy, explanatory text or requirements. These issues require further consideration and the results will be reported back to a future meeting. Recommended Response: The various issues relating to policy DM17 require further detailed consideration and responses on these matters will be reported back to a future meeting.
	DM18		Access and Parking	
50921	DM18	Comment	All new homes should have provision for at least 2 parking spaces excluding garage spaces and in addition there should be provision for off road parking for visitors.	This comment raises detailed issues regarding the draft policy, explanatory text or requirements. These issues require further consideration and the results will be reported back to a future meeting. Recommended Response: The various issues relating to policy DM18 require further detailed consideration and responses on these matters will be reported back to a future meeting.
51326	DM18	Object	The Council's Residential Parking Standards need revising. Developments should be encouraged where there is no provision for private parking and where new residents sign an agreement not to own a car; also the	This comment raises detailed issues regarding the draft policy, explanatory text or requirements. These issues require further consideration and the results will be reported back to a future meeting.

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
			last six words of (iv) should be deleted.	Recommended Response: The various issues relating to policy DM18 require further detailed consideration and responses on these matters will be reported back to a future meeting.
51452	DM18	Object	Any reference to SPDs should be through supporting text only as these have not been subject to examination and do not form part of the development plan.	This comment raises detailed issues regarding the draft policy, explanatory text or requirements. These issues require further consideration and the results will be reported back to a future meeting. Recommended Response: The various issues relating to policy DM18 require further detailed consideration and responses on these matters will be reported back to a future meeting.
51505	DM18	Object	DM18 needs to be specific to certain developments e.g. (i) only applies to residential development; i)-vi) only apply where new parking and access is included in the application.	This comment raises detailed issues regarding the draft policy, explanatory text or requirements. These issues require further consideration and the results will be reported back to a future meeting. Recommended Response: The various issues relating to policy DM18 require further detailed consideration and responses on these matters will be reported back to a future meeting.
	DM19		Development and Pollution	
50083 (Environment Agency)	DM19	Object	Policy focuses on health and should include the environment. An opportunity has been missed to promote development which has positive impact on the environment. There is a need to show links with the Water Framework Directive and the need for no deterioration of water bodies. The reports required to accompany proposals should also refer to the environment as a receptor.	This comment raises detailed issues regarding the draft policy, explanatory text or requirements. These issues require further consideration and the results will be reported back to a future meeting. Recommended Response: The various issues relating to policy DM19 require further detailed consideration and responses on these matters will be reported back to a future meeting.
	DM20		Development and Noise	
50170	DM20	Object	The Policy should highlight the need for new development to address noise impacts from existing adjoining land uses in their proposal. To safeguard the	This comment raises detailed issues regarding the draft policy, explanatory text or requirements. These issues require further consideration and the

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
			ongoing operation of cultural facilities, development proposals adjoining cultural facilities need to ensure that any new residents will not be disturbed by noise or vibration to the extent that Council would be required to take action. [Recent appeal cases cited].	results will be reported back to a future meeting. Recommended Response: The various issues relating to policy DM20 require further detailed consideration and responses on these matters will be reported back to a future meeting.
	DM21		Contaminated Land	
50083 (Environment Agency)	DM21	Support	Support the policy and reference to the improvement of contaminated land.	Support welcomed.
	DM22		Telecommunications, Services and Utilities	
50084 (English Heritage)	DM22	Support	Welcome and support criterion ii	Support welcomed.
50098 (Mobile Operators Association)	DM22	Object	The Mobile Network Operators aim to keep the environmental impact of all communications infrastructure to a minimum. Proposed amendment to criteria (ii) as follows: "If proposing development in a sensitive area, the development should not have an unacceptable effect on areas of ecological interest, areas of landscape importance, archaeological sites, conservation areas or buildings of architectural or historic interest".	This comment raises detailed issues regarding the draft policy, explanatory text or requirements. These issues require further consideration and the results will be reported back to a future meeting. Recommended Response: The various issues relating to policy DM22 require further detailed consideration and responses on these matters will be reported back to a future meeting.
50967	DM22	Object	All new housing should be provided with broadband at the point of sale.	This comment raises detailed issues regarding the draft policy, explanatory text or requirements. These issues require further consideration and the results will be reported back to a future meeting. Recommended Response: The various issues relating to policy DM22 require further detailed consideration and responses on these matters will be reported back to a future meeting.
50098 (Mobile Operators Association)	6.4.49	Object	The level of community consultation applied to any site should be proportionate to the development and appropriate for the area it is proposed in. This is why in 2002 the industry developed the Traffic Light Rating	This representation raises issues that require further consideration, the results of which will be reported back to a future meeting. Recommended Response: The various issues

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
			Model for determining levels of consultation to be carried out. The operators will continue to provide details of any pre application consultation with the local community and schools as part of the Site Specific Supplementary Information document, however, consultation may not be necessary in every case. Suggest that Paragraph 6.4.49 be removed.	relating to policy DM22 require further detailed consideration and responses on these matters will be reported back to a future meeting.
50084 (English Heritage)	6.4.51	Support	Welcome and support second and third sentences.	Support welcomed.
	DM23		Rural Character	
50084 (English Heritage)	DM23	Comment	Welcome references to locally characteristic rural assets, but potential impacts are not limited to visual impact and therefore “or from the significance of heritage assets” would be better placed after “from the public realm or public rights of way”.	This comment raises detailed issues regarding the draft policy, explanatory text or requirements. These issues require further consideration and the results will be reported back to a future meeting. Recommended Response: The various issues relating to policy DM23 require further detailed consideration and responses on these matters will be reported back to a future meeting.
51452	DM23	Object	Development can often be located in rural areas that are suitably and sustainably located. In such circumstances question whether the application of this policy would prevent otherwise sustainable housing sites from being delivered. Also question the Council’s approach towards public rights of way which can be accommodated in development proposals.	This comment raises detailed issues regarding the draft policy, explanatory text or requirements. These issues require further consideration and the results will be reported back to a future meeting. Recommended Response: The various issues relating to policy DM23 require further detailed consideration and responses on these matters will be reported back to a future meeting.
	DM24		Special Trees, Important Hedgerows and Ancient Woodlands	
50084 (English Heritage)	6.4.61	Support	Support reference to heritage value	Support welcomed.
	DM25		Historic Parks and Gardens	

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
50084 (English Heritage)	DM25	Support	Support policy and supporting text 6.4.65 - 6.4.68, although Policy DM25 should refer to the significance of the park, garden, cemetery or battlefield i.e. the first sentence should read ".....on the significance, distinctive character and appearance of a park,".	There have been several comments in relation to the heritage policies of Draft Local Plan Part 2 (DM25 – DM34). These raise numerous issues and the policies will need to be assessed as a whole when considering the points raised. Recommended Response: The various issues relating to policy DM25 require further detailed consideration and responses on these matters will be reported back to a future meeting.
50342	DM25	Comment	delete extra (See response under DM25 above. Recommended Response: The various issues relating to policy DM25 require further detailed consideration and responses on these matters will be reported back to a future meeting.
	DM26		Archaeology	
50084 (English Heritage)	DM26	Support	Welcome and support policy and supporting text.	Support welcomed.
50033 (SWPC)	6.4.72	Support	The Parish Council is glad to see English Heritage's consent will be required for proposals relating to Scheduled Ancient Monuments.	Support welcomed.
	DM27 – DM31		Conservation Areas, Heritage Assets and Listed Buildings policies	
50342	DM27 – DM31	Object	Policies DM27 to DM31 need to be reconsidered as a group to ensure a logical & consistent hierarchy of requirements that are all set by legislation/NPPF together with a list of desirable character & appearance enhancements probably common to all. Policy DM27 should refer to change of use. Policy contrary to NPPF para 131, it is not a requirement that development must be enhanced but a "desirability". There are inconsistency between the requirements for non-historic and listed building applications.. 6.4.79 fails	See response under DM25 above. Recommended Response: The various issues relating to policy DM27-31 require further detailed consideration and responses on these matters will be reported back to a future meeting.

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
			to consider extensions/alterations/demolition for non-historic buildings. Clarity is needed to assist the viability and/or ability to expand of businesses in the CA.	
	DM27		Development in Conservation Areas	
50084 (English Heritage)	DM27	Comment	Welcome and support in principle. Would prefer use of term 'conserve' rather than enhance as this is more consistent with national policy. Also, the significance of a conservation area lies not only in its character and appearance but also in special architectural or historic interest.	See response under DM25 above. Recommended Response: The various issues relating to policy DM27 require further detailed consideration and responses on these matters will be reported back to a future meeting.
51505	DM27	Object	DM27 criterion d) does not make sense as it implies that the inclusion of energy efficiency measures will assist in limiting the impact on character. The opposite is likely. The criterion may be better re-worded to stipulate that where such measures are included this should be done in such a way that it does not harm the character of a building.	See response under DM25 above. Recommended Response: The various issues relating to policy DM27 require further detailed consideration and responses on these matters will be reported back to a future meeting.
50359	6.4.77	Object	Plan lacks robustness in terms of demanding higher densities in appropriate locations. WT has good examples of high densities areas - Parchment Street, Fulflood, Hyde etc which are desirable houses densely packed - done properly high densities can be successful	See response under DM25 above. Recommended Response: The various issues relating to policy DM27 require further detailed consideration and responses on these matters will be reported back to a future meeting.
50359	6.4.79	Support	Welcome reference to limiting size of extensions	Support welcomed.
50342	6.4.80	Object	Does not consider change of use. Amend to read "Poorly conceived alterations and change of use to individual heritage assets	See response under DM25 above. Recommended Response: The various issues relating to policy DM27 require further detailed consideration and responses on these matters will be reported back to a future meeting.
	DM28		Demolition in Conservation Areas	
50084 (English Heritage)	DM28	Support	Welcome and support policy and supporting text. However, it might be reasonable to allow the demolition, in whole or in part, of unlisted buildings or structures where the proposed redevelopment would, overall,	See response under DM25 above. Recommended Response: The various issues relating to policy DM28 require further detailed

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
			enhance or better reveal the significance of the Conservation Area in accordance with paragraph 137 of the Framework.	consideration and responses on these matters will be reported back to a future meeting.
51505	DM28	Object	DM28 does not allow for the demolition of a building that may have some merit, but where demolition is part of a larger scheme for redevelopment, that would bring a much greater benefit to the conservation area.	See response under DM25 above. Recommended Response: The various issues relating to policy DM28 require further detailed consideration and responses on these matters will be reported back to a future meeting.
50359	6.4.83	Object	Para should recognise that in WT few buildings are incapable of economic use. LPA should be more active on heritage matters rather than just reacting to others plans. Repairs notices could be issued to bring properties back into use.	See response under DM25 above. Recommended Response: The various issues relating to policy DM28 require further detailed consideration and responses on these matters will be reported back to a future meeting.
	DM29		Alterations to Heritage Assets	
50084 (English Heritage)	DM29	Support	Support policy and text.	Support welcomed.
50342, 50148	DM29	Object	Not consistent with NPPF 135. Applies the NPPF 133 criteria for designated heritage assets to non designated ones. Suggested amendment (1 respondent): 1. Amend title to read "Alterations to designated heritage assets" & text to read " cause harm to the special interest of a designated heritage asset, or its setting, 2. Insert new policy "xx-Alterations to non-designated heritage assets" consistent with NPPF135	See response under DM25 above. Recommended Response: The various issues relating to policy DM29 require further detailed consideration and responses on these matters will be reported back to a future meeting.
50359	6.4.87	Support	Welcome this reference. Plans for the immediate area surrounding the station should take it into account. WT is full of heritage assets of various sorts, which emphasises the need for a sensitive approach overall.	Support welcomed and comment noted.
50359	6.4.90	Support	Policy regarding the loss of front gardens is very welcome. It impacts not only on the built environment but also on drainage and on wildlife.	Support welcomed and comment noted.

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
	DM30		Changes of Use of Listed Buildings	
50084 (English Heritage)	DM30	Support	Welcome and support policy and supporting text.	Support welcomed.
50359	DM30	Comment	Again an opportunity for proactive policy. Instead of merely refusing plans which would result in the under-use of upper floors, a plan to encourage living over the shop, with council tax incentives if necessary would be valuable.	See response under DM25 above. Recommended Response: The various issues relating to policy DM30 require further detailed consideration and responses on these matters will be reported back to a future meeting.
	DM31		Locally Listed Heritage Assets	
50084 (English Heritage)	DM31	Comment	Support policy and text but as drafted the presumption against demolition would not apply to buildings not on the list. Suggest the fourth para is revised to state ""buildings or structures on the list or otherwise identified as being of local heritage significance, including through the process of determining the application, will be permitted only where.....". This would be consistent with the recognition in paragraph 6.4.98 (but not in the Policy) that the absence of inclusion on the local heritage list should not be taken to imply that an asset has no heritage value. The list of locally listed assets should be 'live'. Preparation of the local list is a high priority for Winchester and preparation of a SPD may delay this..	See response under DM25 above. Recommended Response: The various issues relating to policy DM31 require further detailed consideration and responses on these matters will be reported back to a future meeting.
50132	DM31	Support	Support policy DM31 to establish a local list of heritage assets.	Support welcomed.
51607	DM31	Support	Support DM31 to set up a local list as it will protect heritage assets which are not in a conservation area but are important to local character.	Support welcomed.
50168	DM31	Object	Welcome policy but is concerned to note that it is proposed to have SPD setting out the selection and review process to be followed. This could cause a significant delay to the start of the selection process.. If further guidance is needed. The Cabinet could approve	See response under DM25 above. Recommended Response: The various issues relating to policy DM31 require further detailed consideration and responses on these matters will be reported back to a future meeting.

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
			a paper setting out what is needed. Text in para 6.4.98 should also be included in the policy, to allow for an asset to be classified as locally significant by the local planning authority even if it does not appear on the local heritage list.	
50342	DM31	Object	List does not include whether designated or not & hence applicable policy. 1. Insert at top of list "Designated". Add to end of list "Non-designated" 2. In referenced Appendix D "Historic association - the example of "post-Boer War horse troughs" is neither an important figure nor event. Change example to "memorial"	See response under DM25 above. Recommended Response: The various issues relating to policy DM31 require further detailed consideration and responses on these matters will be reported back to a future meeting.
50359	6.4.98	Support	This is very encouraging and implies there is actually no existing building that will not be given appropriate consideration if faced with alteration or, at worse, demolition.	Support welcomed.
50359	6.4.99	Object	The Council should be more proactive with the use of Article 4 directions to protect heritage assets.	See response under DM25 above. Recommended Response: The various issues relating to policy DM31 require further detailed consideration and responses on these matters will be reported back to a future meeting.
	DM32		Undesignated Rural Heritage Assets	
50084 (English Heritage)	DM32	Support	Welcome and support text and policy.	Support welcomed.
51505	DM32	Object	DM32 is too open-ended in that: it does not define 'undesignated heritage assets'; it requires consideration of whether the building can be subdivided 'if appropriate'; and consideration of whether it can be used in a 'more suitable way', all of which lack precision. These are onerous requirements on buildings that do not merit any form of statutory protection, and are potentially likely to dissuade owners from investing in these	See response under DM25 above. Recommended Response: The various issues relating to policy DM32 require further detailed consideration and responses on these matters will be reported back to a future meeting.

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
			buildings. The restrictive nature of the policy is also likely to be conflict with the recent changes to the GDPO.	
50359	6.4.101	Comment	Storage uses do not require presence on a site all the time, is better to try and attract high end users to ensure maintenance and repairs.	See response under DM25 above. Recommended Response: The various issues relating to policy DM32 require further detailed consideration and responses on these matters will be reported back to a future meeting.
50359	6.4.105	Comment	Implies that most industrial buildings are rural - also need to consider other buildings such as mills that are in WT.	See response under DM25 above. Recommended Response: The various issues relating to policy DM32 require further detailed consideration and responses on these matters will be reported back to a future meeting.
	DM33		Shopfronts	
50084 (English Heritage)	DM33	Support	Welcome and support text and policy.	Support welcomed.
50359	DM33	Support	Policy is welcome and overdue.	Support welcomed.
	DM34		Signage	
50194	DM34	Comment	DM34 should be amended to acknowledge the specific signage needs for tourist facilities with additional guidance set out in an updated SPD. This is not in the current policy and contrary to guidance in PPG on considering specific needs of the tourist industry. Need to provide appropriate on-street and directional signage in the wider area to attract visitors to valuable tourist assets.	See response under DM25 above. Recommended Response: The various issues relating to policy DM34 require further detailed consideration and responses on these matters will be reported back to a future meeting.
	OMISSIONS		Omissions from the plan	
50013 (Denmead PC)	OMISSION	Object	Request new policy is added stating that the capability to use fast Broadband communications should be built into every new dwelling	There are various comments suggesting the inclusion of additional policies on different matters. Recommended Response: The various issues relating to matters omitted from policies require further detailed consideration and responses on

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
				these matters will be reported back to a future meeting.
50114 (Thames Water)	OMISSION	Object	Plan should include a policy on water/waste water infrastructure, in relation to the provision of additional capacity where required. (Thames Water standard policy wording and supporting text supplied)	There are various comments suggesting the inclusion of additional policies on different matters. Recommended Response: The various issues relating to matters omitted from policies require further detailed consideration and responses on these matters will be reported back to a future meeting.
50967	OMISSION	Comment	These matters have not been included in the plan and should be: Disability scrutiny; Development of business in rural areas; Building homes on adoptable roads; Broadband provision in every new dwelling or business space	There are various comments suggesting the inclusion of additional policies on different matters. Recommended Response: The various issues relating to matters omitted from policies require further detailed consideration and responses on these matters will be reported back to a future meeting.
50967	OMISSION	Object	Many people in the district live in Park Homes. Modern Park Homes provide a high quality of home in an economic way. This plan does not allow for the provision of any new park homes. This is regrettable because they provide useful, genuinely affordable housing. Accommodation.	There are various comments suggesting the inclusion of additional policies on different matters. Recommended Response: The various issues relating to matters omitted from policies require further detailed consideration and responses on these matters will be reported back to a future meeting.
50967	OMISSION	Object	Request a policy on the development of businesses in rural areas, to assess impact on roads and neighbours in terms of light and sound and to provide a firm base to determine when the business has outgrown its permission.	There are various comments suggesting the inclusion of additional policies on different matters. Recommended Response: The various issues relating to matters omitted from policies require further detailed consideration and responses on these matters will be reported back to a future meeting.
51373	OMISSION	Object	With reference to paragraph 2.10, LPP2 should amend LPP1 policy CP4 to include Extra Care Housing as a rural exception where a need is demonstrated.	There are various comments suggesting the inclusion of additional policies on different matters. Recommended Response: The various issues

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
				relating to matters omitted from policies require further detailed consideration and responses on these matters will be reported back to a future meeting.
51456	OMISSION	Object	The plans should include a policy for the provision of built community facilities, to promote health and well being, particularly in view of the aging population. There should be an assessment of needs like the open space standards for this type of community provision.	There are various comments suggesting the inclusion of additional policies on different matters. Recommended Response: The various issues relating to matters omitted from policies require further detailed consideration and responses on these matters will be reported back to a future meeting.

Appendix 6

General including Chapters 1 and 2 - Responses to Draft Local Plan Part 2 Consultation

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
			Whole Plan	
50028 (Oliver's Battery Parish Council)	Whole Plan	Support	Supports the aim of LPP2 in allocating land to help deliver the development strategy for new housing, economic growth and diversification set out in Policy DS1 of LPP1 for the period to 2031. More specifically supports the preferred options for development management policies and site allocations set out in the Draft Plan.	Support welcomed.
51473, 51499	Whole Plan	Support	Support the plan.	
50114 (Thames Water)	Whole Plan	Comment	None of the development sites lie within Thames Water operational area and therefore TW has no specific comments to make on them.	Noted. Recommended Response: No change required.
50130 (Marine Management Organisation)	Whole Plan	Comment	The MMO has no specific comments to make but draws attention to the remit of the organisation. The MMO is preparing the South Inshore and Offshore Plan which runs from Folkestone to the River Dart and therefore includes parts of Winchester district. The MMO will be working with all Local Authorities in the plan area and until such time as a marine plan is in place advises all local councils to refer to the Marine Policy Statement for guidance on any planning activity that includes a section of coastline or tidal river.	As the marine planning authority for England the MMO is responsible for preparing marine plans for English inshore and offshore waters. At its landward extent, a marine plan will apply up to the mean high water springs mark, which includes the tidal extent of any rivers. The River Hamble is tidal up as far as Botley. It forms part of the boundary of Curdridge Parish and therefore lies within Winchester district. The MMO's advice is noted. Recommended Response: No change required.
50169 (Winchester Area Community Action)	Whole Plan	Comment	Concern that developers will be held to account to ensure that the requirements set out in policies are fulfilled - such as provision of open space, affordable housing and people will have access to services if they do not have access to a car.	The implementation of policies and ensuring requirements are met will be a matter for planning conditions issued with planning consent and their discharge. The requirements for the provision of affordable housing are set out in LPP1 policy CP3 although this may be varied where specific viability issues are identified and justified. The Transport

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
				Assessments of potential sites for allocation in LPP2 took account of the distance to facilities and services, including bus stops and routes with at least one bus per hour, and the existence of footways. Recommended Response: No change required.
50890, 51664, 51736,	Whole Plan	Object	Object to whole plan: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It is a clever and cynical PR exercise. ▪ Whole plan is unsustainable; object to loss of green spaces, flora and fauna. Present residents are disregarded. ▪ No requirement to build these houses; local infrastructure cannot cope. Development should be targeted to larger areas with the infrastructure, not on greenfield sites in villages. 	The adopted strategy as set out in policy DS1 of Local Plan Part 1 outlines the amount and distribution of the required amount of housing across the District up to 2031. The strategy was developed following consideration of the relative sustainability and suitability of settlements for future development. The Local Plan Inspector considered the soundness of this strategy and LPP1 has now been statutorily adopted following consultation and examination. Development of the sites identified will require improvements to infrastructure where this is considered necessary and deliverable, as specified in the specific site allocations and delivered as part of the resulting planning applications. Recommended Response: No change required.
			Chapter 1 – Introduction & Background	
50105 (South Downs National Park Authority)	1.4	Support	Welcome the clarity of references in the plan to the SDNPA and preparation of its plan. Request that reference is made to under Section 62 of the Environment Act 1995 that relevant bodies which includes WCC has to have regard to the statutory purposes of the national park.	Support welcomed. The Environment Act 1995 requires that in exercising or performing any functions in relation to, or so as to affect, land in a National Park, any relevant authority shall have regard to the purposes, to seek to foster the economic and social well-being of local communities within the National Park, and, if it appears that there is a conflict between those purposes, shall attach greater weight to the purpose of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage of

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
				<p>the area comprised in the National Park.</p> <p>Recommended Response: Amend paragraph 1.4 to include reference to Section 62 of the Environment Act 1995 requirement to have regard to the statutory purposes of the national park.</p> <p>NB paragraph 1.4 will also need to be updated with regard to the Denmead Neighbourhood Plan which has passed the referendum stage and will soon become part of the statutory development plan. Once it is formally 'made' by Winchester City Council (recommended to Council on 1 April 2015) it will be used to determine planning applications.</p>
	1.6 – 1.9		Evidence Base	
51436	1.6	Object	Paragraph refers to the evidence base which supports the LPP2 but fails to make any reference to the 2013 Travellers Accommodation Assessment for Hampshire prepared by Forest Bus Ltd. The needs of gypsies, travellers and Travelling Showpeople must, in accordance with the NPPF, be provided for in development plans.	<p>The studies mentioned in this paragraph are not an exhaustive list but the full list is set out in Appendix C of the Plan. The need for permanent pitches for Travellers, as identified in the Travellers Accommodation Assessment for Hampshire (2013), remains within Winchester District. This will be dealt with when the ongoing site assessment study is completed, the outcome of which will be reported to a future meeting.</p> <p>Recommended Response: No change required.</p>
51443	1.6	Object	Disagree with the way in which the evidence base has been assembled and interpreted, in particular 3 elements – the National Park, Landscape Character and Accessibility – used in the assessment of alternative sites and the resulting strategy and allocations.	<p>Developers seeking to promote alternative sites may disagree with the outcome of evidence studies and put forward their own evidence to support their sites. The NPPF expects plans to be based on proportionate evidence; that is adequate, up-to-date and relevant. Where challenges have been made to proposed sites and alternatives put forward these and the evidence supporting them will be considered.</p> <p>Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2,</p>

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
				further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
50342	1.6	Object	The evidence base is out of date and relies on that prepared for LPP1. Where the evidence base has been updated it has not been used to demonstrate that it provides proportionate support for the housing, employment & retail policy numbers. The Inspector for LPP1 referred to the need for an early review if and when there was an improvement in local economic circumstances. That has now occurred so there is a gross under estimate of housing requirement. The LPP1&2 housing requirement should be 17,000 not 12,500 dwellings and the numerical policies in LPP1 should be updated to be consistent with the current evidence base.	The Local Plan Part 1 is up to date, NPPF-compliant and recently adopted. It is not, therefore, accepted that it is out of date or that an early review is needed. Nevertheless, in a recent judgement (Gladman Development Ltd v Wokingham Borough Council, dated 11 July 2014) the judge concluded that an Inspector assessing the soundness of a plan dealing with the allocation of sites for housing is not required to consider whether an objective (re)assessment of housing need would disclose a need for additional housing. He considered that the legal framework and the NPPF do not require that an allocations plan addresses the question of additional provision even if the Core Strategy needs updating and may need to make additional provision for development in the future.
51386	1.6	Object	The issue of housing supply is not mentioned in this part of the plan. The framework for the supply of housing provided by LPP1 should be assessed in the light of the experience of housing delivery over the Plan period to date, before LPP2 allocates land on that foundation. LPP2 will not be “effective” or “consistent with national policy” (NPPF paragraph 182) if it fails to address the 5 year housing land supply issue. There is a significant shortfall in the Council’s 5 year land supply. This can be rectified by the allocation of land at Pitt Vale Winchester for development.	Experience of housing delivery in the short part of the Plan period that has elapsed indicates that delivery is in line with the expected trajectory (see the Annual Monitoring report 2014). At the present time a 5 year supply can be demonstrated and the purpose of bringing forward the allocations set out in the LPP2 is to ensure that this remains the case.
51452	1.6	Object	Plan is prepared on out of date evidence. The 2012 Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) which provides the basis for the LPP1 does not adequately assess the objectively assessed need. The level of housing that is proposed through the LPP2 only provides allocations to meet the LPP1, it may not provide for the true needs of the District and is not necessarily compliant with either the NPPF or Planning	Recommended Response: No change required.

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
			Policy Guidance. The Council should undertake an early review of the Local Plan and a new SHMA.	
50342	1.7	Object	This paragraph is contrary to NPPF para.158. Circumstances have changed since adoption of LPP1 therefore the evidence base and consequential development strategy should be reviewed. Numerical policies in LPP1 should be updated to be consistent with the current evidence base. Amend 1.7 to read “The development requirements set by Local Plan Part 1, particularly for housing, remain relevant and this Plan does not seek to review them the numerical policies in Part 1 relate to a time of significant difficulties in the local & national economy & WCC committed to the soundness Inspector an early review 20/21 at latest.”	
50342	1.9	Object	Only the impact of changing circumstances on development viability is considered. Flexibility is also needed to maximise site delivery to take advantage of improving circumstances. After 1 st sentence in para 1.9 add “Economic flexibility includes e.g. large windfall sites, growth of real income compared to house prices, capacity of the local construction industry (availability of skills & materials), national & local fiscal boosts to social & market housing, patterns of equity release & right to take pension as lump sum, self employment & PUSH programmes. Social flexibility includes e.g. digital shopping, mixing shopping with leisure, working from home, upper age groups trading down, moving to retirement villages or sheltered accommodation & needs of those with limited mobility. Environmental flexibility includes e.g. open space, development power, insulation, emission & waste recovery sustainability standards; climate change & flood risks, sustainable public & private transport vehicles & routes.”. Retain 2 nd sentence as new 1.9a. Add new policy to read “For as long as the HMR indicates more than a one year backlog of housing	It is not considered necessary to set out examples of possible changing economic, social and environmental circumstances in the Plan. The Plan is required to meet needs but there is no requirement in the NPPF to take steps to exceed housing targets. The Council is required to demonstrate an adequate 5-year land supply (with ‘buffer’) and is doing so at present, and expects to maintain this. Recommended Response: No change required.

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
			need the Council will use all available powers and national and local fiscal and other initiatives to increase the going rate as much as possible above the Local Plan annualised requirement. This may include but not be limited to use of Local Development Orders, designation of self-build sites, normally refusing extension of time on extant planning permissions, focusing CIL funds as much as possible where it will hasten nearby developments and site assembly.”	
	1.10 – 1.11		Sustainability Appraisal	
51443	1.10	Object	The overall approach to sustainability is neutral, when it should be positive, as required by paragraph 14 of the NPPF. Decisions on preferred sites for Colden Common were made before the Enfusion Sustainability Appraisal was commissioned, leading to questions on whether the findings were skewed towards a particular outcome (Site 275).	<p>Enfusion were commissioned to carry out the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) of LPP2 at the start of the Plan production process in 2013. Initial SA work with regard to sites and constraints was undertaken and published (dated September 2013) later that year, well before any decisions were taken by WCC on the sites to be included in the draft Plan.</p> <p>Most of the impacts assessed in the SA are positive. Potential negative impacts have been identified for issues such as nature conservation, climate change and waste as a result of the impact of development, but the SA sets out how these impacts will be mitigated. The SA concludes ‘Overall, the policies and proposed site allocations provide a strong positive framework to guide future sustainable development in the District.’</p> <p>Recommended Response: No change required.</p>
50172 (Hampshire & Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust)	1.11	Support	We are pleased to see WCC acknowledges its commitment to the Interim Solent Recreational Mitigation Strategy and that residential development within 5.6 km of the Solent coast will be expected to contribute towards mitigating its recreational impact	Support welcomed.

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
			through a financial contribution towards implementing the strategy.	
	1.13 – 1.14		Duty to Co-operate	
50105 (South Downs National Park Authority)	1.13	Support	Agree that WCC has engaged positively with the Park Authority throughout plan preparation. The two authorities have met at officer and member level on a regular basis.	Support welcomed.
50084 (English Heritage)	1.13	Comment	Disappointed EH has not been involved in the development of the heritage policies in the plan, although it has been involved in the site allocations.	Acknowledge that EH considers it could have had greater involvement earlier in the Plan making process but EH has now taken full advantage of the opportunity to comment on the draft heritage policies, to support policies or suggest changes to them where needed. Recommended Response: No change required.
51443	1.13	Object	Cross-boundary working has been not been embedded in the formulation of the Plan from the outset. For Colden Common, decisions on the site selection were made before any response was received from the South Downs National Park Authority. Given that “great weight” needs to be attached to the protection of the National Park we conclude that WCC has failed in its Duty to Co-operate.	Decisions on site selection were made over a considerable period of time taking into account a large range of factors as opinions and evidence emerged. In the case of Colden Common the Parish Council considered the outcome of consultations and evidence in October 2013 then again in March 2014 when it amended its recommendation to WCC. WCC officers had consulted and had full knowledge of the response from the SDNPA when considering Colden Common Parish Council’s recommendation in the light of all the evidence when preparing the draft Plan. Recommended Response: No change required.
			Chapter 2 – Meeting Development Needs	
	2.1 - 2.10		Development Needs and Distribution	
50229 (Hampshire)	2.1	Object	Concern about lack of employment allocations outside	The target for employment provision is established in the Local Plan Part 1, which also makes strategic

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
Chamber of Commerce)			of Winchester Town, there is no explanation in the plan why employment provision is not made for growing populations in the market towns and larger villages within and adjoining the PUSH part of the district apart from a small allocation at Bishop's Waltham. Some employment land is lost at Waltham Chase and Colden Common. The plan does not reflect the Solent LEP strategy March 2013 or the call in March 2014 by the Solent LEP for additional logistics land.	allocations including employment. Background studies leading to the draft allocations included a review of employment needs for the settlements where housing development is proposed in LPP1. The draft Local Plan makes employment allocations at Alresford and Bishops Waltham, as well as mixed use allocations. Within South Hampshire Urban Area Policy SHUA2 retains an employment allocation at Little Park Farm and some vacant land remains within the existing employment area at Whiteley. At West of Waterlooville about 23 hectares of employment land is allocated through policy SH2. There is no evidence of need for further employment land at this time. Recommended Response: No change required.
51386	2.1	Object	The Council has a clear shortfall in five year land supply which reflects structural weaknesses in the characteristics of that supply. The extent of the shortfall is significant and can only worsen in the short term. LPP2 provides the Council with an opportunity to remedy the housing supply shortfall by identifying additional land - at Pitt Vale, Winchester.	(As response re paragraph 1.6 above). At the present time an ample 5 year supply (with 'buffer') can be demonstrated and the purpose of bringing forward the allocations set out in the LPP2 is to ensure that this remains the case. Recommended Response: No change required.
51452	2.1	Object	The adopted housing requirement of 625 dwellings per annum is likely to constrain the scope for addressing the affordable housing needs in Winchester. The identified affordable housing need is the equivalent of 59% of the total housing requirement; the Council's affordable housing policy requires a 40% affordable housing requirement which will be insufficient to meet the identified need. The supply of allocations should be increased (to include land at Inhams Lane, Denmead) and an early review of the Plan undertaken.	The issue of affordable housing and overall housing numbers has been settled through LPP1. Policy CP3 of LPP1 addresses affordable housing provision on market led housing sites and policy CP4 addresses affordable housing on exception sites to meet local needs. See also response to paragraph 1.6 above. Recommended Response: No change required.
51452	2.1-2.2	Object	The housing trajectory as provided by the most up to date AMR (2013) demonstrates a very unrealistic trajectory with over reliance on two strategic	Two of the three strategic allocations are now under development and a planning application has now been submitted for the third (N Whiteley). The

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
			allocations. Question whether Barton Farm and North Whiteley strategic allocations) will deliver at the anticipated rate suggested by the Council's latest housing trajectory. Over reliance of this form of development will subject the Local Plan to deliverability issues and lead to a housing deficit hence need to allocate additional land or 'contingency' sites (to include land at Inhams Lane, Denmead) and provide a wide portfolio of sites to ensure the rolling 5 year supply.	delivery of housing and other development is monitored and reported on at least annually. The published Annual Monitoring Report includes information on the delivery of housing together with revised housing trajectories for the period up to 2031 and an assessment of the Council's position on five year land supply. Assessment of this information currently indicates an ample housing land supply, but could trigger a review of the Plan in the future, if necessary. Recommended Response: No change required.
50342	2.2	Object	LPP1 includes SDNP that now removed, fails to take correct account of 6,000 dwelling boost at PUSH sites; also does not take account of improved local & national economy & WCC commitment to soundness Inspector of "early review 20/21 at latest". Development needs should be updated and text changed accordingly.	There is no need to consider a review of the LPP1 at the present time. LPP2 includes in paragraph 1.8 references to the implications of the review of the South Hampshire Spatial Strategy and if any significant changes arise they can be addressed through a future review of the LPP1/LPP2. Recommended Response: No change required.
50446	2.4	Object	No details are given as to the development proposed at Bushfield Camp. In view of the landscape importance of this site, any building must be low-rise, disguised by trees, and of high architectural quality. It would be disastrous if this became another outcrop of motorway junction development. It would be preferable to develop the site as a public green space or park with outdoor recreational facilities.	Bushfield Camp has already been allocated in LPP1 in policy WT3. LPP2 does not need to provide further detail on this site since policy WT3, together with relevant development management policies will provide the appropriate policy context when a planning application is received. Recommended Response: No change required.
51386	2.4	Object	Para 2.4 refers to how LPP1 Policy WT1 defines the spatial planning vision for Winchester Town. The first two bullet points refer to: "Some 2,000 new homes through development and redevelopment of existing sites and premises within and adjoining the defined built-up area" and "About 2,000 homes at Barton Farm". It is clear from this that LPP1 envisaged housing at Winchester could be provided both within and adjoining the built up area. However, LPP2 fails to properly	LPP1 Policy WT1 does allow for the possibility of development adjoining as well as within the built-up area of Winchester as that Plan allocated such land, at Barton Farm. However, studies have identified capacity on deliverable and developable sites within the built-up area, together with a reasonable and justified allowance for windfalls, as allowed by the NPPF, sufficient to meet the needs set out in Policy WT1. Therefore it has not been

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
			assess the need for development adjoining the built up area and gives no consideration at all to the possible benefits of such development - promote land at Pitt Vale for development.	necessary to consider sites proposed by developers outside the built-up area. Recommended Response: No change required.
50105 (South Downs National Park Authority)	2.6	Support	Welcome the clarity of references in the plan to the SDNPA and preparation of its plan. Request that reference is made to under Section 62 of the Environment Act 1995 that relevant bodies which includes WCC has to have regard to the statutory purposes of the national park.	Support welcomed. See response under paragraph 1.4 above.
50342	2.7	Object	Housing, employment, retail and services needs greater than built-up area capacity have to be demonstrated before LPP1 & 2 permit the use of sites in the countryside. Where need is demonstrated then sites still have to be provided despite community objections or lack of support. Sites should also be sustainable extensions to existing built up areas. Change final sentence of paragraph 2.7 to read: "Sites outside settlement boundaries will only be permitted where, following an assessment of capacity within the built-up area, they are shown to be needed, or <i>Sites should be sustainable extensions to the built-up area and where possible located</i> to meet a community need or realise local community aspirations identified through a Neighbourhood Plan or other process which demonstrates clear community support. "	The wording in this paragraph reflects LPP1 Policy CP4, Affordable Housing on Exception Sites to Meet Local Needs, which states, "Subject to the needs of the local community the affordable home should" And "In these circumstances the applicant should demonstrate that the proposal has community support ..." Recommended Response: No change required.
50967	2.7	Comment	Concern regarding additional impact on medical, transport and education facilities from windfall developments in addition to allocated sites including sites permitted outside settlement boundaries and need to ensure infrastructure keeps pace with development.	Considering the sufficiency, or otherwise, of infrastructure and services has been an integral part of developing the LPP2 and its allocations. Allocations have been made where there is capacity, or where capacity can be increased and development is made conditional upon additional service and infrastructure requirements. Recommended Response: No change required.

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
50028 (Oliver's Battery Parish Council)	2.8	Support	Support the importance of protecting areas such as settlement gaps from development as the rural area of the Parish of Oliver's Battery is part of the "Market Towns and Rural Area" location in the Draft Plans.	Support welcomed.
50084 (English Heritage)	2.8	Support	Support reference to scale and design and key historic characteristics.	Support welcomed.
51327	2.8	Support	Support reference to gaps and their retention.	Support welcomed.
50342	2.8	Object	LPP1 has no requirement to allocate employment land outside of 20Ha in Winchester Town. The sequential test is identical for housing, employment, retail & services. "Support" for growth in housing outside the settlements is provided by site allocation but there is no similar policy to ensure that employment, retail & services are expanded in step & sustainably close to existing and/or new housing. Insert new policy, "When new housing sites are proposed for outside of the existing settlement boundary an assessment should be made of whether a further allocation is needed & where to provide employment, retail & services."	See response to comments on paragraph 2.1 above. Recommended Response: No change required.
	2.11 – 2.26		Site Selection: Assessment Methodology	
51452	2.11-2.26	Object	The site selection process of the LPP2 as stated under the supporting document 'Housing Site Assessment Methodology' acknowledges that the starting point for this assessment was provided through a Call for Sites in December 2012; local representatives/ Parish Councils were then asked to identify the development needs for their settlements. Whilst the influence of Localism is important for the consideration of additional sites, the methodology is not an objective assessment. Parish Councils will have different views of the development needs of their area. The methodology of this assessment could of inherently dismissed	With regard to plan-making the NPPF states: "Early and meaningful engagement and collaboration with neighbourhoods, local organisations and businesses is essential. A wide section of the community should be proactively engaged, so that Local Plans, as far as possible, reflect a collective vision and a set of agreed priorities for the sustainable development of the area, including those contained in any neighbourhood plans that have been made." It is therefore entirely appropriate that the

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
			otherwise suitable and sustainable sites from coming forward.	<p>methodology takes account of the outcome of engagement with the local community, whose consideration was informed by evidence. However, the process also took into account the outcome of technical evidence on various topics, and was subject to Sustainability Appraisal / Strategic Environmental Assessment.</p> <p>Recommended Response: No change required.</p> <p>LPP1 Policy WT1 does allow for the possibility of development adjoining as well as within the built-up area of Winchester as that Plan allocated such land, at Barton Farm. However, studies have identified capacity on deliverable and developable sites within the built-up area, together with a modest allowance for windfalls as allowed by the NPPF, sufficient to meet the needs set out in Policy WT1. Therefore it has not been necessary to consider sites proposed by developers outside the built-up area.</p> <p>Recommended Response: No change required.</p>
51443	2.12	Object	The approach in Housing Site Assessment Methodology - referred to in this paragraph - of placing overwhelming weight on Localism, on the one hand, compared with the requirements of the Strategic Environmental Assessment Regulations, Local Plan Regulations and the NPPF, is an error in law.	
50269	2.11-2.29	Object	Disagree that the statement “more organic than mechanical” approach described in paragraph 2.12 is sufficient to safely conclude in paragraph 2.15 that, for Winchester Town “... no further allocations outside the existing settlement boundary need to be identified.” Disagree that no greenfield allocations are needed for Winchester Town. The Town has not been able to benefit from the same robust approach as the villages. Plan does not comply with NPPF para 182. (Seeking allocation of land south of Oliver’s Battery SHLAA site 2540)	
51386	2.12	Object	Failure to consider the reasonable alternatives is also apparent from the Plan’s evidence base. The Council’s Housing Site Assessment Methodology paper 2014 does not provide an appropriate assessment of the sites that provide development or redevelopment opportunities within the Winchester urban area. This is a major omission from the Plan’s evidence base. Promote Land at Pitt Vale.	
51386	2.15	Object	There is no assessment of sites at Winchester outside the settlement boundary through the site selection process. The Plan therefore ignores the possible merits of such sites (or merely assumes that such sites have no merit) and this is a failure to consider the plan’s preferred method of meeting the Winchester housing requirement against the reasonable alternatives. The Plan therefore fails to meet the “justified” test set out in	

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
			NPPF paragraph 182. Promote land at Pitt Vale.	
50084 (English Heritage)	2.26	Comment	Query why non-designated heritage assets are not included in stage 1, whereas sites of local biological and geological importance are.	Stage 1 looked at designated sites rather than non-designated ones. Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation are the local biological designations referred to. These are designated nature conservation areas, which are identified on the Local Plan Policies Map, albeit local ones. Non-designated heritage assets were taken into account at Stage 2. Recommended Response: No change required.
			Welcome the inclusion of historic environment / heritage assets in the settlement based assessments however the term 'Other registered heritage designation' is confusing – better to specifically identify Registered Historic Parks and Gardens and Registered Battlefields the potential impact on which should also have been considered.	'Other registered heritage designation' does include Registered Historic Parks and Gardens and Registered Battlefields the potential impact on which has been considered. Recommended Response: Amend paragraph 2.26 to replace 'Other registered heritage designation' with 'Registered Historic Parks and Gardens and Registered Battlefields'.
			Unclear as to the purpose of stage 3; unsuitable sites should have been eliminated at stage 2 and a stage 4 introduced to clearly set out the sites to go forward through the consultation process.	Stage 3 included public consultation which gave the opportunity to review short listed sites against the key criteria to focus the consultation comments. Recommended Response: No change required.
			Welcome the inclusion of the wider historic environment as key criteria. Query whether there has been any weighting of the key criteria?	Key criteria have not been weighted as such although national designations would be given greater priority over local designations. Recommended Response: No change required.
	2.30 – 2.35		Settlement Boundaries	
50009 (Compton and Shawford Parish Council) & 51327	2.30, 2.32	Support	Supports continuation and retention of settlement boundaries.	Support welcomed.

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
50505	2.32	Support	Support the proposed development boundaries	
50399	2.30	Object	Maps shown at the exhibition differed. Redrawing the village boundary has significant implications, the new boundary does not include two developments, school, doctors or the Wickham centre, and this is a serious omission. These are key facilities in the village and should be included within the boundary. The proposed strategy for Wickham should not be accepted.	Maps for Wickham at the exhibition differed as those for earlier stages showed existing boundaries and the later stage showed the proposed settlement boundary. A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations/settlement boundaries or suggest sites for development, either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition.
51386	2.30	Object	Winchester town is omitted from consideration within the Council's Settlement Boundary Review paper (2014). The settlement boundary review should have considered the merits, scope and limitations of a settlement boundary adjustment at Winchester to ensure a rounded and complete assessment of housing potential. The statement in LPP1 that opportunities will be examined "within and adjoining" the built up area of Winchester to deliver 2,000 new homes requires that this assessment be undertaken.	Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs to be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
51452	2.30-2.35	Object	Object to the use of settlement boundaries. Settlement boundaries such as the ones proposed could effectively preclude otherwise sustainable development from coming forward. The Framework is clear that if development is sustainable it should go ahead. The use of settlement boundaries to arbitrarily restrict sustainable development from coming forward on the edge of settlements would not accord with the positive approach required by the Framework. If the Council continues with the approach to define settlement boundaries, they need to ensure that these settlement limits are not drawn too tightly, and that they enable a degree of flexibility in terms of alternative proposals coming forward on the edge of settlements. Promote site on edge of Denmead.	Settlement boundaries are an established, effective and widely used device. They are used to identify on the Policies Map the application of policies which refer to the use of land "within existing settlements". The Inspector when examining LPP1 said they should be reviewed, not abandoned. LPP2 has taken on board the housing and other development requirements of LPP1 and where these cannot be met within existing boundaries the boundaries of settlements has been extended to include what have been assessed as the most appropriate sites to meet those requirements following consideration of alternative proposals. The Denmead Neighbourhood Plan has, in accordance with Policy MTRA2 of LPP1, identified

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
				sites to deliver the required amount of housing development. The Neighbourhood Plan allocates 4 sites for housing purposes and there is no requirement for LPP2 to allocate further sites. Recommended Response: No change required.
51482	2.33	Object	The LPP2 Settlement Boundary Review – Matters To Take Into Consideration states that the allocation of sites outside the settlement boundary will need to follow the process set out in the Site Assessment Checklist. This identifies ten criteria or ‘key requirements’ for assessing whether a site is suitable for development. There are sites outside the settlement boundary that score Green on the traffic light scoring system for all ten criteria, therefore having no significant constraints to development. The same cannot be said for all sites within the settlement. Sites that score well on the edge of settlements should be allocated for development such as Dykes Farm, Winnall.	LPP1 Policy WT1 does allow for the possibility of development adjoining as well as within the built-up area of Winchester as that Plan allocated such land, at Barton Farm. However, studies have identified capacity on deliverable and developable sites within the built-up area, together with a modest allowance for windfalls as allowed by the NPPF, sufficient to meet the needs set out in Policy WT1. Therefore it has not been necessary to consider sites proposed by developers outside the built-up area. Some sites within the settlement may have constraints but that does not mean they are not deliverable and developable. Recommended Response: No change required.
50028	2.35	Support	Supports that public open space and other undeveloped areas, such as recreational space on the edge of settlements are part of a settlement’s social, physical or environmental infrastructure and contribute significantly to the character or setting of a settlement. Such open spaces should remain outside the defined boundary, where they are also protected from development by countryside policies.	Support welcomed.
			Policy Omissions	
50083 (Environment Agency)	Flood risk	Object	Given the localised flooding that occurred in the District in 2013/14, a localised flood risk policy may be prudent, although there is a strong policy in LPP1. A localised policy would be helpful for windfall developments.	The “strong policy” in LPP1 is CP17. Where specific issues require a localised policy this has been addressed, as is the case with Wickham and policy WK1, and in site allocations for example in Swanmore and policy SW2 The Lakes in LPP2. The nature of windfalls is that their location cannot

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
				be anticipated and policy CP17 can be used. Recommended Response: No change required.
50085 (Natural England)	Natural Environment	Comment	The NPPF (paragraph 114) says that plans should have a strategic approach to enhancing the natural environment. The adopted LPP1 has a number of natural environment policies, but these do not appear to constitute a strategic approach, but rather they set out what planning applications the council will support. The LPP2 does not appear to include such a strategic approach, and so it is not clear what the Council's strategic approach to enhancing the natural environment is. Taken together, the LPP1 and LPP2 should contain such a strategic approach so as to be consistent with the NPPF and thus sound. In addition, having such an approach could allow for any offsite compensation measures needed to be deployed in a strategic and a both cost and ecologically effective manner.	This is about the local planning authority working collaboratively with other partners, including Local Nature Partnerships, to develop and deliver a strategic approach to protecting and improving the natural environment based on local priorities and evidence. Also, considering the opportunities that individual development proposals may provide to enhance biodiversity and contribute to wildlife and habitat connectivity in the wider area. At a strategic level in the South Hampshire part of the plan area the City Council is involved in the Partnership for Urban South Hampshire Green Infrastructure Strategy which is currently being reviewed. Within specific allocations in the LPP2 opportunities are taken to protect and enhance adjoining natural environment sites such as Stratton's Copse at Colden Common. Recommended Response: No change required.
50172 (Hampshire & Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust)	General	Object	The Winchester LPP1 has a very good policy on Flooding, Flood Risk and the Water Environment. (Policy CP17). This recognises the importance of the protection of the important chalk streams and the ground water. As Winchester has such an important water environment the Wildlife Trust would wish to see this policy and its accompanying text reflected more within the LPP2. LPP1 has a statement "Ensure that development is permitted only where there is adequate infrastructure to provide and treat water". We request that this is included in each site allocation under infrastructure requirements to highlight the need to ensure the water environment is protected and that the increased level of development proposed in the LPP2 does not lead to further pressures on the rivers.	The two parts of the local plan LPP1 and LPP2 should be read and used together and it should not be necessary to repeat policy or text from LPP1 in LPP2. The utility companies and the Environment Agency have been consulted on the site allocations to ensure that sites are only allocated where there is already adequate infrastructure to provide and treat water or it can be provided. Recommended Response: No change required.

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
			Policies Map	
50105 (South Downs National Park Authority)	Policies Map (Settlement Boundaries)	Comment	SDNPA notes that small segments of some settlement boundaries lie within the NP and that this can be resolved by the two authorities working together, to show the complete boundaries in their respective plans.	On the Policies Map – see for example settlement Map 1 Bishop’s Waltham – the area of the South Downs National Park is shaded in pale blue and the short sections of settlement boundary that are within the Park are shown by a paler blue line than the rest of the settlement boundary. The Key indicates “Settlement Boundary within the South Downs National Park”. Agree that the local authorities need to work together. Recommended Response: No change required.
			Background Documents / Evidence Studies	
50973	Background Studies	Object	The Council should not use consultants who lack empathy and knowledge of living in our communities and whose research of areas appears to have been done from Google Earth.	It is sometimes necessary to commission consultants to undertake studies due to timing, their specialist knowledge or need for an independent view. Such consultants do not always have local knowledge; however, this is applied by council officers when reviewing the consultant’s reports. Recommended Response: No change required.
51558	Housing site assessment methodology	Comment	The acknowledgement within the document that the ‘Main Road’ area of the settlement (Colden Common) is a potential centre for new development based on its ‘attributes and public preferences’ is welcomed (para 7.10). This point further emphasises the suitability of Glen Park (Site 2389) for allocation. On the basis of the initial site sieve (Colden Common Initial Site Assessment), and assuming that ecological impacts can be mitigated, it is evident that this site performs as well as, if not better than most of the other sites within the settlement. If resident’s responses are also taken into account, it is an obvious choice for an additional allocation.	A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations/settlement boundaries or suggest sites for development, either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs to be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
50138	Strategic gap review	Object	The boundaries of strategic gaps, now known as settlement gaps are required to be reviewed in accordance with para. 132 of the Inspector's Report into the Joint Core Strategy. Objections have been raised to the boundaries of the Whiteley – Fareham Gap, the Gap that affects land at Lower Chase Road and the Otterbourne - Southdown gap. These objections have been submitted separately.	The principle of Gaps between named settlements is established in Local Plan Part 1 (policy CP18). In defining the detailed boundaries of Gaps, the approach adopted consistently across the District is to define all the land between the respective built-up areas. This approach is continued in the draft LPP2, with boundaries reviewed where site allocations are necessary in an area. The Gaps have, therefore, been reviewed to the extent necessary to accommodate development requirements, but should be contiguous with the built-up areas they separate. Recommended Response: No change required.
			Consultation	
50399	Consultation	Object	The response form asks for specific references e.g. paragraph number, policy number etc. This is very difficult to achieve unless you are actually standing in front of the exhibition boards. The website is very complicated and difficult to search for relevant information. Cross-referencing in particular is difficult to a lay-person. The WCC officers at the consultation (Wickham) were unhelpful and unable to answer what I felt were relatively simple questions. Guidance on housing densities was not readily available. Many terms could have been given a more readily understood explanation i.e. 'outside existing settlements'.	Officers tried to guide respondents at the exhibitions to the policy numbers in the Plan to assist their responses. Where respondents have not included policy or paragraph numbers officers have been able to determine which part(s) of the plan they are supporting or objecting to. The exhibitions aimed to explain, with the help of officers and additional documentation, what the plan contained for those who can't access a computer and hand written responses have been accepted and included. Paper copies of the Plan and comment forms were sent to all Parish Councils and were available at local libraries.
50711	Consultation	Comment	Very difficult to comment in the web site as there are no paragraph or policy numbers and this appears as a deliberate attempt to put people off from commenting.	The publicity arrangements for each exhibition or meeting (14 events) were agreed with the local Parish/Town Council and typically included posters, public notices, banners, flier distribution to all homes and/or notices in Parish Magazines or other publications. In Winchester a flier was sent via the
50973	Consultation	Object	Lack of accessibility to information for those who are not computer literate.	
51424	Consultation	Object	Poor consultation. Lack of documents available for inspection, matters poorly exhibited and whole exercise	

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response		
			poorly advertised. Should be easier to understand.	local free newspaper to all households.		
51500	Consult	Object	<p>Should such an exercise be conducted again we offer the following suggestions:</p> <p>a. Any opinion survey should be conducted and interpreted by professional pollsters.</p> <p>b. The results of such a survey should be given significant weight in much the same way as the Village Design Statement was given weight in the site selection process – as part of the decision process but not treated as ‘paramount’.</p> <p>c. The planning decisions should be taken by professional planners on planning grounds – giving due weight to public opinion but not constrained by it.</p> <p>d. Requests by developers for dialogue after the ‘first pass’ of the process (LPP1 in the current process) should not be turned down but encouraged. The more ideas that can be thrown into the ring and debated, the better.</p>	<p>Consultation is not an opinion poll, nor is it dependent on the number of people making comments. It does however seek comments on the planning issues.</p> <p>Recommended Response: Learning points from the consultation process will be used in efforts to make consultation more accessible and understandable in future.</p>		
Appendices						
50342	Appendix A	Comment	<p>Missing "Blue Corridors" referred to in "Green Infrastructure".</p> <p>NPPF Replace first sentence by NPPF 1 "The National Planning Policy Framework sets out the Government’s planning policies for England and how these are expected to be applied."</p>	<p>Reference is made to ‘Blue Infrastructure’ in Chapter 6 and ‘Blue Corridors’ in the glossary, but these terms have not been defined. The term ‘Blue Corridors’ is used and defined in Local Plan Part 1.</p> <p>The proposed amendment to the definition of the NPPF comes direct from the DCLG website.</p> <p>Recommended Response: Add definition in Appendix A Glossary to read:-</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%;"><i>Blue Infrastructure (Blue Corridors)</i></td> <td style="width: 50%;"><i>Describes the seas, rivers, their tributaries and floodplains and includes canals and ponds which can form linked</i></td> </tr> </table>	<i>Blue Infrastructure (Blue Corridors)</i>	<i>Describes the seas, rivers, their tributaries and floodplains and includes canals and ponds which can form linked</i>
<i>Blue Infrastructure (Blue Corridors)</i>	<i>Describes the seas, rivers, their tributaries and floodplains and includes canals and ponds which can form linked</i>					

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
				<div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; margin-bottom: 10px;"> <i>'Blue Corridors' for the movement of wildlife through the District.</i> </div> <p>Amend Appendix A Glossary definition of NPPF to read:-The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) sets out the Government's <i>planning policies for England and how these are expected to be applied</i>.priorities for planning in England. It replaced the previous raft of planning policy guidance notes and statements (PPGs and PPSs).</p>
50036 - Swanmore Parish Council	Appendix C	Comment	Swanmore PC will revisit the Swanmore Village Design Statement (2001) once the WDLP is published, being mindful of the content of the guidance within the High Quality Places Supplementary Planning Document.	<p>Comments noted and reference to draft High Quality Places SPD is welcomed.</p> <p>Recommended Response: No change required</p>
50084 – English Heritage	Appendix C	Comment	Conservation Area Character Appraisals and Management Plans could be added to Appendix C as could the Hampshire Integrated Character Assessment.	<p>The Conservation Area Character Appraisals are currently being updated by the Historic Environment Team and only statements for Hambledon and Sparsholt are currently available on-line. As the list is not meant to be a comprehensive list of the evidence base, it is recommended that these statements are not added to the list. The Hampshire Integrated Character Assessment is available on line.</p> <p>Recommended Response: Add reference to Appendix C under Key Background Documents / Evidence Studies:- Hampshire Integrated Character Assessment</p>
50084 – English Heritage	Appendix D	Comment	English Heritage welcomes the local listing criteria set out in Appendix D, although the description of “Evidential value” is incorrect: “evidential value” is defined in English Heritage’s Conservation Principles as “value deriving from the potential of a place to yield evidence about past human activity”. “Association with a notable family, person, event or movement” falls	<p>Comments Noted.</p> <p>Recommended Response: To ensure that the correct definitions are used, the Historic Environment Team will be asked to review the comments made on Appendix D and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.</p>

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
			within "historical value"	
			Habitat Regulations Assessment	
50085 - Natural England	HRA	Comment	The HRA of the LPP 2 is relying on elements of the HRA of the LPP 1. Since the LPP 1 was adopted, Natural England has undertaken more work with the Environment Agency regarding the River Basin Management Plan (RBMP) for the area covering the River Itchen SAC. Revised targets have been published which are more stringent than those when the HRA of the LPP 1 was undertaken. Advise that these revised targets need to be taken into account in the assessment of Local Plan Part 2. Concur with the conclusion of the HRA Screening Report September 2014 that is: "4.5 The screening concluded that none of the policies/allocations in the Draft Local Plan Part 2 are likely to have a significant effect either alone or in combination on the identified European sites; therefore, an Appropriate Assessment is not required".	Support for the conclusion of the HRA Screening Report welcomed. Natural England also comment that revised targets have been published which should be taken into account in the HRA. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including Sustainability Appraisal and Habitat Regulations Assessment, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
50217 - RSPB	HRA	Object	Concern that the New Forest SPA has been screened out the HRA. The available evidence relating to the New Forest shows that increased residential development within 20km of the SPA will significantly increase recreational pressures on the three Annex 1 heathland bird populations. Without mitigation, new housing within the South and West of the District (including Bishops Waltham, Wickham, Whiteley, and parts of Winchester) could lead to in-combination adverse effects on the integrity of the SPA, meaning that those developments could not go ahead. It is critical that provision is made within the Local Plan Part 2 to ensure that the necessary policy is in place, in line with that of surrounding local authorities (including Fareham and Test Valley).	This response raises matters that require further investigation. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including Sustainability Appraisal and Habitat Regulations Assessment, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
			Sustainability Appraisal / Strategic Environmental Assessment	
50085- Natural England	SA/SEA	Comment	<p>Query the appropriateness of aggregating all sites in a settlement into one row per SA objective in Appendix VI - SA of Potential Site Allocations, if the intention is to use the SA to differentiate between the sustainability of the various sites. The scores produced, being an aggregation of the sites concerned, cannot be used to differentiate between sites, and so it is unclear what purpose they serve.</p> <p>We also note that there appear to be a number of errors in site referencing in Appendix VI. We do not regard these as being serious failings of the SA process.</p>	<p>This response raises matters that require further investigation.</p> <p>Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including Sustainability Appraisal and Habitat Regulations Assessment, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.</p>
50693	SA/SEA	Object	<p>The SA is based on incorrect evidence including the following :- the local objections to the Plan are not recognised; no evidence to suggest displaced businesses will stay in Alresford; Sun Lane is not served by regular public transport; there is local flooding at the SW corner of the Sun Lane site; complete destruction of the landscape is not noted. The SA is unbalanced and the 'iterative' process as required by Government guidance has not been undertaken, the SA should be revised.</p>	<p>A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations or suggest sites for development either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition.</p> <p>Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including Sustainability Appraisal and Habitat Regulations Assessment, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.</p>
51095	SA	Object	<p>The SA highlights the unsuitability of SHLAA site 365 for development.</p>	<p>A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations or suggest sites for development either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition.</p> <p>Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including Sustainability Appraisal and Habitat Regulations Assessment, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.</p>

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
51465, 51466	SA/SEA	Object	The SA should be revisited and each of the sites tested individually against the SA objectives and then compared to one another.	A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations or suggest sites for development either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including Sustainability Appraisal and Habitat Regulations Assessment, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
50633 – Alresford Professional Group, 50693, 51132	SA	Object	The SA does not consider reasonable alternatives. In New Alresford – the assessment is based on sites in the September 2013 SA. It doesn't consider a concentrated approach or dispersal and the Alresford APG alternative plan should be included in the SA process.	The alternative plan was not available when the SA of the draft LPP2 was undertaken. The SA looked at the alternative sites available at the time which included some of these sites, but not all of them. The SA is an iterative process, and any further work on the SA will feed into the Pre-Submission Local Plan Part 2. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including Sustainability Appraisal and Habitat Regulations Assessment, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
51465, 51466	SA/SEA	Object	The SA should test reasonable alternative strategies, including the option of exceeding the residual housing target to deliver wider community benefits and dispersal of development vs single urban extension.	A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations or suggest sites for development either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including Sustainability Appraisal and Habitat Regulations Assessment, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
51443	SA/SEA	Object	The SA did not assess reasonable alternatives, including Site 1871. It assessed sites, not options. Options include dispersed growth, or smaller site at Church Lane, Colden Common (Detailed and specific points of contention are set out.)	A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations or suggest sites for development either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including Sustainability Appraisal and Habitat Regulations Assessment, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
51452	SA/SEA	Object	The SA fails to analyse reasonable alternatives. Not in line with PPG Guidance in respect of the overall housing allocations. The SA should assess how affordable housing provisions could be met through its assessment of reasonable alternatives. The SA also fails to provide a suitable alternative for the Parish of Denmead and only includes recommendations for the Parish.	The Strategic Environmental Assessment of the Denmead Neighbourhood Plan policies provides an understanding of the 'reasonable alternatives' and outlines the reasons for selecting the alternatives. The Examiner's report to the Neighbourhood Plan responds to specific representations on this matter and to the collaborative working and sharing of information between the City Council and the Parish Council and recognises that the Sustainability Appraisal for LPP2 includes an appraisal of potential site allocations in Denmead. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including Sustainability Appraisal and Habitat Regulations Assessment, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.

Appendix 7

Winchester Town - Responses to Draft Local Plan Part 2 Consultation

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
			Location, Characteristics & Setting	
51393, 51440	3	Support	Support the proposals for Winchester Town, and no development should be allowed outside it	Support Welcomed
50028 – Oliver’s Battery Parish Council	3.1.1	Support	Support the inclusion of the built up part of Olivers Battery as part of Winchester Town and the remainder to fall within the Market Towns and Rural Area.	Support Welcomed
50084 – English Heritage	3.1.2	Support	Welcomes reference to historic and cultural assets of exceptional quality.	Support Welcomed
50967	3.1.5	Comment	Support vision for Winchester but add the following: - <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High tech environment offering highest quality of mobile and broadband communication, aiming to be a ‘smart’ city with ‘smart’ market towns too. • Encourage low carbon travel options, and low/no energy housing • Provide an environment and infrastructure that provide opportunities to live an active and healthy lifestyle • Provide homes for life • Primarily meets the needs of all those who live and work in the city and district. 	Comment noted but the vision quoted in this paragraph is taken from the Vision for Winchester Town 2012-2017 published by the Winchester Town Forum Recommended Response: No change required.
			Development Needs	
50269	3.2	Object	There is an over reliance on small sites, the plan should allocate further greenfield land for development. There is opportunity to accommodate development within the landscape surrounding Winchester that would not have an unacceptable impact on the setting of Winchester or	A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations or suggest sites for development either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition. Recommended Response: To ensure that the

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
			the wider landscape character.	most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
50367	3.2	Object	Need to retain some car parking in the city centre for people to access services. Ensure that new buildings fit in with their surroundings. If car parks are closed the spaces lost must be replaced nearby e.g Cattle Market.	Objection noted, but this is what the Plan seeks to achieve Recommended Response: No change required.
50084 – English Heritage	3.2.1	Support	Support the reference to the internationally important heritage of Winchester.	Support Welcomed
50174	3.2.2	Object	Object to the inclusion of reference to development at Bushfield Camp, which is not a sustainable location for employment development and will detract from the commercial vitality of the city. It is therefore contrary to policies WIN1 i) and iii), WIN 2 ii), WIN 3 iii) and many policies within the Vision for Winchester as well as the LPP1	Bushfield Camp is allocated for development by policy WT3 of Local Plan Part 1 and this allocation was required by the Local Plan Inspector in order to make that Plan sound. It is not, therefore, possible to change this allocation and it is appropriate to refer to it in LPP2, which should be in accordance with LPP1. Recommended Response: No change required.
50967	3.2.2	Comment	Add to vision; provision of education facilities to include pre school and adult education- with high quality and low energy design in any new development or extension.	Comment Noted; but the spatial vision to which this comment relates is taken from the LPP1 Recommended Response: No change required.
50509	3.2.3	Object	Object to short term projects that destroy the local area i.e replacing a much used and much enjoyed car parks. More retail space is not required as there is sufficient vacant floorspace.	Objection noted; the Council considers that it has a robust evidence base to support the development requirements in LPP2 Recommended Response: No change required.
51489	3.2.4	Object	The preparation of the Part 2 Local Plan identifying local policies and proposals without any formal assessment of the area or its potential results, the document cannot be considered sound in its current form.	Objection noted; the Council considers that it has a robust evidence base to support the LPP2 Recommended Response: No change required.
50967	3.2.6	Comment	Support the robust planning and challenge through the Wellbeing Board to reduce strain on the public trying to	Comment noted. The bodies responsible for primary health services have not identified a need

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
			access primary health services. Surprised that a new health centre is not required for Winchester despite residents claiming they can't get appointments.	for land to be allocated for additional facilities. Recommended Response: No change required.
51489	3.2.6	Object	Paragraph 3.2.6 acknowledges the objections that were raised during the consultation process, the majority relating to the redevelopment of the cattle market. Due consideration of alternative strategies could have addressed these including full consideration of the potential for mixed use development including housing at Winnall.	A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations or suggest sites for development either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
50168	3.2.6 + 3.6.8	Object	No mention is made of the capacity of supplies of water, gas, electricity, sewage treatment and surface water drainage to accommodate the future growth that is being proposed in the plan. Continual renewal and repair is evidence of the existing strain being imposed on this aspect of infrastructure. LPP2 includes Development Management in its title and should include a statement about the existing capacity of these utilities, and their ability to be managed to provide for the needs of future growth. Education is a major activity in Winchester. With 4000 new dwellings being proposed in the plan period, the population of Winchester will increase by about 10.000, there is a need for LPP2 to assess and identify provision for future educational requirements.	A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations. Infrastructure delivery is also addressed in LPP1 and was taken into account in setting the development requirements for Winchester. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting
			Housing	
50174, 50503, 51386, 51476	3.3	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Figures allocated within Net Housing Requirement table need to be more robust. Need to clarify how reduction of numbers within Silver Hill and the Police HQ will be addressed. There should be a requirement (not an expectation) that all housing sites should provide 40% affordable 	The Net Housing Requirement table under paragraph 3.3.1 will be updated in the next version of the Plan. A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations or suggest sites for development, either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
			<p>housing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning policy should be to increase densities not reduce them. • Not planning positively as failing to allocate more land for development. • Reliant on a large amount of windfalls and unallocated SHLAA sites to meet its requirement. • Completions are lower than requirement and some sites are slow to deliver - reliance on SHLAA sites is over optimistic (not met NPPF requirements in defining deliverable and developable sites). • Need for older persons housing in the form of extra care (not included in the housing target, but required by PPG). Suitable sites for extra care should be allocated. 	<p>addition.</p> <p>Recommended Response: Update the Net Housing Requirement table as necessary (paragraph 3.3.1). To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.</p>
50998, 51126, 51372, 51388, 51408, 51431, 51435, 51482, 51109, 51567, 51568, 51569, 51570, 51571, 51572, 51574, 51575, 51582, 51813, 51573, 51576	3.3	Object	<p>Generally support the plan, but object to the proposal by Linden Homes to extend the development at Pitt Vale, this will have severe impact on local roads and services and is both unnecessary and will impose further strain on the environment and services in the area. Such a development will need the Council to revisit the strategic plan to ensure that the local infrastructure can cope. (Several of these objectors also supported WIN1 and the requirement that development should be confined within the defined settlement boundary)</p>	<p>The objection is noted but this proposal is not an allocation in the LPP2</p> <p>Recommended Response: No change required.</p>
51055, 51344, 51130	3.3	Comment	<p>Support the policy of keeping new development within the settlement boundary of Winchester. This will preserve the surrounding countryside, avoid closing separation gaps with neighbouring villages, and ensure that brownfield sites are redeveloped or repurposed as the priority. Traffic congestion is already severe and should not be made worse by more development.</p>	<p>Support welcomed and comments noted.</p> <p>Recommended Response: No change needed.</p>
50168	3.3.2	Object	<p>Delivering at higher densities should be encouraged on both large and small sites. Barton Farm is being</p>	<p>As the Barton Farm site has outline consent for 2000 dwellings as established in LPP1, there is no</p>

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
			developed at about 20dph. Should be planning for 21st century high density suburb by building terraced housing centred on squares and generous green spaces that encourages cycling and walking and discourages car use. The LPP2 should include a policy to require a review of the Barton Farm masterplan to examine the potential for achieving more development.	requirement for an additional policy ion LPP2. Recommended Response: No change required.
51097	3.3.3	Object	Concern that there is pressure from developers to release further sites for development around Winchester Town despite the plan being categorical in references to the exceptional qualities of the town and its setting. These sites cover areas of historic value and provide key links between the town and countryside. Policies need to be more robust and specific as possible to protect the exceptional band of countryside around Winchester.	Objection noted, LPP2 seeks to prevent the release of further greenfield sites. Recommended Response: No change required.
50168, 50359	3.3.4	Object	Development has been allowed with reduced or non provision of affordable housing. Concern of the cumulative impact this will have on social housing provision and there is now a need to allocated affordable housing on greenfield sites. WCC should robustly challenge claims of non-viability so that all sites above the threshold provide 40% affordable housing.	The provision of affordable housing is required by the NPPF and LPP1 to be subject of viability testing. Recommended Response: No change required.
50432	3.3.4	Object	Sites within the built up area will not be sufficient to meet the objectively assessed housing needs. Notwithstanding the doubt over the deliverability of various elements of supply within the town, there are issues associated with viability on larger sites; the Plan should include sufficient sites which can contribute to the provision of affordable housing. Promoting land adjacent the Down House, Harestock Road.	A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations or suggest sites for development either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
50168	3.3.5	Object	Introduce a policy to encourage land assembly so that higher densities can be achieved. Such a policy was	Objection noted, but it would not be appropriate for the LPP2 to be prescriptive over higher densities

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
			advocated by the City of Winchester Trust in the document it published in 2001, 'The Future of Winchester a Strategic Vision' and believes it would make a useful contribution to delivering more well designed housing within the town's boundary.	Recommended Response: No change required.
50982	3.3.6	Comment	Support the boundaries showing the limits of development, concern that more development will have a negative impact on existing road network.	Comment noted. Recommended Response: No change required.
			Employment	
50146 & 50147	3.4.1	Object	<p>Bovis Homes and Heron Land Developments object to the over reliance on Bushfield Camp to meet the future employment requirements of Winchester Town. The delivery of the relatively small scale employment allocations proposed at Station Approach are similarly uncertain.</p> <p>Object to the failure of LPP2 to allow employment sites to come forward in response to changing economic circumstances over the plan period or lack of delivery on identified sites. A knowledge park should be allocated on land north of Well House Lane as part of a mixed use extension to the strategic allocation at Barton Farm.</p>	<p>Bushfield Camp is an allocation in Local Plan Part 1 and was included following a recommendation by the Local Plan Inspector in order to make the Plan sound. It is intended to meet particular needs, should these arise in future. A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations or suggest sites for development either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition.</p> <p>Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.</p>
50229	3.4.1	Comment	Not clear what sectors are aimed at for the business park at Bushfield Camp. The M3 LEP identifies science and technology as key drivers of future economic growth. This area should provide a link with local universities and create a science and creative industries area.	Comment noted, this site is allocated for employment uses in the LPP1 Recommended Response: No change required.
50168 – City of Winchester Trust	3.4.1 -3.4.4	Object	Object to Bushfield Camp being identified as an employment site of around 20 hectares because of its impact on Winchester's setting. If it is implemented it will not be in accordance with policy WIN 1(i). To avoid	See response to comments on paragraph 3.2.2 above. The relevant LPP1 policy (WT3) already includes a requirement that the site should only be used for development which could not otherwise be

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
			premature development of Bushfield Camp, The Trust proposes that policy should be included that: ' no development at Bushfield Camp for employment use should be permitted before allocations of employment land set out in policies WIN 5, WIN 6 and WIN 7 have been permitted, implemented and occupied'.	accommodated within or around Winchester, as well as other criteria. Recommended Response: No change required.
51489	3.4.2	Object	The paragraph sets out a presumption that employment areas including Winnall will remain in employment use. Given changes in government policy it is important that the potential release for alternative uses is considered. The land within the employment area is brownfield land within the settlement boundary. The potential to convert buildings to residential use as has been approved for the Cavendish Centre.	This paragraph refers to policies which are adopted within Local Plan Part 1. The Council has commissioned a Winnall Planning Framework which will examine issues relating to that area. Recommended Response: To ensure that the policy includes the most appropriate wording, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting
			Retail	
50229	3.5	Object	Concern about the amount of retail in Winnall, this will endanger the attraction of the city centre and reduce units for industrial use. Tighter controls are needed	The council has commissioned a Winnall Planning Framework which will examine this issue. Recommended Response: To ensure that the policy includes the most appropriate wording, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting
50359	3.5 & 6.4.120	Comment	The only mention of market stalls is in passing. This suggests the argument over whether they should stay down the High Street in WT is over. A good market is an attractive and desirable attribute of an historic town but the current weekday markets in their current location are not inevitably an asset. It's noticeable that the famous markets have purpose-designed spaces.	This is not a matter that is appropriate for inclusion in the Local Plan. Recommended Response: No change required.
50168, 50359	3.5.1- 3.5.5	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Other submissions indicate amount of retail floor space proposed at Silver Hill will result in an 	These matters are dealt with in Local Plan part 1 and the retail study which informs it has been kept

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
			<p>overprovision of floorspace, in expenditure terms. This should be investigated.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the impact of on-line retailing on retail floorspace requirements needs further consideration. 	<p>up to date. This included consideration of the amount of floorspace needed and the impact on online retailing.</p> <p>Recommended Response: No change required.</p>
50342	3.5.3	Object	<p>WCC committed to review retail requirements by 2021. This should be changed to "but the situation will need monitoring and the retail study will be reviewed before 20/21 at the latest."</p>	<p>The Council stated its intention to review Local Plan Part 1 (LPP1) in para 10.3 of LPP1, following recommendations in the Inspector's report. This is still the intention, although no date has been set. There is no need to refer to this in the Local Plan Part 2.</p> <p>Recommended Response: No change required.</p>
			Infrastructure	
51534	3.6.4 – 3.6.5	Object	<p>Redevelopment of the recreation centre is not needed, with limited resources renovation will be sufficient.</p>	<p>The options for the leisure centre at River Park are being considered as a major project, the results of which will feed into the Local Plan Part 2, if necessary.</p> <p>Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.</p>
50230, 51041	3.6.4 – 3.6.5	Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Question protection of land designated as DM5 Need to take a strategic and integrated view of the Bar End area incorporating the Depot site and adjacent sites (Chilcomb). This area should be protected and enhanced for sport and recreational use with new indoor and outdoor facilities to create a community sports hub; with provision of pedestrian and cycle access into and through the area. 	<p>The protection that would be afforded to any land designated under DM5 is set out under this and other relevant policies in LPP2.</p> <p>The options for the leisure centre at River Park are being considered as a major project, the results of which will feed into the Local Plan Part 2, if necessary.</p> <p>Recommended response:-To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various</p>

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
				points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
50174, 50162, 50168	3.6.6 - 3.6.7	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerned about the conflicts in LPP2 which will result in unsustainable development – contradictions between strategies. • Plan does not set out provision of sustainable transport options or address adverse environmental impacts of existing transport; includes policies which would make impact worse – (Silver Hill and Station Approach). • Policies taking wrong direction on parking provision and bus provision • Lack of progress in developing cycling and walking infrastructure. • LPP2 should include policies to reduce Transport emissions to meet targets for the reduction in carbon emissions. • Add reference and policies as appropriate to implement Car Parking Strategy, Winchester Town Access Plan, Cycling Strategy, Walking Strategy. • WCC has not reduced car parking as required by Winchester Town Access Plan but retaining or adding to it. 	<p>A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations or suggest sites for development, either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition.</p> <p>Recommended Response: To ensure that the policy includes the most appropriate wording, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting</p>
50967, 50973, 51720	3.6.6, 3.6.7	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should also refer to rail transport; and poor facilities at the station. • Poor parking at smaller stations; problems with commuter parking - should be a clear aspiration of the Plan. • Concern about further reduction in car parking in Winchester – link to price reductions for parking provision further out. • Bus service needs to be improved to ease traffic. 	<p>A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations or suggest sites for development, either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition.</p> <p>Recommended Response: To ensure that the policy includes the most appropriate wording, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.</p>

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
51501, 51814	3.6	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Create traffic free areas in the city - could improve economic performance. • Lack of reference to walking cycling strategy. • Link new developments with existing networks. • Needs to be a strategic view of routes into the city centre and opportunities. 	<p>A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations or suggest sites for development, either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition.</p> <p>Recommended Response: To ensure that the policy includes the most appropriate wording, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting</p>
50432	3.6	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Plan cannot be considered to be 'Positively Prepared' in terms of seeking to meet infrastructure requirements. • The Open Space Strategy is not fit for purpose and does not meet the requirements of the NPPF and PPG. • Questions the extent the open space needs can be met within the built up area, particularly in the north of the town. • Over estimates existing sports field provision as includes sports grounds with no public access – instead there's a deficit in sports grounds. • It includes land which has been lost to affordable housing. • "Needs and Opportunities" doesn't match presented data and is misleading. • Promote land adjacent to the Down House, Harestock Road to deliver a mixture of informal open space, natural greenspace and play provision to meet the needs of Harestock. 	<p>A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations or suggest sites for development either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition.</p> <p>Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.</p>
50967	3.6.1	Comment	Open space facilities are unevenly distributed around the town. This applies to meeting places, including those for young people too.	<p>This is addressed through the relevant policies in Local Plan Part 1 and the proposed policy DM5.</p> <p>Recommended Response: No change required.</p>
50967	3.6.8	Comment	Lack of parking/ park & ride facilities for those coming	Planning permission for development at Barton

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
			from the north is barrier to economic development of Winchester. Larger facilities at Barton Farm should be re-explored. All Winchester primary schools are two form entry as three form creates a different environment which I believe, should be resisted most strongly.	Farm has now been granted and is being implemented. The County Council is the education authority and as such, will advise on the appropriate education requirements. Recommended Response: No change required.
			WIN 1	
51482	3.7	Comment	Welcome the study for Winnall. The brief for this piece of work states that the council are looking for new housing sites on the edges of Winnall, one assumes outside the settlement boundary and at Dykes Farm as there are no other edges with land suitable for development. It is essential that LPP2 leaves open the possibility that this important piece of work can reach open ended conclusions.	A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations or suggest sites for development either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
51489	3.7	Object	The plan fails to allow for the comprehensive redevelopment and reconfiguration of land and buildings at Winnall. A full assessment of Winnall should be undertaken, the potential of the land to be redeveloped for a mixture of uses including retained employment, residential and leisure should be considered. Following this detailed assessment, a new policy should be drafted to outline an area of potential where such uses will be considered favourably.	A planning framework for Winnall is being developed and may result in additional policies, as necessary. A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations or suggest sites for development either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
51742	3.7	Comment	Move hostel opposite Discovery Centre to the bottom of the city. Winchester is a wonderful place to live; don't let it be spoilt.	Comment noted – this raises a very specific matter which is not covered in LPP2. Policy WIN1 establishes development principles to be followed for all developments within the Town. Recommended Response: No change required.

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
50084	WIN1	Support	Support the policy to protect and enhance the special qualities of Winchester Town including its setting and treed sky lines.	Support welcomed
51053	WIN1	Support	Support the boundaries as proposed to avoid more development on our green spaces.	Support Welcome
51534	WIN1	Support	Support the housing allocation proposals for the City and maintaining the proposed boundaries of development.	Support Welcome
50168, 50172, 50174, 50359, 51497, 51720 , 51742	WIN1	Object	<p>Policy should refer to :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the character & charm of Winchester – which should be defined – suggest as compact, mixed use, combining buildings of different ages, historic, with easy access to countryside, green fingers e.g. along river, accessible on foot, relationship with water, views of countryside the importance of the River Itchen the importance of Winnall Moors and other open spaces in flood defence bullet ii should refer to ‘be of sufficient density to meet...’ bullet iii should include reference to cycling and walking under sustainable transport <p>Question whether this policy will deliver the social housing, transport solutions it refers to.</p>	<p>The purpose of WIN1 is to realise the Vision for the Town by establishing a set of principles to be followed, and proposals will also need to be judged against other policies in the Plan. The matters referred to by these objections are covered in a range of policies and documents mentioned in the supporting text.</p> <p>Recommended Response: To ensure that the policy includes the most appropriate wording, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.</p>
50162, 50174	WIN1	Object	A more specific policy is needed on reducing pollution and meeting the City's targets on greenhouse gas emissions; The Council is breaking the law on air pollution; the notion that the Council feels it is within its discretion to balance air pollution against the freedom of traffic to pollute is simply preposterous.	<p>Climate change targets are referred to in LPP1 and in particular policies CP11 and CP12. However, this response raises matters that require further investigation.</p> <p>Recommended Response: To ensure that the policy includes the most appropriate wording, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.</p>

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
51669	WIN1	Object	Object to the loss of Chesil Car Park, the bulk and height of the development is unsuitable for this site.	This objection relates to the proposal for an Extra care scheme on the Chesil car park site. This site has been subject to a planning application, not a Local Plan proposal, and on 5 February 2015 the Council granted planning permission to build 52 extra care units on the site of the Chesil surface car park. Recommended Response: No change required.
50168	WIN1 - WIN2	Object	The City of Winchester Trust welcomes the encouragement of sustainable transport options etc in paragraph (iii) of Policy WIN 1 but does not believe the wording in paragraph (iii) in Policy WIN 2 ('effectively mitigates adverse environmental or transport impacts within Winchester town centre.') will deliver this. The Trust would therefore like to see a precise policy to deliver the aims of WTAP such as the reduction of 500 spaces in the town centre mentioned in LPP1 in place of policy WIN 2 (iii).	This response raises matters that require further investigation. Recommended Response: To ensure that the policy includes the most appropriate wording, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
50168	WIN1	Object	The City of Winchester Trust advocated the designation of a Green Belt around the north, west and south of the City in representations on LPP1, to complement the South Downs National Park to the east, This would provide an appropriate measure to support this policy. Winchester's setting and compact nature has been recognised in a number of documents. There has to be a limit to the growth of the City if its character and setting are not to be fundamentally altered and a green belt would be an appropriate way of ensuring that is prevented. The Trust therefore proposes that these documents would be a useful starting point in preparing a consultation document for the creation of a green belt and the following policy is proposed: A consultation exercise is prepared and undertaken for the designation of a Green Belt around Winchester in conjunction with or following the adoption of the South Downs National Park	The matter of a green belt around Winchester Town was discussed at the Examination into LPP1, where the Inspector concluded that "In conjunction with the NPPF, the current suite of policies in this plan and elsewhere available to the Council is more than sufficient to ensure that inappropriate and/or unsustainable development proposals in and around Winchester are unlikely to progress, during this plan period at least. The heritage assets and landscape character of the town and the district as a whole should receive appropriate protection accordingly. Therefore, there is no current necessity for a Green Belt around the town." Given, LPP2 follows the strategic objectives of LPP1, the LPP2 is not the right means, or time, to consider the introduction of such a policy tool. Recommended Response: No change required.

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
			Local Plan in 2017.	
50174	WIN1-WIN2	Object	Policies WIN1 and WIN2 refer to development in the Town and contain statements about 'sustainable transport options etc...' and 'mitigates adverse environmental or transport impacts'. These are too vague and need more detailed policies. A clear statement needs to be included that refers to the Winchester Town Access Plan and how this will be delivered through LPP2.	This response raises matters that require further investigation. Recommended Response: To ensure that the policy includes the most appropriate wording, further work needs to be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
			WIN 2	
50084 (English Heritage)	WIN2	Comment	EH would welcome an additional bullet to read "conserves and enhances the sensitive historic environment of the town centre and the heritage assets therein".	This response raises matters that require further investigation. Recommended Response: To ensure that the policy includes the most appropriate wording, further work needs to be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
50359	WIN2	Object	Policy refers to "creating a regional centre for creativity and culture", but no space is dedicated for it. A small hotel should be provided for to support the growing number of niche restaurants which have no accommodation.	WIN2 refers to the granting of planning permission that accords with the elements of the policy which would not preclude a small hotel. There are many uses that could be aimed at creating a regional centre for creativity and culture and this policy allows for these to be positively considered. Recommended Response: No change required.
			WIN 3	
50105 (South Downs National Park)	WIN3	Support	Support this policy which names St Catherines Hill as a key historic feature, it should be noted that St Catherines Hill is in the national park.	Support welcomed.
50359	WIN3	Support	Welcome reference to micro-generation equipment etc	Support Welcomed
50084 (English Heritage)	WIN3	Comment	Policy needs to specify from where there are important views and why these views are important, how much of	This response raises matters that require further investigation.

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
			<p>the feature is visible and if a partial loss occurred how important would this be. Further work is needed to ensure the approach undertaken is robust. WIN3 fails to recognise the importance of the setting of the city as part of the view. Surprised to see St. Giles Hill and St. Catherines Hill not specified. The importance of the setting of Winchester is highlighted in a report commissioned by EH this omission is surprising. Views and the setting of Winchester would benefit from further explanation through the production of an SPD.</p> <p>The reference to the Winchester City and its Setting document should include its status and date. It should also be referenced in WIN3 or its supporting text.</p>	<p>Recommended Response: To ensure that the policy includes the most appropriate wording, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.</p>
50185	3.7.6	Object	<p>Add St Giles Hill to the list of Winchester Key Historic Features. It is the key viewpoint from which Winchester's roofscape can be best appreciated and features in many publications. The inclusion of the Barclays Bank Building in this list is unjustified and should be deleted.</p>	<p>This response raises matters that require further investigation.</p> <p>Recommended Response: To ensure that the policy includes the most appropriate wording, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.</p>
50148	WIN3	Object	<p>This policy is not required and adds another layer of unnecessary restriction on development within a large part of the historic city of Winchester. These matters are covered by the High Quality Places SPD which is not mentioned in the text or policy. Winchester College is listed as a key historic feature but the map shows the original college building whereas Winchester College is much more than a 'key historic feature' and comprises an extensive campus over 60ha of which approximately two thirds comprise of sports playing fields and historic water meadows. The remainder is intensively developed with academic and support buildings, which form an integral part of the Winchester Conservation Area.</p>	<p>This response raises matters that require further investigation.</p> <p>Recommended Response: To ensure that the policy includes the most appropriate wording, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.</p>

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
			Request WIN3 is deleted.	
50174, 50359, 50509	WIN 3	Object	<p>Various comments in relation to Policy WIN3:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Redevelopment of the Police Headquarters is bound to improve the skyline, but it is not only the skyline that needs protecting from over-large buildings – Silver Hill and the station area • There should be an encouragement of the design of roofscapes to provide efficient orientation for solar collection. • A 5-7 floor building placed at the point of Andover road and Worthy is not sympathetic to Hyde Close, Worthy Lane or being adjacent to a conservation area. This is not visionary and will completely ruin the views for locals 	<p>This response raises matters that require further investigation. A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations.</p> <p>Recommended Response: To ensure that the policy includes the most appropriate wording, further work needs to be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.</p>
50168	WIN3	Object	<p>The City of Winchester Trust welcomes inclusion of this policy but believes it needs additional work. The consideration for views should be widened beyond views to and from the Key Historic Features listed in para. 3.7.6, to include views of landscapes such as St Giles Hill and St Catherine's Hill. Therefore the Policy should include height as a factor which governs the size of a development. Roofscape is a product of building type (church, public building, commercial, residential), floor plan area, building height, materials and topography. Policy on this matter needs to be more explicit, if it is to be helpful and able to be implemented. The Trust acknowledges that a study to define and support a roofscape policy would be complex, but if undertaken it would make the policy more credible.</p>	<p>This response raises matters that require further investigation.</p> <p>Recommended Response: To ensure that the policy includes the most appropriate wording, further work needs to be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.</p>
			WIN 4	
50084 (English Heritage)	WIN4	Support	Welcome and support criteria (ii) and (v) of Policy WIN 4 – Silver Hill.	Support welcomed
50168, 50174, 50229, 50359, 50446, 50967,	WIN4	Object	Object to various elements of the policy including:- Parking :	A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations.

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
50973, 51534, 51669, 51769,			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reduce the amount of parking rather than replacing the Friarsgate car park. For residential parking, a car club should be a requirement, • (iv) about parking provision should be amended by deleting 'Appropriate car parking to replace any spaces lostthrough the Transport Assessment'. <p>Office Provision :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Disappointing that Silver Hill no longer contains any office provision <p>Retail provision</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The need for extra shops is not demonstrated, are long term vacant shops so no evidence of demand for more. Silver Hill is the wrong location for more shops and could have a negative impact on the high street. <p>Public Transport</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site should be more aware of public transport needs • all the facilities needed by passengers should be provided and be of high quality and located conveniently near the bus stops. • Bus station should be included <p>Affordable housing :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should include 40% affordable housing • Site should include a high percentage of affordable and social housing <p>Landscaping :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • incorporate the waterways that run through the site as a landscape and amenity feature <p>Design and Layout</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • site should show a sense of place • retain the scale and intimacy of the medieval and 	<p>Recommended Response: To ensure that the policy includes the most appropriate wording, further work needs to be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.</p>

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
			Victorian streets and mingle houses and apartments with small shops, businesses and workshops Demolition in Conservation Areas is completely contradicted by the Silver Hill plans and the antique market.	
			WIN 5 – WIN 7	
50168	3.7.9 – 3.7.15 + 6.4.74- 6.4.82	Object	Extending the boundaries of Conservation Areas is not mentioned in the Plan. Consideration should be given in Winchester around the Station Approach area. The City of Winchester Trust has become aware of the Conservation Area Project 2003 which recommends the extension of the Conservation Area in 4 places (part of which includes the Registry Office). WCC should takes steps to implement these extensions and start the process leading to this. An appropriate policy should be included in LPP2 if it helps to do so.	This response raises matters that require further investigation. Recommended Response: To ensure that the policy includes the most appropriate wording, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
50174	3.7.9	Object	Object to the wording 'The City Council has assessed the potential for viable development in this area in order to maximise the benefits for the city as a whole.' This is incorrect. The viability study concentrates narrowly on the City Council's own landholdings.	This response raises matters that require further investigation. Recommended Response: To ensure that the policy includes the most appropriate wording, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
50967	3.7.9-3.7.10	Comment	This area must incorporate better waiting and parking facilities and bus provision, and make it easier to change from one mode of transport to another.	This response raises matters that require further investigation. Recommended Response: To ensure that the policy includes the most appropriate wording, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
51883, 50084 51669, 50146 50147, 50168 50174, 50185 50359, 50367 50445, 50509 50523, 50967 50971, 51079 51285, 51326 51355, 51482 51493, 51534 51584	WIN5	Object	<p>Object to policy WIN5 for one or more of the following reasons:</p> <p>Design:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development of 4,5 and 6 storey offices, apartments and multi-storey car parks is not appropriate design for a 'vibrant gateway'. • Should refer to do not exceed 4-5 storeys in height, except where good urban design principles (these require closer definition), require a landmark building (6 storeys) • Sub paragraph (v) of Policy WIN 5 should be amended to delete "4-5 storeys" and substitute "3-4 storey", Reference to a 6 storey landmark building should be deleted. There is no historic or townscape justification for such a building at the Worthy Lane / Andover Road junction • The 'Landmark element' will inevitably impose a monolithic block at Andover Rd/ Worthy Lane junction - create a distinctive and modern 'landmark sculpture' set in a small well maintained, landscaped park. • There is more land in this area which could be included • Station is a major interchange and proposals should be included to allow full integration with the city centre by all modes • The City needs a historic Winchester entrance, not a brash new globalised office complex, do not vandalise Station Approach • make this a museum, a gallery space, a park, to improve the gateway to town. A different approach is needed to develop Winchester and not to turn it into an overdeveloped congested area • Concentrate parking on the Cattle Market site 	<p>The City Council is undertaking further consultation on the Station Approach area and the results will be taken into account in deciding whether/how to amend the relevant policies. A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations. These representation also need to be read in conjunction with those to Policies WIN5-7 below.</p> <p>Recommended Response: To ensure that the policy includes the most appropriate wording, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting</p>

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
			<p>would be preferable</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • retain existing trees and buildings where they make a positive contribution • Conflicts between cars and pedestrians in this area should be avoided.. • Not enough for pedestrians; too much parking within the area; Not enough contribution to sustainable transport needs across the whole of Winchester Town; provision of an Integrated Transport interchange unreasonably dismissed; • provide active streets frontages to enhance the public realm and pedestrian environment, including the vitality and viability of the local centre along Andover Road; • for use of land around the station is that the station should facilitate easy low carbon movement in and out of Winchester town for people who live, work and enjoy leisure in Winchester. The policy should give high priority to pedestrians and ensure cycle parking • WIN5(viii) should be deleted as it makes no reference to the additional parking provision provided at the Station <p>Affordable Housing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Disagree with results of viability report • Ideal site for affordable housing • To state that affordable housing cannot be generated on our own land makes it virtually impossible to ever get affordable housing on any urban site <p>Loss of open space</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of valuable open space • Retain surface car parking at Gladstone Street and Cattle Market – • allows open spaces to be used for other activities 	

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
			<p>more in keeping with the needs of residents and visitors and retains open buffer area between residential and commercial use of land.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The small tree-filled car park below it is one of the few car parks that should be protected. <p>Retention of registry office</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> turning it into a performance space or visitor centre. include on a list of local assets. The Registry Office (old Railway Refreshment Inn) is entirely connected to the arrival of the railway and enhances the setting of the station, the old Refreshment Inn could become a small hotel and restaurant is ideally placed <p>Detail policy wording</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Object to the reference in Policy WIN5 to the Development Framework set out in the Winchester Station Approach Development Assessment. Lack of consultation on the framework particularly with local residents Policy not supported by an evidence base Clarify roles of WCC – land owner and local planning authority Undue weight is given to the proposals to the detriment of the wider Winchester area. Amend Policy WIN 7 to be consistent with amended WIN 5. 	
50445 50084 51496	3.7.14	Object	The Registry Office has a colourful history as a pub welcoming train travellers, the site of weddings, registration of deaths etc, it is a part of Winchester's history and a much-loved landmark. it should be converted into a Tourist Office/Cafe/WCs to greet tourists as they arrive. Further it could potentially be a venue for	A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations. Recommended Response: To ensure that the policy includes the most appropriate wording, further work needs be undertaken on the various

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
			<p>small artistic projects such as Chamber Concerts. The proposed developments on Station Approach do not fulfil the ambition of the Council. Aesthetically the Station Approach is exceptionally pleasing and with the addition of a Tourist Office, situated in a more sensible place than it is at present, would make the arrival at Winchester extremely agreeable. There is no need for 'active frontage' as generally people walk to town for shopping purposes. There is no need for a Vibrant Gateway on Station Approach, why not leave it as an extremely pleasant well-planted welcome to Winchester?</p>	<p>points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting</p>
<p>50162,50168, 50174, 50359, 50436, 50445, 50446, 50457, 50507, 50554, 51237, 51424, 51501, 51584, 51884</p>	<p>WIN 5, 6, 7</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>Object to these policies for one or more of the following reasons:</p> <p>Removal of car parking –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cattle Market/Worthy Lane car park is one of the highest used weekdays • Valuable site for other events – car boot sales • an important 'gateway' car park by other groups • makes a positive contribution to town scape • retained and improve with fencing and landscaping • need to reduce commuting – keep cars out of the city centre • transport implication have not been assessed • lack of reference to cycle provision <p>Height of proposed buildings –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Disagree with proposal for 6 storey building opposite 2 storey cottages in a conservation area • Disregard to scale and impact on surroundings • Avoid high rise <p>Car use</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposals will have a detrimental impact on car use and pollution in the city centre. 	<p>A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations.</p> <p>Recommended Response: To ensure that the policy includes the most appropriate wording, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.</p>

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic impact <p>Other matters</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • develop a transport hub at the station • loss of trees • retain special heritage • impact on conservation area • retain conservative club and put to community use • consider site for affordable housing • consider site for creative industries • retain Register Office • commercial hub is inappropriate • proposals will have a negative impact on this part of the town • need to consider archaeology in the area • policies pay lip service to pollution matters and need to reduce carbon emissions 	
50174, 51669	WIN6	Object	<p>Suggest the following wording:</p> <p>Land at the Carfax site, as shown on the Policies Map, is allocated for a mixed-use development comprising office (Use Class B1a) uses, small-scale retail or leisure uses, residential accommodation, and car parking or such other uses as shall be set out within the station area assessment once it has been subject to public consultation and review. Planning permission will be granted provided that detailed proposals accord with other relevant policies and:</p> <p>(i) include a Design and Access Statement which clearly demonstrates a full understanding of the site constraints, context of the area, and shows how the designs have responded to it; (ii) provide a fitting gateway into the town, by enhancing and extending the public realm and</p>	<p>A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations.</p> <p>Recommended Response: To ensure that the policy includes the most appropriate wording, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.</p>

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
			providing buildings of the highest design quality; (iii) retain and respect the Registry Office, Records Office and Station buildings and assess the impact of development within the wider context, including residential properties and views; (iv) prioritise pedestrian routes through the site and links to the town centre and other key destinations, improving provision for and integration of pedestrians, cyclists and public transport, including appropriate provision for a transport hub as identified by the Station travel plan.	
51669	WIN6	Object	Retain adequate car parking and restrict buildings to 3 storeys.	A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations. Recommended Response: To ensure that the policy includes the most appropriate wording, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
50229	WIN6-WIN7	Comment	Welcome proposals but car parking should be retained at both locations to ensure visitor and retail economies are supported.	A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations. Recommended Response: To ensure that the policy includes the most appropriate wording, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
50084	WIN7	Comment	Support criteria iii and v, request v to read "retain a view of the Cathedral from Andover Road or from within the development."	A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations. Recommended Response: To ensure that the policy includes the most appropriate wording, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
50174	WIN7	Object	<p>Suggest the following wording: Land at the Cattlemarket site, as shown on the Policies Map, is allocated for a mixed use development comprising offices (Use Class B1a) and other commercial uses, residential accommodation, and car parking or such other uses as shall be set out within the station area assessment once it has been subject to public consultation and review. Planning permission will be granted provided that detailed proposals accord with other relevant policies and:</p> <p>(i) include a Design and Access Statement which clearly demonstrates a full understanding of the site constraints, context of the area, and shows how the designs have responded to it; (ii) provide a fitting entrance to this part of the town, by improving the public realm, improving pedestrian and cycling access, including through the site, and developing buildings of the highest design quality including a landmark element at the junction of Andover Road and Worthy Lane</p> <p>(iii) define the extent and significance of any archaeological remains and provide for their preservation or recording, as appropriate;</p> <p>(iv) ensure that the scale of the development respects and is not overbearing for nearby residential and other properties;</p> <p>(v) seek to retain a view of the Cathedral from Andover Road or from within the development.</p> <p>(vi) The conservative club building, once stripped of its later additions, is a fine mid-19th cent villa capable of adding significant character to redevelopment of the cattle market. Its removal should only be considered if a comprehensive justification can be provided which overrides this.</p>	<p>A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations.</p> <p>Recommended Response: To ensure that the policy includes the most appropriate wording, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.</p>
50445, 50469, 51007, 51100, 51326, 51669,	WIN7	Object	<p>Object to policy WIN7 for one or more of the following reasons:</p>	<p>A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations.</p>

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
51883			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site is inappropriate for a landmark need to respect the roofscape and the close proximity to The Conservation Area of Hyde, will have a major negative impact on the conservation area. • the area would benefit from some renovation of the car park perimeter and shop fronts along Andover Road • must respect the historic character of Winchester • object to loss of car parks which used almost to capacity by commuters, tourists, visitors to Peter Symonds College, and local residents for whom permit controlled on street parking is inadequate • height of buildings inappropriate • the view from Andover Road is important • should be no more than 3 storeys 	Recommended Response: To ensure that the policy includes the most appropriate wording, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
			WIN 8	
51882	3.7.11-3.7.16, WIN8	Support	Support the policy commitments in WIN8.	Support welcomed
50146 50147	WIN8	Object	Object to the reference in Policy WIN8 to the key principles and proposals set out within the Stanmore Planning Framework. These should be set out in detail within Policy WIN8 so that they can be subjected to independent scrutiny. Not clear what status the Planning Framework has in the context of Local Plan Part 2; the Planning Framework should more appropriately have been prepared as an Area Action Plan.	This response raises matters that require further investigation. Recommended Response: To ensure that the policy includes the most appropriate wording, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
50967	WIN8	Object	All new homes in this area should be built to and include 'homes for life' principles to accommodate the needs of the whole community. Flats with stair access is unsuitable accommodation except for mobile people and creates social isolation, including young families.	This response raises matters that require further investigation. Recommended Response: To ensure that the policy includes the most appropriate wording, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
				be reported back to a future meeting.
			WIN 9	
50967	3.7.23	Object	This is too prescriptive and not a reflection of consultations. The need for additional properties is acknowledged, consultation is ongoing and this paragraph should be removed until it has finished.	This response raises matters that require further investigation. Recommended Response: To ensure that the policy includes the most appropriate wording, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
50146, 50147, 51039	WIN9	Object	Not clear what status the Planning Framework has in the context of Local Plan Part 2. The key principles and proposals for Abbotts Barton should be set out in within Policy WIN9 rather than the Abbotts Barton Planning Framework so that they can be subject to independent scrutiny. Consider that the Planning Framework should more appropriately have been prepared as an Area Action.	This response raises matters that require further investigation. Recommended Response: To ensure that the policy includes the most appropriate wording, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
51039, 51693, 51769, 51805	WIN9	Object	Alternative sites should be considered rather than losing open space and garage courts which will be needed in future:- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use scrubland at Hillier Way rather than loose open space. • land adjacent to Francis Gardens • Hillier Way (12 dwellings) • Dyson Drive (10-15 units) 	A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations or suggest sites for development, either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
50502	WIN9	Object	Too many houses planned. Object to houses in Charles Close as reduction in green space will impact on community. Consider alternatives:- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land in Hillier Road 	A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations or suggest sites for development, either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition. Recommended Response: To ensure that the

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Redevelopment of Council garages for housing 	most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
			WIN 10	
50359, 50967, 50973	WIN10	Support	The suggestion of an Article 4 Direction to protect against the proliferation of HMOs is welcome. Article 4s should also be used for conservation purposes.	Support welcome Recommended Response: No change required.
50967	3.7.32	Comment	University growth has fuelled the trend for more HMO accommodation. Winchester University must be encouraged to provide accommodation all year round, not just in term time, as many students have jobs.	Universities provide an important contribution to the local economy and community and the Plan therefore seeks to support them and their programmes for accommodation provision, as well as recognising that there are imbalances that need to be addressed through policy. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
50967	3.7.34	Comment	Should also require HMO's to be licensed. This gives the tenant, the landlord and the neighbour more power to take action if necessary.	Licensing may have an impact on the quality and management of the property, but not the key issues of concern in Stanmore regarding HMOs. An Informal Scrutiny Committee looked into extending licensing requirements in 2013 (OS69) and concluded that '... only the use of planning law that can be used to restrict the increase in future HMO numbers and that the introduction of HMO additional licensing is beyond the current capacity of Private Sector Housing'. Recommended Response: No change required.
51669	WIN10	Object	Should aim for no more than 10% of HMOs in one street not 25%	This response raises matters that require further investigation.

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
				Recommended Response: To ensure that the policy includes the most appropriate wording, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
			Maps	
51321	Map 24	Object	The value of land inside the city boundary is limiting the supply of affordable dwellings. WCC should investigate the potential for limited amendments of the boundary to increase the supply of housing. Land at 6&10 Harestock Road is adjacent to the city boundary and the Barton Farm development and would be a sustainable location for housing.	A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations/settlement boundaries or suggest sites for development either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting
51489	Map 26	Object	Proposals Map 26 for East Winchester does not identify any proposals for the Winnall area of Winchester. The area should be allocated as an area of potential for conversion and redevelopment for other uses including residential. This area should include the Cavendish Centre on Winnall Close which has permitted development rights for conversion from office to residential and could form part of wider redevelopment proposals	A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations or suggest sites for development either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting
			Omissions	
50269	Omission	Object	Without considering sites beyond the existing settlement boundary, the social, environmental and economic needs of Winchester cannot be met. This is true of housing numbers, delivery rates and flexibility (quantitative) but also true of the qualitative issues too. The plan does not	A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations/settlement boundaries or suggest sites for development either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition.

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
			promote sustainable development. Do not agree 3.3.6. that no more greenfield allocations are required. Land to the south of Oliver's Battery would be the obvious choice for allocation.	Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs to be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting
50489	WIN1 Omission	Object	Promote land at Old Orchard and the former Old Manor Nursery. Both parcels of land are adjacent to one another and accessed off Kilham Lane. The site is previously developed (brownfield) land. The LPP2 Draft does propose an alteration to the settlement boundary for Winchester Town at Kilham Lane, although land at Old Orchard and Old Manor Nursery has been omitted. The LPP2 should amend the settlement boundary to include the land or to amend the wording of the relevant draft policy to allow for the redevelopment of previously developed land in sustainable locations, where it adjoins a settlement boundary.	A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations/settlement boundaries or suggest sites for development either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs to be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
51467	Omission	Object	The settlement boundary for Winchester Town should be amended to include land off St Cross Road, which belongs to The Hospital of St Cross and alms-house. The properties clearly form part of the urban area and should not be considered to be countryside. These properties clearly define and reinforce the existing urban edge.	A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations/settlement boundaries or suggest sites for development either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs to be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting
50146, 50147	Omission	Object	Object to the calculation of the residual housing requirement set out in paragraphs 3.3.1-3.3.6. Consider that the City Council has significantly over-estimated the current housing land supply position. It is not clear whether the City Council have made any allowance for non-implementation of these sites. The	See response to comments on paragraph 3.2.2 above. A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations or suggest sites for development either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
			<p>SHLAA includes sites which are no longer being promoted by developers and over estimates capacity. A number of the SHLAA sites are also included in the Station Approach, Stanmore or Abbotts Barton Planning Frameworks; If the sites are included in the Planning Framework, they should be taken out of the SHLAA for transparency reasons and to avoid any potential for double counting. The allowance for windfall development is excessive and is unlikely to be delivered. It is unlikely that sites within the existing built up area will deliver the housing required by Local Plan Part 1 given that the Plan also seeks to retain existing employment land, provide new employment and retail floorspace and to protect areas of public open space, sporting and recreational facilities.</p> <p>Promote land north of Well House Lane which should be allocated as a mixed use extension to the strategic allocation at Barton Farm. In the event that it is not necessary to allocate additional greenfield sites at this stage, the site should be identified as a reserve site..</p>	<p>addition.</p> <p>Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting</p>
50153	Omission	Object	<p>Promote Land at Texas Drive, Oliver's Battery, for residential purposes. The Council will struggle to maintain a five year supply of housing and should allocate this site as it is available and deliverable. The Council has not carried out a proper analysis or review of the function and justification of the local gap where the site is situated. The site does not form a role in preventing coalescence of settlements.</p>	<p>A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations/settlement boundaries or suggest sites for development either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition.</p> <p>Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting</p>
50228	Omission	Object	<p>Object that no new greenfield sites require to be allocated on the edge of Winchester.</p> <p>There is a need for smaller greenfield sites to be allocated on the edge of Winchester to give a greater</p>	<p>A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations/settlement boundaries or suggest sites for development either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in</p>

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
			range of housing sites and house types to meet housing need and market demand. The Plan should include land at Old Sarum Road/Kilham Lane. The table at 3.3.1 needs to be updated as site capacity has changed; no capacities are given in policies WIN5-9 and SHLAA sites capacity is over estimated.	addition. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting
50243	Omission	Object	Land at Winchester Trade Park, Easton lane should be allocated for retail to meet the additional floor space needs identified in LPP1 for 2021 and beyond. This is a sustainable and sequentially preferable location to accommodate needs not met in the town centre. It is an area dominated by retail use; is attractive for this use; is not adversely impacting on the town centre; it contributes to the local economy.	A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations or suggest sites for development either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting
50432	Omission	Object	The absence of any sites to meet local housing needs on the edge of Winchester is in conflict with adopted Policy WT1; Sites within the built up area will not deliver sufficient affordable housing to meet objectively assessed housing needs, nor will they provide new open space to address the deficit; The identification of greenfield sites to provide the necessary certainty of delivery to meet objectively assessed local market and affordable housing needs; and deliver much needed open space. The Council should allocate land adjacent the Down House, Harestock Road to ensure sufficient flexibility over the plan period; and, offer the opportunity to deliver high quality public open space which will make a t contribution to addressing local deficiencies in the area.	A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations/settlement boundaries or suggest sites for development either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting
50503	Omission	Object	Land to rear of Courtney Road should not be allocated as “green infrastructure” in policy WT2.The land is not included as green infrastructure or mitigation for Barton	A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations/settlement boundaries or suggest sites for development either as an

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
			Farm. The settlement boundary will encompass the Barton Farm development and it would be reasonable that land to the rear of Courtenay Road is included within a defined settlement boundary as an additional development opportunity. Land to the rear of Courtenay Road will be surrounded on three sides by development, once the Barton Farm site is developed.	alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting
50510	Omission	Object	Land at Dykes Farm adjoins the settlement boundary and can provide housing including affordable housing. The site is close to the city centre and rail station. Request SHLAA sites 2585 and 2486 are considered together and allocated for development. The sites are deliverable, have no constraints and are the closest greenfield sites to the city centre. Detailed supporting information on landscape; flooding; transport matters also submitted.	A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations/settlement boundaries or suggest sites for development either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting
51386	Omission	Object	Promote land at Pitt Vale as the housing supply assumptions in the Plan require review. There is a significant shortfall in the Council's 5 year land supply that arises from a structural imbalance in the pattern of housing supply. Immediate remedial action could be achieved through the allocation of additional sites including land at Pitt Vale, Winchester that consists of approximately 26.5 hectares of undeveloped land on the south western edge of Winchester on the Romsey Road, at its junction with the A3090. The site is in a sustainable location that is free from constraints and can provide a development of approximately 350 homes together with landscaping, open space and a local centre.	A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations/settlement boundaries or suggest sites for development either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting
51476	Omission	Object	Promote land south of Winchester adjoining Oliver's	A number of representations make comments on

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
			<p>Battery on the basis that the Plan includes too heavy reliance on the existing built-up area of Winchester, two strategic development areas and the market towns and larger villages, to deliver the District's identified housing requirement. This is unlikely to provide sufficient flexibility to respond to the SHMA figures or to respond to rapid change (as required by paragraph 14 of the NPPF). Additional allocations for housing are required at Winchester as it is the most important settlement in the District. Land to the south of Winchester adjoining Oliver's Battery which presents an opportunity for Winchester to grow and provide more affordable and market housing, together with green infrastructure, other land uses and local facilities in a new 'garden suburb'. The area can accommodate improvements to public transport and routes for sustainable transport modes including walking and cycling, and can help to enhance access to open space for residents of Oliver's Battery. The total area available for development is about 48 hectares, which is large enough to respond to the many varied opportunities and constraints presented by this location, whilst respecting heritage assets, landscape character and significant views of Winchester. Development of some 500 homes could take place on an area of about 25 hectares, whilst leaving more than half of the area open.</p>	<p>the proposed site allocations/settlement boundaries or suggest sites for development either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition.</p> <p>Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.</p>
51442	Omission	Object	<p>Land at Salters Lane (SHLAA site 2541) could provide housing including affordable, make up open space deficiencies in the area and be of low environmental impact.</p>	<p>A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations/settlement boundaries or suggest sites for development either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition.</p> <p>Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including</p>

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
				sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting
51462	Omission	Object	Local Plan Part 1 states that specialist accommodation including extra care housing and housing for the older population will be delivered through the strategic allocations and “other development”. The Local Plan Part 2 does not specifically identify care facility sites. Demand for care within the District is significant with projections indicating that by 2031 over a third of the population will be of pensionable age. Bushfield Camp would be an appropriate location for a care village. This could include a mix of care home, assisted living units, independent living units and some key worker housing.	Bushfield Camp is allocated for development by policy WT3 of Local Plan Part 1 and this allocation was required by the Local Plan Inspector in order to make that Plan sound. It is not, therefore, possible to change this allocation. Recommended Response: No change required.
51482	Omission	Object	Dykes Farm Easton Lane, is appropriate for development, within walking distance of the centre and have no impact on residential amenities. Few sites within the Settlement Boundary are as well located. Sites should be allocated on merit and their contribution to a wider vision rather than merely being located within an existing settlement edge.	A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations/settlement boundaries or suggest sites for development either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs to be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting
51533 51542 51545 51370 51867 51453	Omission	Object	Site in Bar End Winchester including the Biffa site, would be more suitable for Travellers than Hensting Lane, Colden Common. The impact in a semi industrial area with good transport links, superstores, schools, and employment opportunities, will be minimal.	The City Council has commissioned an assessment of potential traveller sites in conjunction with East Hampshire District Council and the South Downs National Park Authority. The results of this are awaited. A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations/settlement boundaries or suggest sites for development either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2,

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
				further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
			Consultation	
51399	Consultation	Object	The consultation process is clearly inadequate since 2000 marchers voiced concerns on 29th November. Engagement and consent of the residents of Winchester must be adequately sought before plans go ahead. The quality of Council communication on these matters is very poor compared with the case made by objectors	The march to which this objection refers took place before the closing date for comments on the draft Local plan, enabling anyone with concerns to make comments. A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations or suggest sites for development either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
			Other Comments on Winchester Town	
50028 (OBPC), 51435	6.3.8	Support	Support reference to Oliver's Battery in para 6.3.8; this local centre acts as an important community hub.	Support welcomed.

Appendix 8

Implementation and Monitoring - Responses to Draft Local Plan Part 2 Consultation

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
50342	7.4	Object	WCC committed to soundness Inspector "early review 20/21 at latest". Replace 1st sentence by: Local Plan Pt1 was produced at a time of difficulty in the local & national economy with the inevitable uncertainties involved in longer term predictions & planning policies becoming out-of-date. Hence the Council is proposing to review Parts 1 & 2 of the Local Plan in any event no later than 2020/2021.	<p>The Council stated its intention to review Local Plan Part 1 (LPP1) in para 10.3 of LPP1, following recommendations in the Inspector's report. This is still the intention, although no date has been set. There is no need to refer to this in the Local Plan Part 2.</p> <p>Recommended Response: No change required.</p>
50082 – Highways Agency	7.6	Comment	Would be concerned if any material increase in traffic were to occur on the SRN as result of development. The local plan must provide the planning policy to ensure that development cannot progress without appropriate infrastructure or demand management. Pleased to see that site allocations have taken into consideration all aspects of transport - cycling, walking and public transport into the site assessments and subsequent allocations. Request early consultation on any emerging sites. Any sites which could have an impact on the SRN will require a full Transport Assessment.	<p>Comments noted. The policies requested already exist in Local Plan Part 1 (policies CP10 and CP21) so there is no need for additional policies in Local Plan Part 2.</p> <p>Recommended Response: No change required.</p>
50028 – Oliver's Battery Parish Council 51435	7.9	Comment	While OBPC welcomes the benefits associated with the CIL in providing some funding towards infrastructure needs arising from developments it is important to recognise that adjacent parishes and wards should receive appropriate contributions where specific infrastructure needs arise from nearby developments. For example, improving road junctions in and out of Oliver's Battery in light of the changes and increases in traffic resulting from the Pitt Manor Development.	<p>Contributions will be collected predominantly through the Community Infrastructure levy (CIL) system or through S106/S278 obligations related to individual developments. The Council has an adopted CIL Charging Schedule. The City Council must give 15% of the CIL receipt from a development in a parished area to the relevant parish council (subject to an upper monetary limit in any given year defined in the CIL regulations). If the parish council has an approved statutory neighbourhood plan then the percentage rises to 25% and there is no upper limit. This allocation is</p>

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
				<p>mandatory. The Council has also agreed to give 25% of the remaining CIL to Hampshire County Council for the delivery of infrastructure projects which are the responsibility of the County Council from the Regulation 123 list. The remaining receipts will be put into to a programme to be developed alongside the City Council's capital or revenue expenditure programmes for the delivery of priority infrastructure projects by the City Council or other key providers.</p> <p>Recommended response: No change required.</p>
50217 - RSPB	7.13	Object	<p>Concerned that the reference to large developments within paragraph 7.13 is not consistent with the Interim Strategy or with Natural England's advice. The Solent Recreation Mitigation Strategy is not only designed to mitigate the effects of small developments. Natural England's advice is that, as a starting point, all residential development within 5.6km should contribute towards the Strategy, with some developments (due to their scale/proximity to the SPAs) potentially requiring additional local measures. Recommend that paragraph 7.13 is revised to reflect the wording of the Solent Recreation Mitigation Strategy (in particular paragraphs 4.12 & 4.13).</p>	<p>Agree that the wording of paragraphs 7.12 and 7.13 should be amended to reflect the wording within the published Interim Solent Recreation Mitigation Strategy as recently agreed by the Partnership for Urban South Hampshire.</p> <p>Recommended Response: Amend the wording of Paras 7.12 and 13 to reflect the wording in the published strategy.</p>